View metadata, citation and similar papers at core.ac.uk
brought to you by CORE
provided by Columbia University Academic Commons

“WORKING AUTOBIOGRAPHY”—
EXPLORING THE (IM)POSSIBILITIES OF (RE)PRESENTING “CURRICULUM” AND TEACHER “NARRATIVES”

by

Patricia Mito Gibson

Dissertation Committee:

Professor Janet Miller, Sponsor
Professor Haeny S. Yoon

Approved by the Committee on the Degree of Doctor of Education

Date ________May 16, 2018_______

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education in
Teachers College, Columbia University

2018

ABSTRACT

"WORKING AUTOBIOGRAPHY"—
EXPLORING THE (IM)POSSIBILITIES OF (RE)PRESENTING "CURRICULUM" AND TEACHER "NARRATIVES"

Patricia Mito Gibson

Qualitative research around teachers' interpreted "experiences" has contributed to an increase and legitimization of "voice" and "experience" of those who have traditionally been excluded from research. Narrative inquiry in the form of autobiography has been utilized as one mode of inquiry to represent such teacher stories. However, such research that attempts to "capture" these "experiences" assume "experience" as fact and transparent, thus neglecting to acknowledge the idea that the "self" is constructed and mediated through discourse and power relations. Furthermore, many conceptualizations around "curriculum" focus on curriculum as "course of study" and neglect to recognize the ways in which "experience" intersects with "curriculum" and how this is manifested in daily school contexts. This inquiry explored the intersections of teachers' interpreted "experiences" and how their understandings of their professional identities, if at all, spill into their understandings of "curriculum" based on conceptualizations of "curriculum" as discourse. Working from feminist poststructural orientations towards discourse,

subjectivity and power, this qualitative inquiry took a particular event in Japan as an entry point and explored if and how teacher's interpreted "experiences" and their understandings of their "selves" shifted, contradicted, and/or collided and, at times, impacted their understandings of the "curriculum."

Drawing from poststructurally inflected understandings of narrative inquiry, this inquiry explored how specific teachers spoke of their educator "experiences" in relation to their current circumstances of teaching in displacement following a series of natural and man-made disasters, and how they conceptualized "curriculum" in relation to their interpreted "experiences." Through qualitative data collection and analysis informed by and interrogated by feminist poststructural assumptions, I attempted to trouble how I understood "data" and chose to represent these "data" throughout. Such troublings stemmed from what some qualitative researchers have called the "crisis in representation." More specifically, through autobiography as one mode of narrative inquiry as self-reflexive practice and processes that I sought to "trouble" from poststructural perspectives, I grappled with the "crisis in representation" throughout this inquiry as I explored and challenged the limits of transparent notions of "experience" and "self."

© Copyright Patricia Mito Gibson 2018

All Rights Reserved

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Within the last few years of engaging with and through this dissertation, many individuals have impacted the ways in which I understood, understand, and continue to grapple with my own attachments to the already familiar.

I am grateful to the teachers, administrators, and friends who have agreed to share their experiences as well as their stories with me. I am inspired by their courage, love for teaching, and care for their students.

I am indebted to my dissertation committee members Professor Janet Miller and Professor Haeny Yoon. I am also grateful to my defense committee members Professor Detra Price-Dennis and Professor Christine Baron. Thank you for your feedback as well as pointing towards a possible continued engagement with this work. Professor Miller, you pushed and challenged me in ways I could not imagine possible but you were right there next to me throughout this exhilarating doctoral exploration. Thank you for your encouragement, patience, and listening ear when at times my life seemed unclear. Professor Yoon, you too have been by my side throughout this process. Without your support and belief in me, I would not have been able to write this here to express my gratitude. My deepest gratitude and appreciation to all professors who have influenced, touched, and impacted me in ways that I never imagined possible before this doctoral experience.

I also would like to thank Samantha, who has been a mentor and inspiration for me throughout these years. I have learnt the art of smiling even when situations are difficult in front of me. Thank you for all your support, friendship, mentorship, and guidance.

To my C&T cohort. Yes, I was the last one to arrive to class and the first one to leave class. But you were always there for me even when I found it hard to open my heart to you. My heart fills with joy thinking of each and every one of you. And my "Dissertation Editing Group"—nothing but love for you.

Connie and Aya. I did it. Finally. Done. やったよ！

チャーちゃん。卒業ちょっと遅れちゃったね。でもやっと卒業だよ。来世もチャーちゃんの孫として色々な世界をチャーちゃんと見たいな。

ママ。どんな時も私が一番聞きたいこと、聞かなければいけないことを言ってくれますよね。時には心にぐさっとくる。でも、ママがいたからここまで来れた。チャーちゃんとママがいたからここまで来れた。ありがとう。

Recognizing these tellings are partial, I owe my sincere gratitude to so many more. You know who you are because you were one of the first people I called or texted when I defended this dissertation. Love to you all.

P.M.G.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PROCESSION viii

I—INTRODUCTION 1
Background of Context 5
Shifts in Japanese Education 5
Normalizing the Safety Discourses 8
Statement of Problem 11
“Curriculum” Reconceptualized 12
“Complicated Conversations” 15
Rationale for the Study 18
Statement of Purpose and Research Questions 20
Research Questions 20
Conceptual Framework 22
The Subject and the “I” 22
Poststructural Perspectives on Discourse 25
The Subject and “Experience” 28
Researcher Role(s)/Positionalities 33
Summary 35

II—CURRICULUM IN CONTEXT 37
Education in “Post-Crisis” Contexts 39
“Curriculum” As It Relates to Textbooks 42
“Curriculum” As It Relates to “Experience” and “Self” 46
“Curriculum” As It Relates to Inequities 51
Teachers in “Post-Crisis” Contexts 54
Troubling “Curriculum” and “Experience” 59
“Curriculum” as Discourse 63
Interdependency—An Inquiry Within and Without 66

INTERLUDE—IN ANTICIPATION OF AN ENCOUNTER 68

III—METHODOLOGICAL CONCERNS AND RESEARCH PROCESS 70
Enlightenment Versions of Narrative Inquiry 70
Feminist Poststructural Critiques of Narrative Inquiry 73
The Reconceptualization of “Curriculum” and Autobiography 75
Feminist Poststructural Versions of Autobiography 77
Confronting the Crisis of Representation 79
“Validity” 81
“Uncomfortable Reflexivity” 83
Miller’s Exploration of Transnational Flows and Mobilities: Working Autobiographically 84
Data Collection 86
Elements of “Data” Constructed 87

III (continued)

Study Participants 88
In-person In/formal Interviews 89
Grappling With “Data” 93
Data (Engagement) (Analysis) 95
Limitations of the Study 98

INTERLUDE—TELLING A STORY ABOUT “I” 101

IV—MY TELLINGS OF HIRO 103
Casual Conversations With Hiro 106
Earlier Influences to Hiro’s Educator “Experiences” 109
Making a Difference as a Teacher 111
School Goals and Objectives as the “Curriculum” 117
“Kyouiku Keikaku” = “Curriculum”? 121
Organizing “Curriculum” and Lesson Plan 124
Hiro’s Connections to School T 127

INTERLUDE—THE TRANSLATING I’S 134

V—BECOMING (UN)FAMILIAR WITH PLACE AND SENSE OF BELONGING 146
Engaging With Nao’s Memories as a Student 153
A Harmonious Place—Sensibilities of a Teacher-in-the-Making 157
Returning “Home” to Teach 159
Interruptions to Nao’s Sense of Belonging—3/11 161
Connectivity and Engagement During Evacuation 165
Redefining Boundaries and Belonging 171

INTERLUDE—SEEKING ENTRY TO A PLACE CALLED “HOME” 176

VI—DISCOURSES OF CERTAINTY—THE HABITUAL TELLINGS OF THE AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL “I” 181
Constructions of Sora Based on Field Notes 182
Interrupting My Approach to “Data” 184
Sora’s Understanding of “Curriculum” 186
Home Studies as “Curriculum” 188
Home studies as a place of tension 190
An Uneasy Dialogue 193
Informing and Consenting 194
Remaining Within Constructs 197

VII—AN ATTEMPT TO CONCLUDE 199
My Telling of Teacher “Stories” 200
Critique of Study—Limitations 204
Conflicting Conceptual Framework 205
Partial Interpretation of “Narratives” 206

VII (continued)
To Whom Do I Write? (Implications) 207
"Curricular" Enactments and Continued Conversations....207
Reconceptualizing Curriculum to Interrupt Policy 210
Interrupting Traditional Interviewing as Research Practice 211
Future Research Possibilities 213

EPILOGUE....215
Practices of Methodology 216
Practices of Power....217
An Address....220

REFERENCES 222

APPENDICES
Appendix A – Sample E-mail to Be Sent to Solicit Participant Suggestions 241
Appendix B – Sample E-mail to Be Sent to Potential Participants 243
Appendix C – Sample E-mail to Be Sent to Potential Participants Who Have Agreed to Participate....245
Appendix D – Informed Consent and Participant's Rights English Version....247
Appendix E – Informed Consent and Participant's Rights Translated Version 251
Appendix F – First Interview Protocol 255
Appendix G – Second Interview Protocol 257
Appendix H – List of Acronyms....259

PROCESSION

My mother introduced me to Malcolm X when I was in the third grade. I had read about Ida B. Wells, Thurgood Marshall, Martin Luther King, Jr., Rosa Parks, and Nat Turner, to name a few, not because I wanted to but because they were available for reading in our family bookshelf. I read through them with awe as I got to know individuals who had triumphed against all odds. Yet, it was just that; I was reading "stories" of people who only existed in books until my Japanese mother one day mentioned the importance of knowing my own history. She showed me my family tree that my grandmother from Florida had sent just a few weeks prior. Among unrecognizable names I excitedly searched for my name—and there I saw the rigid line stemming from my "Japanese" mother and "a quarter Cherokee" and "three quarters Black" father. My name printed small at the bottom corner of the paper. I am Black...? The more time she spent with me explaining the history of "my African American heritage," I felt a surge of anger—anger that came up from within towards injustice, hatred, and inequality that still seemed to exist in a place called the United States of America.

As I began recognizing these emotions towards my African American heritage, I was assigned a social studies project on World War II at the international school I was attending in Japan. Unlike the specificity of my mother's regular impromptu African American history class, the unit on World War II was at a scale of nations. As I learned about the bombings of major cities during the Pacific War and the atomic bomb supposedly bringing an end to it, I realized that my own maternal grandmother, who used

to live 2 hours from me, had experienced these very atrocities I was reading about in textbooks. I began begging my grandmother to share "stories" she remembered and how she survived these atrocities. She had vivid "stories" based on her experience living in Tokyo that filled my youngling imaginations. She would look at photos, share an episode in relation to the moment captured in the photo, and drift into her memories as I tried to travel with her. As she became comfortable sharing her "stories," she would always insert her disapproval of the then-top leaders who "led Japan to war." My grandmother's confusion, anger, and eventual relief seemed to transmit themselves to me as I, too, felt outrage towards the violence and injustice that rampaged my grandmother's youth. "Violence is never good. You are Japanese, Patricia, remember that."

Japanese… Japan…United States… African American…

I was always aware of my difference growing up in Japan as kids asked me why my hair was curlier, why my nose was wider, and why my skin was darker than their own. Questions were better than accusations of being referred to as "burnt skin"—"kuronbo" or "makkurokurosuke"—both derogatory terms in Japanese. I struggled with each encounter—my response was an eruption of emotions that I struggled to describe verbally. My mother encouraged me to fight back when kids refused to play with me because of the color of my skin. Fight back? I didn't have it in me. I just wanted to play. Why?

And so, the categories that were presented to me—Japanese/African American—gave me something of a comfort knowing that I "belonged"—as complex and ephemeral as this sense of "belonging" seems. By the time I reached college in the United States, I owned my heritage—I was confident in acknowledging the two heritages until a

classmate of mine on several occasions jokingly said, “But you’re not Black enough.” Black enough? If there was a “one drop rule” here in the United States that made anyone with any trace of Black heritage to be labeled as being Black, what did it mean to lack Blackness? So if I am not Black enough…what am I when I told this person I was half Black? Such confusion was further ignited on occasions when I spoke fluent Japanese and I was commended for my fluidity. The opposite would happen once others discovered I grew up in Japan. How can one be commended for the fluidity of the languages she grew up speaking? Could it be because my physical appearance smeared the often-so-clear boundaries that separate ethnic and racial boundaries? Or that cultures, traditions, and language(s) do not cross borders? Or the attachments we individually have to what certain practices around culture and ethnicity should look like? What did these moments allow to take place and what did it silence?

The very identity categories that gave me a temporary sense of belonging now felt constricting as I moved through differences and boundaries. Perhaps this is why Miller’s (2005) work that questions and problematizes any notion of a static “identity” or “curriculum” gave me so much comfort—like a fish craving for water after so many hours of being left on the parched earth. In the introductory paragraphs to her book *Sounds of Silence Breaking*, Miller wrote that the intention of her work was “to articulate effects of exclusions, absences, stereotypes, disruptions, reconfigurations and generalizations within the very processes of curriculum theorizing as well as within the very categories and constructions of ‘woman,’ ‘voice,’ ‘experience,’ ‘identity’ and ‘curriculum.’” (p. 5). With her words resonating in my life, I proceed.

I – INTRODUCTION

This inquiry is a manifestation of my desire to better understand the paradoxes of "belonging," "dislocation," and "attachments," and the illusory relation to conceptions and perceptions of "self" in relation to the "curriculum." In particular, this inquiry is motivated by my desire to understand what "experiences" and attachments teachers have to their senses of selves and perceived "experiences" in relation to the March 11, 2011 Great East Japan Earthquake and subsequent evacuation in a particular region of Japan. Specifically, I wish to explore the "experiences" among teachers who were affected by the March 11, 2011 earthquake and subsequent nuclear power plant explosion in Fukushima, Japan. In hearing the teachers' interpretations of their "experiences," I am curious to explore if and, possibly, how these attachments, as well as possible disruptions, spill into the ways in which they currently understand their perceived professional selves in relation to conceptions of "curriculum."

I place particular terms that are interpretative and fluid in quotation marks as a way to draw attention to and invite disruption to the text. For instance, the term "curriculum" will be in quotation marks to emphasize the various ways in which it has been understood, conceptualized, and defined at different times and places. Traditionally, in the United States, its "place of origin" as a field of study, "curriculum" has been interpreted as a guide or course for educational planning that is predetermined and often includes a linear process (Tyler, 1949). Hence, it is also associated with the idea of design and development consistent with the Tyler Rationale, named after educator Ralph Tyler

(1949). More than half a century later, Tyler's Rationale is not foreign as it consists of processes that are habitually utilized by educators across the globe: teachers must select and define learning objectives, select learning "experiences," organize these "experiences" to achieve the objectives, and finally evaluate the "curricular experiences." Thus, the idea that "curriculum" can be predetermined has prevailed over the years.

Curriculum scholars seem to agree on the long-lasting influences of Tyler's Rationale in teaching and how "curriculum" continues to be conceptualized in the United States sometimes as content, learning outcomes, or objectives to be achieved (Taba, 1962; Tanner & Tanner, 2007; Tyler, 1949). While Tyler's Rationale is linked to traditional understanding of "curriculum," various scholars have spoken back to such conceptualizations of "curriculum" (Cherryholmes, 1988; de Alba, Gonzalez-Gaudiano, Lankshear, & Peters, 2000; Doll, 1993; Kliebard, 2004; Miller, 2005; Pinar, 2004; Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1995). Instead of focusing on achieving predetermined objectives that tend to ignore the individual's role in interacting with and, thus, experiencing as well as creating the "curriculum," scholars such as Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, and Taubman (1995) have shifted the idea of "curriculum" from development to that of "understanding." In this "understanding" is the idea of understanding the educational "experiences" of students, teachers, administrators, families, and communities in relation to the social, historical, political, and economic contexts and discourses in which schooling takes place—and the influences of these factors on a person's interpretations of his or her educative experience (Kliebard, 2004; Miller, 2005; Pinar et al., 1995; Youdell, 2006).

This idea of traditional conceptualizations of "curriculum," I argue, cannot be discussed without referring to the idea of the subject and how that subject "experiences" his or her world. While I will further explore notions of the subject in subsequent sections, here I refer to the subject as individuals who take on predetermined expressions and meanings of being in relation to dominant discourses. While acknowledging humanist versions of the self, which often is theorized as unified, conscious, and rational versions of the subject, this inquiry takes on poststructural framings of the subject as being constituted of and constituting competing discourses—thus the subject becomes a site of constant change and process (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012; Miller, 2005; St. Pierre, 2000b; Weedon, 1987). The diverse and often conflicting ways in which subjects interpret their "experiences" of and in their worlds are "integral to curriculum conceptions and enactments" (Miller, 2010b, p. 126). Hence, this very inquiry begins with the assumption that "curriculum," "experience," and subjectivities may consist of multiple, often contradicting, conflicting, and competing understandings.

This inquiry is twofold in that, first, I intend to explore how specific teachers in Fukushima, Japan, speak of their educator "experiences" in relation to their current circumstances of evacuation, and how they conceptualize "curriculum" in relation to their interpreted "experiences." Second, I autobiographically explore my own "experiences" of "belonging" as dominant discourses situated in socioeconomic, political, and cultural contexts, and how these influence my interpretations of my own "experiences" as I engage in this inquiry. I especially will attend to how my interpretations of my multiple selves coincide and collide in relation to the individuals participating in this dissertation research project. To these ends, I draw, in particular, from Miller (2005), Pinar (2004),

and Pinar et al. (1995) to help me understand the various ways in which "curriculum" has been conceptualized and continues to be reconceptualized. I also draw from poststructural feminist scholars such as Miller (2005, 2006), Richardson (2000), St. Pierre (1997, 2000a, 2000b), and Weedon (1987, 2004) to help me work through my understandings of subjectivities and how these relate to the idea of "experience" when subjectivities interact with the national, gendered, cultural, social, geographic, temporal, and political coordinates in which the subject hovers (Smith & Watson, 2010).

My intent for this inquiry is not to provide suggestions for best practices for places in contexts experiencing similar humanitarian crises of dislocation or to articulate the significance of poststructuralism in curriculum theory. Rather, acknowledging assumptions of this particular theoretical orientation, I am interested in exploring one particular "event" and its connections to my concerns around "belonging" in my "home country" of Japan and its effects, if any, on educators whose work and "homes" are located in Fukushima, a region that experienced an earthquake, tsunami, and subsequent nuclear power plant explosion. In particular, I wish to research teachers' conceptions of "curriculum" and interpretations of their professional selves in this educational context following a catastrophic event. In addition, given my own situated-ness, I wish to examine my own notions of "curriculum," "experience," and sense of "belonging" as they encounter others who also have their own interpretations of these concepts that are both constructed and implicated in history, culture, economics, language, and politics. I first provide a background of the context followed by the statement of the problem, rationale, statement of purpose and research questions, conceptual framework, and a brief review of this chapter.

Background of Context

I realize that all "experience is at once always already an interpretation and something that needs to be interpreted" (Scott, 1991, p. 96), and so I write this section with caution. My concerns center on representing, but also having to represent, a result of encountering the crisis in representation, both my interpretations of the context in which my study was based and the participants' responses to my research inquiries. It is not my goal to be an expert in the field of Japanese education. I am interested in how "curriculum" and "experience" are spoken of and how the subject is discursively constituted in "post-disaster" contexts. Yet, I chose to write this section to provide some context while at the same time having to acknowledge that "all writing is narrative writing" (Richardson, 2000, p. 926). In other words, I recognize that in writing one account of the context, I may be excluding other interpretations. In this qualitative inquiry, I also hope to examine how these participants' interpretations of their schooling and teaching "experiences" were impacted by their historical, social, political, and cultural contexts. To this end, I recognize the existence of diverse educational discourses, in particular, that have existed prior to the 20th century. Yet, this inquiry starts with the assumption framed from post-World War II Japan discourses, which scholars have attributed as constituting "the foundation" of current Japanese educational systems (Cave, 2010; Takayama, 2007; Yano, 2013).

Shifts in Japanese Education

Since the early 1900s, the direction of Japanese educational systems has been influenced by political, military, and economic factors. For instance, one of the goals of

educational reform following the U.S. occupation was to move away from a nationalistic education to that of a system based on democratic principles (Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology [MEXT], 1980). One such move was to decentralize the system, and the Basic Education Act of 1947 was established in accordance with the new constitution based on democratic ideals such as equality and respect for diversity (MEXT, n.d.a). The Basic Education Act of 1947 was coupled with the establishment of the School Education Law, thus, solidifying the "modern" educational system of Japan today (MEXT, 1980).

The Course of Study, which coincides with traditional conceptions of "curriculum" above, was also established shortly after 1945 for teachers teaching particular subject content with the intent of providing "broad standards for all schools from kindergarten through upper secondary schools, to organize their programs in order to ensure a fixed standard of education throughout the country" (MEXT, n.d.b). Thus, the educational system adopted new approaches to providing education to the masses. For instance, shortly after the war, there was an emphasis on learning in context; however, as the economy started to thrive, Japanese citizens were demanding different needs (Bjork & Tsuneyoshi, 2005). To address these different needs, the educational system, once again, shifted its emphasis from learning in contexts to learning towards high school and college entrance examinations (Bjork & Tsuneyoshi, 2005; Motani, 2005). This was a direct result of changes in living standards, educational expectations, and an increase in access to education.

Parallel to these developments, the Japanese economy soared as new markets proliferated internationally in the post-World War II eras (Willis, Yamamura, &

Rappleye, 2008). In accordance with this internationalization, in the 1980s special interest groups began to influence educational reform as they saw fit to serve the booming economy (Motani, 2005). For instance, then Prime Minister Nakasone wanted to "create a more cost effective, flexible education system through decentralization, deregulation, and privatization, in order to produce more assertive and creative Japanese workers for the economic development of the country in an increasingly competitive world economy" (p. 313). However, over time, this emphasis on examination gave birth to criticism against an educational system that created large numbers of failing students who could not keep up with the "curriculum"—conceived only as "course of study"—that taught towards passing an entrance exam. This, again, resulted in another shift in the educational system where contents of the "curricula" were reduced and teachers were not expected to teach certain concepts until much later in a student's learning trajectory (Bjork & Tsuneyoshi, 2005).

Contemporary Japanese education suggests how "curriculum," over time, has become an object that shifts in its adaptation to the perceived needs of the social, economic, political, and cultural context in which it serves. Here we begin to see how politics, economics, and history are closely intertwined with the Japanese educational system (Pinar et al., 1995; Willis et al., 2008), which seems to run parallel to the ways in which education has been impacted by the various historical, economic, and political events that have occurred in other countries such as the United States; examples of such have been documented by various curriculum scholars who have noted ways in which "curriculum" has shifted, transformed, and conceptualized (Anderson, 1988; Kliebard, 2004; Lagemann, 2000; Taubman, 2009). In the next section, I outline how, specifically,

social, economic, and political events have impacted educational "experiences" in one particular context and historical moment in Japan.

Normalizing the Safety Discourses

While the national education system was undergoing major changes, what has now become known as Town A,[1] of Fukushima Prefecture, was also experiencing some changes. Two small towns—Town C and Town D—merged into Town A in the mid-1950s. Prior to this merge, the biggest income to the two towns came from agriculture, which had already suffered greatly from the damages of World War II. During the winter months, men would travel to the greater Tokyo area to find work. By the 1960s, the vast amounts of land that were previously being used during World War II as airports were chosen as a perfect location to start building nuclear power plants. By the end of March in 1971, the first power plant started to operate, contributing to the development of this region as it created jobs, established cultural and sports facilities, and provided at least a part of the constant and reliable provision of electricity to the urban areas of Japan (Fukushima-Kencho, 2013; Takeuchi, 2012).

While criticized as a form of "overexploitation of northeastern Japan by the central government" (Nancy, 2015, p. 13), the power plant became a part of the daily lives of the residents of Town A. For instance, many schools took part in poster contests around the topic of this nuclear power plant. Reflecting the mainstream sentiment towards the nuclear power plants, many of these contests did not call for a debate about what it meant to co-exist with a nuclear power plant in their community; on the contrary, many posters hinted at communities happily co-existing with the power plant economy

[1] In an effort to ensure confidentiality of the participants of this study, I have chosen to provide pseudonyms to the towns referred.

(Goto, 2013). Similarly, Town A's basic stance towards the power plant, up until March 2011, was to co-exist with the power plants with the premise that they are safe (Goto, 2013; Takeuchi, 2012).

Despite minor accidents throughout the years, this general stance, or the 安全神話—anzen shinwa (safety myth), had become the foundational myth around the plant, based on the assumption that since multiple safety mechanisms are in place, the power plants will be safe. It was in this context that the Great East Japan Earthquake of March 11th, 2011 claimed more than 15,000 lives, resulted in 7,000 missing, and displaced many more (World Health Organization [WHO], 2012). While the earthquake and subsequent tsunami accounted for the majority of these deaths in many other regions affected by this earthquake, the tsunami shut down the cooling functions and resulted in the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant "accident" (Gaspar, 2015; Save the Children, 2012; Tokyo Electric Power Company [TEPCO], 2012), leading Prime Minister Kan to order the complete evacuation of residents in counties nearby the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant. Town A was one of the towns designated as a "restricted area" where residents were displaced and evacuated eventually to City B, a city 100km west of Town A.

Prior to March 11, 2011, there were approximately 115,000 residents and among them a high percentage of 0-15 year olds (Takeuchi, 2012). Unique when compared to other areas in Fukushima, Town A was experiencing an increase within the younger demographics (Fukushima Ken Kikaku Chousei-Bu Toukei Chousa Ka Hen, 2012; Takeuchi, 2012). At the time of the Great East Japan Earthquake, Town A housed one kindergarten, two elementary schools, and one junior high school. At the start of the

school year in the spring of 2011, there were a total of approximately 1,400 students. However, by October of 2013, the student population combined across the schools in Town A had decreased to approximately 330. With the uncertainty of low-dose radiation and its effect on health as well as on the possibility of returning to Town A, these schools experienced a constant and rapid drop in student population (*Fukushima Minyu*, 2016; Takeuchi, 2012). With such a decrease in student population, one of the questions administrators began asking was what should be included in the "curriculum" to make sure the students "take pride in their heritage."

While the central government continued to urge local educational administrators to focus on raising reading and math skills (Endo, 2013; Takeuchi, 2012), administrators from Town A were growing concerned about addressing local needs that they believed should have been considered when working with the Course of Study (Takeuchi, 2012). One of the concerns raised was what considerations must be put into place when creating "curricula" catered towards students who have experienced a series of disasters and are in displacement. One of the ideas considered was to incorporate "home studies" as part of the "curriculum" where students learn about the unique heritage of Town A (*Sankei News*, 2017; Takeuchi, 2012). In addition to providing subject matter instruction, some administrators believed that providing opportunities for students to "experience" traditions, histories, and cultures from Town A was crucial while in displacement (Takeuchi, 2012). This spirit behind the idea that the children of Town A should always be educated according to the culture of Town A was reflected in the language of one of the administrators who expressed gratitude to the residents and administrators of City B, the city in which they are currently located, for being supportive during these challenging

times (Takeuchi, 2012). In this text, the administrator described City B as a place where the students will eventually be able to become active agents in developing their hometown of Town A. At the same time, with the possibility of not being able to return "home," administrators were concerned with what academic subjects and issues "should" become part of what I can identify as a "traditional" notion of "curriculum" as "content to be developed," reflective of Tyler's Rationale around curriculum design, development, and evaluation.

Statement of Problem

I am intrigued by ideas that resist and challenge traditional conceptions of "curriculum" conceived only as an object, something that needs to be developed or designed, and, hence, if teachers are trained well, they will be able to execute "the curriculum"—most often designed in advance based on someone else's interpretations of "what knowledge is of most real worth" (Spencer, 2009, p. 31)—in an efficient and meaningful manner. While educators continue to work with traditional conceptions of "curriculum" rather than the ways in which "curriculum" has been reconceptualized, for example, as racial, gendered, psychosocial, historical, and political, I must also note that reports around Fukushima have focused on providing psychosocial support, detailing health risks that the community has and continues to face, and describing and assessing the ongoing nature of the disaster (Save the Children, 2012, 2013; WHO, 2012).

It is only recently that pockets of discussions have surfaced around what knowledge to include in the "curriculum" (Goto, 2013; Sanuki, 2013; Takeuchi, 2012). At the national and prefectural level, such debates remain at the level of how best to

design the content of the curriculum to raise the academic skill as well as physical ability of the students (Fukushima Board of Education, 2013; Takeuchi, 2012; Tani, 2013) and, I would argue, lacks acknowledgment of the daily "experiences" of educators in the field. In contrast, and although circumstances are different, "curriculum" scholars such as Kliebard (2004), Miller (2005, 2006), Pinar (2004), Pinar et al. (1995), and Taubman (2009) have all contributed to reconceptualizing "curriculum" as only fixed and predetermined content.

"Curriculum" Reconceptualized

Conceptualizations of U.S. "curriculum" studies are not detached from their historical, social, political, and economic contexts; yet traditionally, "curriculum," as an administrative need, has been understood only as "content" and, thus, as something that requires design and development. It was not until the late 1960s that we see diverse ways in "curriculum" conceptualization.

The reconceptualization of U.S. "curriculum" studies is inseparable from what Miller (2005) called particular "historical moments in U.S. education" (p. 19) such as feminist movements, Civil Rights movements, and peace movements, which intersected with the lives of individuals who were devoted to the reconceptualization of "curriculum." While Pinar et al. (1995) referred to this moment as a "paradigm shift," it was also a moment in U.S. educational history when diverse approaches to "curriculum studies" occurred. The traditional mainstream approach to "curriculum" development was questioned as the focus shifted from designing content to "a focus on understanding the nature of educational experience, broadly defined" (Miller, 2005, p. 19). To this point on the reconceptualization of "curriculum" Miller noted, "the reconceptualization itself was

about understanding curriculum as intersections of the political, the historical, and the autobiographical" (p. 19) that focused on examining varying sources of knowledge as well as by whom and how that knowledge was being constructed. Unlike the traditional ways in which "curriculum" was separated from the "experiences," emotions, and lives of the students and teachers, the reconceptualization initially was composed of diverse theoretical and philosophical orientations including Marxism, phenomenology with its existential varieties, psychoanalysis as well as variations of hermeneutics and feminisms (Miller, 2005; Pinar et al., 1995). All these varied theorizations focused on expanding the traditional conceptualizations of "curriculum" with awareness of these as deeply intertwined with both students' and teachers' subjectivities—that is, in examinations of how they interpret their "experiences" of what most often was presented as predetermined content. Later, other diverse perspectives such as poststructurally inflected feminisms, postcolonial, and neo-Marxist interrogations, among others, continued the work begun in the reconceptualization (Miller, 2005; Pinar et al., 1995). For example, one such theoretical perspective is grounded in social psychoanalytic work around conceptualizations of "place" and its relation to "curriculum" theory.

Much work on the "curriculum" theory of "place" is grounded in social psychoanalytic work and the educational experiences in the American South. Kincheloe and Pinar (1991) noted that "curriculum" theory is implicated in history, place, and human intention and that "curriculum" theorists must "account for the realities of particularity or collectivity" (p. 21). Aspects of both Kincheloe and Pinar's work have, at times, centered around the American South and, for this reason, this quote suggests that particular kinds of knowledges have historically been implicated in and connected to the American South.

Recognizing that much work around "curriculum" theory of "place" centers around educational research in the American South, I found inspiration in conceptualizations of "curriculum" theory of "place" as I explored the interpreted "experiences" of teachers in Town A and how their understandings of "curriculum" are impacted by their relation to the region. In my encounters with these teachers, I cannot ignore how their interpreted "experiences" and "voices" are implicated and expressed in relation to the region, history, and 神話—shinwa (myths) of Fukushima. In this respect, I referred to scholars who have and continue to theorize "curriculum" (Casemore, 2008; Kincheloe & Pinar, 1991; Kincheloe, Pinar, & Slattery, 1994; Miller, 2005; Pinar et al., 1995) as one entry point to explore the "experiences" interpreted by teachers from Town A.

Despite the concerns around health risks, evacuation, and traumatic "experience" the community of Town A is undergoing, the "curriculum" of Town A must take into consideration the Course of Study, which is centralized by the Japanese government. However, influenced by the vast amounts of "curriculum" theorizing in the United States that continue to be conducted today, I argue that traditional understandings of "curriculum," as these are being used in Japan and particularly Town A, are not able to take into consideration the ways in which educators' "experiences" in this particular locale are being interpreted, complicated, and implicated in these historical, social, cultural, discursive, and political contexts—and how these, thus, influence the ways in which teachers conceptualize themselves as teachers as well as how they conceptualize the "curriculum." Working with this major assumption of mine and simultaneously considering the history of the current educational system in Japan and the direct influence of U.S. western thought in shaping its "modern" educational system, I hope, in this study,

to use notions provided by both "traditional" and reconceptualized versions of "curriculum" in order to work through my interpretations of what the teacher participants describes as their educators' "experiences" with "curriculum" within their current and multiple contextualized and interpreted educator lives.

"Complicated Conversations"

The conversation around educational and curricular practices in Fukushima, I argue, is at a pivotal point after the earthquake and subsequent evacuation. Residents as well as the Department of Education have had multiple conversations around schooling for Town A residents (Takeuchi, 2012). It is this discussion with which I wish to engage. In particular, how are school discourses around knowledge and "experience" being constituted? I wish to research how and what teachers in this local are conceptualizing and inheriting as school discourses through their interpretation of their teacher "experiences." In particular, how are teachers engaging in this knowledge construction as educators considering the devastating earthquake followed by displacement of entire towns? In engaging with such questions, I find it helpful to consider "curriculum" as discourse instead of development, as I work with "curriculum" conceived as "complicated conversations" (Pinar, 2004, p. 8) in this very inquiry.

Most often, "curriculum" is linked to student performance and test scores and, hence, the idea that "curriculum" is something that needs to be covered or taught (Miller, 2005; Taubman, 2009). Consider, for example, the history of "curriculum" in the United States. After a surge in immigrant population during the Industrial Revolution, there was a need to rethink the "curriculum" and how to efficiently and best educate students who did not necessarily share similar social, cultural, political, and ethnic backgrounds with

their classmates or teachers (Hurn, 1993; Kliebard, 2004; Tyack, 1974). While not having direct influence in the field of education, Frederick Winslow Taylor's concerns for efficiency was reflected in the Taylor System, which allowed greater production at a lower cost (Kliebard, 2004). While this system was not directly applied to educational systems, conceptualizations of efficiency were surely applied to school management (Kliebard, 2004). With the rapid increase in student population and changes in cultural values, textbooks became widespread as a way to standardize teaching (Kliebard, 2004). This also coincided with schools beginning to develop a course of study—a forerunner of what we understand to be "the curriculum"—according to grade level and student age group (Tyack, 1974). Educators John Franklin Bobbitt and Ralph Tyler epitomized the efficiency-minded educators of their time and their influences that still permeate the field of curriculum today. Bobbitt was instrumental in the field of "curriculum" development as he proposed a model of defining learning objectives and experiences inside the classroom (Kliebard, 2004; Pinar et al., 1995). Taking such approaches to "curriculum" further, Tyler was instrumental in devising what has become known as the Tyler Rationale (Kliebard, 2004; Pinar et al., 1995). Infused with behaviorism, the goal of the Tyler Rationale was to provide clear and linear educational objectives to achieve a desired outcome that can be evaluated (Kliebard, 2004). Both educators' approaches to "curriculum" suggested that knowledge is neutral and that educational "experiences" can be predetermined and organized in linear, developmental, and progressive steps.

While the history of U.S. "curriculum" can be described as a contested field, Kliebard (2004) commented that the "national preoccupation" with the U.S. "curriculum" can be traced back to these historical moments. Such preoccupations with schooling and

knowledge are reflected in the language of standardization, testing, and school reform as teachers and schools are held accountable for student performances (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2004; Kim, Ham, & Paine, 2011; Taubman, 2009). Student performance can no longer be explained by individual failure; instead, teachers and schools are also held accountable because "if all students don't test well, their teachers and schools will be held responsible" (Taubman, 2009, p. 64). The historical reliance on testing is reflected in current practices on testing as more policies continue to rely on the validity of testing and assessments, especially with businesses and investors engaging in educational policy (Motani, 2005; Taubman, 2009; Willis et al., 2008). Moreover, to ensure that student test scores reflect these efforts, the focus is often placed on developing a "curriculum" that enhances subject learning outcomes, leaving little space for teachers and students to attend to individual interpretations of schooling and/or life experiences as "curriculum" (Pinar, 2004; Soslau & Yost, 2007).

While some may be persuaded by the need for stronger accountability and standardization, Pinar reminded us that "curriculum" is "a highly symbolic concept" (Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, as cited in Pinar, 2004, p. 185) that cannot be separated from those who engage with/in it. In developing this idea, Pinar (2004) reminded us that the work of those interested in "curriculum" theory is autobiographical as well as political, and that subjectivity, academic knowledge, and social norms and educational expectations are interconnected. I am persuaded by this idea and hope to engage with this "complicated conversation" around "curriculum" and "experience(s)" among teachers in Fukushima.

Rationale for the Study

While the student population has decreased significantly since the evacuation, at the start of the new school year in 2017, approximately 38 students still remain enrolled in both School Q and School T combined (*Sankei News*, 2017). Prior to the earthquake and subsequent evacuation, Fukushima prefecture established the 6th Fukushima Prefecture Comprehensive Educational Plan in 2010, which emphasized the importance of raising the academic skills of students (Tani, 2013). Against such a move towards academic excellence, the residents of Town A were making life-changing decisions on where to settle based on the limited amount of knowledge available on radiation exposure and how to continue their 人間関係—ningen-kankei or relationships that comprise a great amount of educational discourse among educators in Town A. Despite this prefectural focus on academic skills, educators and administrators from evacuated counties in Fukushima questioned the prioritization of raising academic skills when residents faced questions of life and death (Tani, 2013). The superintendent of Town A also critiques such decisions by arguing that the focus on raising academic skills remains in the 安全地帯—anzen chitai or “safety zone” (Takeuchi, 2012; Tani, 2013). Subsequently, the Fukushima Board of Education followed up on these critiques by considering the immediate impacts of the disaster on its educational system. In its reconsideration, the Fukushima Board of Education (2013) has pointed to the importance of raising the quality of teachers’ pedagogy and sense of responsibility as teachers. The rationale behind such emphasis is in the belief that teachers work closely with the students and, hence, teachers are expected to better themselves constantly based on the understanding of a resilient and harmonious Fukushima (Takeda, 2017). Despite the

Board of Education's efforts to take into consideration the impacts of the earthquake and subsequent incidents, I cannot ignore the humanist assumptions underlying the educational plan or "curriculum" as well as conceptions of teachers as always able to fully and rationally understand, handle, and best execute their educational duties as conceived by others. Indeed, I am concerned with how the disaster has affected teachers' conceptions of themselves as teachers who are always fully rational and in control of their intentions and emotions.

Miller (2005) critiqued the notion of the rational self-reflective teacher. Miller referred to Butler's notion of "permanent openness and resignifiability" as the distinguishing characteristics of an identity category, such as "woman" (Butler, as cited in Miller, 2005, p. 50) to question taken-for-granted assumptions of how historically, socioculturally, and discursively constituted and framed "selves" and "curriculum" are conceptualized. For instance, Miller spoke about the assumptions of the unitary self that are reflective of humanist discourse as undergirding the dominant goals of teacher reflection and development in certain school reform agendas. This unproblematic narrative of reflective teachers' abilities to become aware and conscious of themselves through development and reflection—in addressing student needs, for example—stems from humanist notions of a "unitary, fully conscious, universal, complete and non-contradictory" (p. 51) self. Immersions in humanist assumptions are evident in the opening remarks of the Fukushima Prefectural Education Center (2017), reassuring the common understandings among all schools and educators to support the development of students' humanity, strong mind, and imagination while at the same time ensuring their solid academic abilities. Considering the various expectations around individual

interpretations of their educational "experiences," and in juxtaposing the traditional notions of the "curriculum" to what Pinar (2004) would describe as understanding "curriculum," I believe that the conceptual framings of my research within these tensions may open up different ways in understanding and recognizing schooling "experiences" as these are interpreted and enacted by educators within this particular "post-disaster" context. This is where I see my entry point as I work through my own interpretations of the teachers' interpreted "narratives" of both past and current educator "experiences" within a particular city in Fukushima, Japan.

Statement of Purpose and Research Questions

The purpose of this inquiry was to explore how educators as well as myself as researcher are being constituted and constituting both our conceptions of "curriculum" and our subjectivities within the current social, political, economic, and historical context available. Furthermore, considering that these educators are teaching in displacement, I wanted to explore how they speak of their interpreted "experiences" as educators before, around, and after March 11, 2011, and relatedly, to explore the ways in which teachers speak of and understand "curriculum."

Through these inquiries, the following research questions undergirded my inquiry process.

Research Questions

1. In what ways, if any, are teachers speaking of the "Fukushima disaster" in relation to their roles as educators?

   1a. How, if at all, do the teachers describe events of March 11, 2011?

1b. How, if at all, do teachers speak of changes, disruptions, and/or continuities in their perceptions of themselves as educators post-March 11th?

2. How, if at all, do teachers conceptualize “curriculum”?

   2a. How, if at all, do teachers describe how they have habitually talked about “curriculum"?

   2b. How, if at all, are they talking differently about curriculum since March 11, 2011?

   2c. How, if at all, do teachers talk about what they perceive as their current students’ needs in relation to “curriculum?”

3. How do my subjectivities affect how I am seeing, hearing, and reading post-March 11, 2011, Fukushima?

   3a. How do my subjectivities affect my interpretations of my study participants’ descriptions of their educator experiences both before and after the disaster?

   3b. With what considerations of power and knowledge, in relation to my researcher identities, must I grapple, as a qualitative researcher who calls Japan “home”?

   3c. How, if at all, do my current assumptions about “curriculum,” now informed by reconceptualized perspectives, shift, and change as I research the “Fukushima disaster” and its multiple effects on current educators’ efforts within this specific locale?

Conceptual Framework

In conceptualizing my doctoral research in Fukushima around teacher as well as researcher subjectivities, I was drawn to feminist poststructuralist work because it attempts to trouble taken-for-granted notions of knowledge that are framed by dominant discourses which, in turn, have shaped, to a great degree, the way we think and act. While recognizing the (im)possibility of getting to the bottom of what poststructuralim "is" (St. Pierre, 2000b), I found it useful here to work through some significant concepts that are undergirded by poststructural theories because theory, as Pinar et al. (1995) suggested, "functions to provoke" (p. 8) us to think. In other words, instead of focusing on how we think and act the way we do, particular theories may push us to think about how we might think and act the way we do differently from what may appear as "natural" or "given." It is the idea of fluidity as well as questioning the idea of the one fixed and universal "truth" that allows me to conceptualize "curriculum" and "experience" differently from how these have often been understood. For this reason, I drew from poststructuralist assumptions of discursive influences on the constructions of the "subject" as I explored how "curriculum" and educator subjectivities are variously being conceptualized as well as discursively constructed via one specific "event" in a particular locale in Fukushima, Japan.

The Subject and the "I"

In previous sections of this chapter, I suggested "curriculum" as a concept "always-in-the-making" (Miller, 2005, p. 6) as educators continuously "experience" and

construct their understandings of their multiple "selves" through their interactions with the "curriculum." My interest lies in how an individual's sense of being is discursively constituted and, thus, I am compelled to think constantly about how I understand my role as a researcher as a research "subject" alongside my participants. In this reflexivity, which I go into in more depth in the subsequent chapter, I am reminded of the often-unchallenged, especially in the field of education, Enlightenment notion of the "rational, knowing Cartesian subject" (Youdell, 2006, p. 61), the "I." At the core of such humanist assumptions around the "self" is the notion that individuals possess a rational, fully conscious, and unitary sense of self that is the basis of their being (Miller, 2005; Weedon, 1987; Youdell, 2006).

Dominant theories of the "subject" tend to be linked to what Althusser (1971) referred to as the "knowing subject"—the "I" that is always an accessible, fully conscious, and rational being. The poststructural understandings I am persuaded by, however, do not assume the "subject" as a unitary and fixed being that is separate from its social structures and dominant discourses that determine the conditions and normative ways in which a subject can exist. Instead, poststructural thought examines ways that the subject comes into being as a "discursive constitution who appears to be abiding and natural, not because s/he is so but because ongoing discursive practices create this illusion" (Youdell, 2006, p. 34), thus suggesting the possibilities of how subjects can be otherwise than fixed and unitary versions of the "self." Enlightenment perspectives might suggest that subject identity categories are influenced or constructed by individual choice; on the contrary, poststructural understandings are concerned with how subjects are constituted and, thus, attend to the daily discursive practices and processes that are

historically, socially, politically, and culturally contingent. Hence, poststructural perspectives reject the notion of the rational, fully-conscious "self" because the "knowing self is partial in all its guises, never finished, whole, simply there and original" (Haraway, 1988, p. 586). Instead, poststructural perspectives posit that subjects take on multiple and conflicting subjectivities—"the conscious and unconscious thoughts and emotions of the individual, her sense of herself and her ways of understanding her relation to the world" (Weedon, 1987, p 32) within relations of power and dominant discourses. Poststructural orientations to subjectivity allow conceptualizations of the "split and contradictory subject" and the processes in which individuals take on multiple subject positions.

While I do not directly incorporate Foucault's theorizing into my research, I understand his works as central to poststructural discussions of power. Foucault's (1972) perspective on such shifted the idea of power being possessed by an individual to that of power being "productive" and constantly circulating as "exercised" via discursive practices. Put simply, subjects are constituted discursively in relation to or as a function of power (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012; St. Pierre, 2000b; Weedon, 2004). In thinking about the subject and such particular notions of power, I am reminded of Foucault's (1972) reference to "regime of truth," which he described as "the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true" (p. 131). He further described "truth" as "a system of ordered procedures for the production, regulation, distribution, circulation and operation of statements" (p. 133). These statements suggest the inseparability of power and discourse, how "truths" are distributed as knowledge via discursive practices, and how subjects are constituted. Poststructural orientations influenced by Foucault's work around power/knowledge help me think about how power continues to circulate with/in relations,

its effects, and how it produces knowledge about the subject within such competing discursive fields. Thus, the often conflicting, contradictory, and competing senses of the subject both take on and possibly resist subject positions with/in discourses of power and can be characterized by the notion of multiple subjectivities rather than taking on a stable sense of being.

Poststructural Perspectives on Discourse

St. Pierre (2000b) reminded us of the (im)possibility, from poststructuralist perspectives, of ever definitively defining discourse as just one "thing," given that language is slippery and open to change. Furthermore, reflective of Foucauldian notions of power and discourse, she noted that poststructural explorations of discourse are not focused on defining but rather on investigating how it functions, how it is produced, and what its effects are. In Power/Knowledge, Foucault (1972) commented, "power means relations, a more-or-less organized, hierarchical, co-ordinated cluster of relations" (p. 198). In other words, such interpretations of power focus on how knowledge and the subject are constituted through discourse(s), discursive practices, and various power relations that circulate to establish and maintain dominant versions of such. Such a focus on power allows one to see how the subject is constructed in relation to dominant discourses that shape what counts as constituting their social and cultural practices.

While recognizing the limitations of language, various scholars, drawing from Foucault, have attempted to describe discourse. Scott, for example, described that "discourse is not a language or a text but a historically, socially, and institutionally specific structure of statements, terms, categories, and beliefs" (as cited in St. Pierre, 2000b, p. 485). Also, in describing discourse, Youdell (2006) referred to Foucault who

noted, “discourses are understood to be bodies of knowledge that are taken as ‘truth’ and through which we see the world” (p. 35). Both interpretations of discourse suggest that discourse(s) is(are) found in the subject’s very daily cultural and social practices in that the “person is at once rendered a subject and subjected to relations of power through discourse” (as cited in Youdell, 2006, p. 41). Poststructural orientations to discourse not only attend to the dominant discourses that allow particular ways to be a teacher or how “curriculum” is conceptualized, but also to the multiple subject positions that teachers may take on or reject within discursive practices of schooling.

Further, because not all discourses are equal in power, although discourses circulate as forms of power, certain discourses come to the forefront at different points in time. In other words, the social, cultural, historical, and political significance attached to particular meanings “come into view” through discourse (Baker, 1999). Language implicated in socially and historically specific discourses produce different meanings as subjects are interpellated—the processes of subject constitution—into their subject positions (Youdell, 2006). Drawing from poststructuralist thought, Richardson (2000) argued that the “individual is both site and subject of these discursive struggles for identity and for remaking memory” (p. 929). Thus, because we are subject to multiple, and at times conflicting and contradicting, discourses, our subjectivities are also constantly shifting. Such understandings of discursively constituted subjects may complicate educators’ understandings of themselves as “subjects,” their interpreted “experiences,” and their understandings of “curriculum” in ways that juxtapose, complicate, and challenge traditionally conceptualized understandings of “curriculum” and teacher “experiences.” In particular, feminist poststructural understandings of

language complicate and question any essentialized as well as unitary constructions of categories such as “woman,” “teacher,” or “self.” However, it is beyond the scope of this inquiry for me to disrupt notions of gender, for example.

In asking the question of how discourse functions in educational settings, Weedon’s (1987) cautionary remark is helpful. She wrote that discourse is “more than ways of thinking and producing meaning” (p. 105) and that discourses “constitute the ‘nature’ of the body, unconscious and conscious mind and emotional life of the subjects which they seek to govern” (p. 105). Similarly, St. Pierre (2000b) also noted that discourse is more than language or linguistics, but “it organizes a way of thinking into a way of acting in the world” (p. 485). Thus, certain subjects become possible and/or impossible depending on the discourse(s) available. For example, Richardson (2000) provided the example of “domestic violence” to articulate this point. Persons in a marriage may experience domestic violence differently depending on the discourse(s) available to them. If they “experience” such violence within the discourse(s) of violence as normal in marriage, where violence is a husband’s right to control—or violence is against human rights—the ways that they “experience” and make meaning out of this “experience” may differ. Richardson described how one responds to this “experience” may vary because “individuals are subject to multiple and competing discourses in many realms” and thus “their subjectivity is shifting and contradictory, not stable, fixed, rigid” (p. 929).

While Richardson’s example may seem far from educational settings, how discourse functions and allows certain ideas, knowledges, and subjects to exist and function indeed is applicable to schooling. For example, the “curriculum” has functioned

as a technical approach to designing a set of behavioral objectives to seek particular results. Yet, poststructural epistemological and ontological assumptions about "being" and "experience" confront traditional understandings of "curriculum"—or further, how a subject learns or functions within the school setting. The "curriculum" no longer functions as a linear, static entity because "curriculum," too, operates within discourses and power relations that render particular subjects and their interpretations of their experiencings of knowledge possible—or impossible. I elaborate further on this point of how "curriculum" can function as discourse in the following chapter.

Considering that studies around individual interpretations of educational "experiences" in post-March 11 Fukushima are only recently being conducted in school contexts, poststructural framings helped me to explore my own attachments to my versions of my and others' sense of "belonging," "self," and "experiences." In this doing, I hope to trouble and "to learn to what extent the effort to think one's own history can free thought from what it silently thinks and so enable it to think differently" (Foucault, as cited in St. Pierre, 2000a, p 260). In a time of extreme uncertainty—such as those conditions in "post-disaster" Fukushima, Japan—where the tendency is to seek clarity and order through the "curriculum," how, if at all, can "curriculum" be conceptualized otherwise as it relates to educators' conceptualizations of their educative needs, desires, and experiences?

The Subject and "Experience"

The Western notion of the self is infused with the idea that the subject "I" is always an accessible and rational unit (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012; Miller, 2005; St. Pierre, 2000b; Weedon, 1987, 2004). Since the individual, within the Enlightenment discourse,

precedes language, one's "experience" also supposedly becomes cohesive and absolute (Britzman, 1995). Humanist notions of language assume that language is where meaning and the essence of the object can be found. Language serves to reflect reality as it categorizes to create order. For example, many feminist poststructuralists refer to the ways in which the category "woman" has been represented as a static and single identity category within humanist discourse. Such interpretation allows us to identify, regulate, and categorize "individual" differences as static, complete, and unitary objects. As such, "identity" has often been understood as "limited and temporary fixing for the individual of a particular mode of subjectivity as apparently what one is" (Weedon, 2004, p. 19). Yet, how do we account for the often conflicting and contradictory ways in which identities often collide? Unlike humanism where language is understood to reflect reality, poststructural theory places discourses as the centerpieces that not only link but also construct social organization, meaning, power, and, for example, those normative senses of ourselves—what many call "subjectivity" (Richardson, 2000; St. Pierre, 2000b; Weedon, 1987). This means that instead of language reflecting reality, it produces a particular type of reality where "experience" and memory also become sites of both interpretations and constant change. In other words, language is no longer fixed and static; it produces "reality," and those constructions of "reality" are also changing, conflicting, and contradicting.

Hence, according to poststructuralist assumptions, language no longer reflects one's sense of self, but produces one's subjectivity in relation to its historical, political, social, cultural, and economic contexts and normalizing discourses (Richardson, 2000; St. Pierre, 2000b; Weedon, 1987). With this idea, there is no longer a direct

correspondence between a word and the object because poststructuralist interpretations of language "trouble[s] the idea that language mirrors the world" (St. Pierre, 2000b, p. 481). For example, in her autobiographical approach to curriculum theorizing, Miller (2005) further developed her interpretations of "curriculum" by moving away from phenomenological framings towards those of poststructuralist and queer theoretical perspectives by troubling the notion of the unitary self and the supposed transparent meanings of "experiences" that the "self" may encounter. Through autobiography, which Pinar et al. (1995) argued is a research tool, Miller (2005) complicated, via a challenging of humanist and traditional versions of "autobiography," "experience," and "self," by conceptualizing these, via poststructural theories, "as historically situated and discursively inflected practice" (p. 47) that "disrupt rather than reinforce static and essentialized versions of our "selves" and our work as educators" (p. 54). Miller asserted that autobiography, re-theorized via poststructural theories, as educational research can "pry open identity categories that still frame much of how teaching, learning, and curriculum are conceptualized and enacted" (p. 55). Miller urged us to examine how the "subject" is discursively constituted amid relations of power that also are implicated in particular social, cultural, political, and economic contexts.

Poststructuralism allows one to not take things as "the way they are" because poststructuralist perspectives recognize the constantly changing aspects of this very object or idea that language tries to categorize, name, or pin down as what it "really" is. Thus, it becomes impossible to get down to the "crux" of one's "identity" or sense of "self"—but it is possible to explore processes of how one takes on multiple subjectivities. What becomes important is not to identify the core or essence of things, but to explore

how language operates to create one's subjectivity and how meanings of such have changed over time. Numerous scholars (Britzman, 1995; Butler, 2001, 2005; Richardson, 2000; Scott, 1991) have explored and troubled the very notion of the subject in relation to how language has traditionally reflected "experience."

Scott (1991), an historian who troubles this idea of the unitary subject and "experience," wrote, "when the evidence offered is the evidence of 'experience,' the claim for referentiality is further buttressed—what could be truer, after all, than a subject's own account of what he or she has lived through?" (p. 81). Scott here is problematizing this idea that the truth lies in the bearer of the "experience." Drawing from historical texts, Scott argued that focusing on historical events as "reality" essentially overgeneralizes "experiences" and identities as static and unitary. For example, Scott raised the case of a historical account of working-class "experiences." When the focus of object is the event itself, it neglects to see the cross-sectional workings of identity, race, and class within a political and discursive system. She instead called for a "change of object" from actual events to "changing discursive processes" (p. 92). In this change of object, while valuing the effects of particular events on identity formation and their interpretation of "experiences," Scott acknowledged the possibility of knowledge production within "discursive systems" that might highlight differences otherwise. This entails the study of "experience" as "not the origin of our explanation, but that which we want to explain" (p. 96).

To this same point, Britzman (1995) questioned mainstream understandings of "experience" in ethnographic study. Referring to traditional forms of ethnographic work, Britzman spoke of the impossibility of representing a holistic reality. She argued that

"ethnographers must think the categories of agency and voice beyond the humanist assumptions of a self capable of transcending history or a self that can somehow recover his or her authority from the unwieldy effect of discursive regimes of power and truth" (p. 235). Both Scott (1991) and Britzman (1995) were critiquing the transparent nature of language as well as the idea that truth lies in one's interpretation of "experience," a foundational belief in humanist notions of the unitary and always fully conscious self. An individual's "experience" or "voice" is considered authentic because humanism assumes that language is transparent and allows persons to express their individuality (Weedon, 1987). Poststructuralist assumptions instead point to the idea that subjects are no longer always fully understandable or knowable to themselves (Olson & Worsham, 2000). In other words, the subject is produced in discursive as well as material relation to others and, as such, it is impossible to give a complete, fully conscious, and "rational" account of oneself because the "self is already implicated in a social temporality that exceeds its own capacities for narration" (Butler, 2005, p. 8). Hence, if the subject is implicated in temporality, relationality, and various "discursive regimes," our interpretations of "experience" also become temporal, discursively framed, constituted, interconnected with others, and always constantly changing. Such conceptualizations of "experience" interrupt normative discourses of teacher "experiences," for example, as accessible, complete, and "truthful," but as conflicting, multiple, and in process.

If language is no longer "transparent, that the thing itself always escapes" (St. Pierre, 2000b, p. 484) and that it is "always implicated in cultural practice" (p. 483), we can certainly understand how and why our varying versions of social reality are constantly competing and changing. Furthermore, if it is in language that the subject is

constituted and being constituted, this understanding of language suggests that taken-for-granted notions of differences such as identity, cultural practices, or deep-rooted structures are open to change. It is this possibility that I am drawn to in relation to how teachers' interpretations of "experiences" as well as "curriculum" can be understood as influenced, framed, and constructed by discourses of power. I consider all of these possibilities as I attempt to explore historically, culturally, politically, and socially implicated ways in which teachers speak of their "experiences" in "post-disaster" Fukushima, Japan.

Researcher Role(s)/Positionalities

I visited my family in Japan during the summer of 2011, three months after the earthquake. Despite my previous memories of home, public spaces such as supermarkets and stations were dark, places that were usually freezing with blasting air-conditioning were humid and sticky, and most of all, there was a solemn hum that seemed to resonate in these spaces. But what surprised me the most was that most of my friends in the Greater Tokyo Metropolitan area were not interested or willing to talk about the radiation exposure following the nuclear power plant explosion. It was like pulling teeth to engage friends in talking about the disaster. For many of them, March 11th, 2011 was a "post"—the disaster was in the past and, hence, the northern regions of Japan were in the reconstruction stages. I was feeling a distance between my eagerness to ask questions around the disaster and my friends' "experiences" of seemingly having gotten on with their lives. Was I somehow an outsider in being concerned? Why were they unconcerned not only about their own health, but also about the government or the media that

perpetuated a certain "narrative" of progress? And how about fellow citizens who were forcefully evacuated due to the nuclear power plant "accident"?

I think of Butler (2001) who reminded us that "the unitary subject is the one who knows already what she is, who exits the conversation the same as when she entered" (p. 86). While I entered this curricular exploration as a novice researcher, I wondered what happens in this engagement as my multiple subjectivities as a woman, doctoral student, full-time international student advisor, Buddhist, former language teacher, daughter, multiracial, raised in a middle-class single-family household, among other constantly shifting subject positions, interact and collide. And in these interactions, how do I represent my interpretations of interactions in relation to the educators in Fukushima? As I asked this question, I nodded towards one assumption underlying qualitative inquiry—it is interpretive in the sense that the researcher aims to "make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them" (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p. 3). Yet, I also recalled Scott's (1991) point that "experience" is "at once always already an interpretation" (p. 96), thus reminding myself that the very "meanings" educators may share in response to my research questions are all interpretations. Further, within often convoluted and complex research processes, many qualitative researchers noted of the impossibility of ever fully and accurately representing "data" (Cho & Trent, 2006; Marshall & Rossman, 2011; Miller, 2005; Richardson, 2000; Van Maanen, 2011). A poststructural assumption undergirding the "crisis in representation" is that a researcher can never fully and accurately "capture lived experience" (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p. 19).

For these reasons, I grappled throughout this study with how and why I interpret and represent my “data” as I took up poststructurally inflected versions of “autobiographical” narrative inquiry as a mode of inquiry. In these “grapplings” I was reminded of Miller’s (2005) work around self, identity, and the subject as she argued that autobiographical researchers must grapple with these tensions by constantly questioning to the best extent possible, despite being immersed within dominant discourses, our own subjectivities. Through examples of autobiographical teacher “narratives,” Miller pointed out the dangers of telling a one-sided, fully conscious, and unitary “narrative” of teacher subjectivities. It is just not enough to tell “our” story or highlight “our” assumptions, thus again suggesting the unitary, fully conscious self. Instead, the responsibility of autobiographical researchers is to continue grappling with the tensions of “crisis in representation” as we attempt to “monitor” our subjectivities. I take up these issues in more detail in the methodology chapter.

Summary

This inquiry was motivated by my desire to understand, to whatever extent possible, given my own located subjectivities and discursively constituted “subject positions,” what interpretations of their “experiences” and attachments educators, who are in displacement in Fukushima, Japan, have with their professional subject positions. In particular, the aim of this study was to explore possible relationships among their interpretive “experiences” as teachers teaching in displacement and particular versions and conceptions of “curriculum” with and in which they must interact. To this end, I provided the background of the context, briefly describing a particular version of the

"history of Japanese education since World War II" and if and how the earthquake of March 11, 2011, and subsequent power plant explosion have impacted the ways in which "curriculum" is being practiced in Fukushima by my research participants. I then present interpretations from the literature of gaps in how curriculum is understood at the national, prefectural, and local level, thus justifying the need for my research. Throughout, I emphasize the reconceptualization of "curriculum" as an entry point into understanding educators' interpretations of their "experiences" in Fukushima and how these reconceptualized perspectives positioned alongside poststructural perspectives trouble taken-for-granted notions of the educator "self" and predetermined versions of "curriculum" as subject matter only. I then present my research questions followed by a conceptual framework undergirding my research. The following chapter positions my inquiry within a larger context of "curriculum" and teachers' interpreted "experiences" in post-crisis contexts.

II - CURRICULUM IN CONTEXT

Discourses of “curriculum” development and design, which posit “curriculum” as “content squeezed into textbooks” (Miller, 2005, p. 3), I argue, have led to a sense of certainty and control about “curricular” experiences. To some extent, parents and educators from Town A are facing questions of what memories, knowledge, and “experiences” to impart to their children considering their prolonged evacuation. What other “content” along with the traditional subject content should be included in the “curriculum”? What are they learning inside and outside the classroom? How should the cultural and historical values of their heritage be taught? While such questions have definitely been raised in conversations with educators, my concern is how “curriculum” is conceptualized and “experienced” by educators and how, in the process, they are interpreting these as well as their teacher subjectivities.

Amid such interpretations of “curriculum” as a container stuffed with knowledge and content, what Miller (1990) referred to as a “packaged and predetermined program” (p. 11), Pinar (2004) reminded me that “curriculum” is “a highly symbolic concept” (p. 185) that cannot be separated from those who engage with/in it. To this, Miller (2010a) added that “curriculum” is more than an object that needs developing, but that it could be understood as a “political act, with incomplete, fractured, and deferred meanings constantly shifting and reconstructing versions of particular knowledge” (p. 499). Not only do such perspectives pry open spaces to understand or reimagine “curriculum,” but they are also invested in exploring how discourses and/or events create multiple

conceptions of “curriculum.” With the occurrence of natural disasters, political instability, and conflict leading to displacement of populations around the world (International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies [IFRC], 2013; International Rescue Committee [IRC], 2016; United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization [UNESCO], 2014a, 2014b), concerns around “curricular” experiences are not only unique to the residents of Town A but also are of similar concern for educators and practitioners working with displaced populations. Taking up the stories and “experiences” shared by teachers from Town A as an entry point, I recognized that at the commencement of this particular inquiry, the educators’ interpretations of “curriculum” and teacher “experiences” in Fukushima in which I wished to engage—if they can be labeled at all—can and could be categorized as “post-disaster” or “post-crisis.” In this recognition, I acknowledge that the needs of a region in post-disaster contexts differ greatly from the needs of a region in post-conflict contexts. However, for the purpose of this literature review, I drew from literature that focused on both conflict- and disaster-affected regions, not only because this research context fell under the definitions of “post-crisis,” but also because this literature provides a contextual backdrop for this work.

This chapter also attempts to examine literature around what most often are taken to be “traditional” versions of “curriculum” and educators’ interpretations of “experiences” of such in such regions. To this extent, this review drew from empirical, secondary resources, and theoretical literatures by researchers, international organizations, and governments to explore how “curriculum” and “experience” are often conceptualized in the literature. In this review, I concentrated on these conceptualizations

in relation to the question: What assumptions underlie these conceptualizations? I first describe educational discourses in “disaster- and conflict-affected regions” to situate this inquiry within both wider and particular contexts. I then explore these literatures as they relate to conceptions of “curriculum” and to teachers’ interpretations of their “experiences” and how these have been represented in the literature. Finally, I provide a summary of his section.

Education in “Post-Crisis” Contexts

> Conditions linked to conflict and fragility—including poor governance, violence, repression, corruption, inequality and exclusion—may affect accessibility, quality, relevance, equity and management of education provision in ways which can exacerbate economic, social or political instability.
>
> Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE, 2010b)

It is only recently that education has joined life-saving humanitarian efforts to provide food, water, health, and shelter (Hodgkin, 2007; Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies [INEE], 2010b) in disaster-affected regions, although it continues to struggle with low funding and prioritization (UNESCO, 2015). While access to education has been designated as a basic human right since the inception of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (Dryden-Peterson, 2011), it is in the continuous efforts of practitioners, governments, and international organizations such as those reflected in the 1979 Convention of the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the Conference on Education for All in 1990, and the 2000 Dakar World Education Forum (Dryden-Peterson, 2011; Kagawa, 2005) that a heightened sense of the need for quality educational provisions in

areas having experienced disasters and/or conflict has emerged. In reference to the layered and complex nature of today's conflicts and disasters and how these have affected numerous regions of the world, the United Nations coined the term *complex emergency* to refer to "crises requiring a system-wide response" (Kagawa, 2005, p. 488), suggesting a weakened capacity of local governments to provide the necessary protection, security, and resources to its citizens. The United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF, 2008), a global organization that leads a movement for children's rights and protection, characterizes crisis as caused by natural disaster or conflict. They further break down humanitarian crises inclusive of "wars, earthquakes, tsunamis, floods, protracted conflict" to problematize the devastating effects of such events on the continued provision of quality educational environments to children (UNICEF, 2014a). Despite the devastating effects of crisis on children, UNICEF (2008) noted that the immediate aftermath of crisis presents a "window of opportunity for introducing educational reform and innovative thinking that governments may not have been receptive to previously" (para. 6). While the concept of "post-crisis" may open up further discussion around "time" in relation to what and who gets to determine when an event enters a transition period characterized as "post," for the purpose of this chapter, my focus remains on exploring literature around "curriculum" and teacher "experiences" in conflict- and disaster-affected regions that often get categorized as post-conflict, post-disaster, or post-crisis.

Numerous governmental and non-governmental agencies have since committed themselves to this endeavor to provide not only access but also quality education for all. Over time, it has become common to refer to the immediate provision of educational services in acute post-crisis contexts as emergency education (Kagawa, 2005; Nicolai &

Triplehorn, 2003; Sinclair, 2002). In addition to providing quality education, teacher recruitment, preparation, and development are of great concern in certain post-crisis settings because of the anticipated changes in expectations to which the teachers are held accountable (INEE, 2010a; UNESCO, 2015). In some crisis settings, teachers may lack formal training and qualifications, yet teach both traditional and non-traditional topics such as health and sanitation issues, peace education, and human rights education (INEE, 2010a; Kagawa, 2005; Oxfam-Novib, 2009; Van Nuland, 2009).

For example, the INEE is a leading network of practitioners who aim to ensure the right to quality education by mitigating future conflict or disaster (UNESCO, 2015). They aim to ensure dignity of life "by offering a safe space for learning, where children and youth who need other assistance can be identified and supported" (INEE, 2010b, p. 2). While numerous articles refer to the immediate dangers that schools face as targets of physical violence (Anderson, 1999; Burde, 2010; INEE, 2010b), discourse around education in emergencies seems to agree that schools as well as teachers symbolize a sense of safety (INEE, 2010b; Moore, 2007; Sinclair, 2002; UNESCO, 2014b) and, in particular circumstances, symbolize a movement towards recovery and development (INEE, 2010b). The INEE Minimum Standards is a foundational toolkit that is referred to by numerous organizations working in regions affected by disaster and/or conflict. Under this framework, the INEE emphasizes the significance of recognizing the importance of the curricula in providing an education that mitigates suffering and further conflict. Looking for supportive research that could further this claim, I searched for articles and literatures to examine how and what conceptualizations of "curriculum" and teacher

"experiences" serve communities affected by crisis or catastrophic events such as natural disasters and man-made disasters.

"Curriculum" As It Relates to Textbooks

Numerous scholars and researchers have pointed to the inextricable relationship between the "curriculum" and textbook usage in schools. These literatures range from the ways in which textbooks have contributed to the standardization of "curriculum" (Charland & Cyr, 2013; Kliebard, 2004; Noddings, 2013) to the political nature of "curriculum" published by multinational publishing companies across the world (Altbach, 1991; Apple & Christian-Smith, 1991; Low-Beer, 2001; Pinar et al., 1995).

Similarly, shortly after the East Japan Earthquake of 2011, the Japanese Ministry of Education published supplementary textbooks to be incorporated into the already existing textbooks as part of the "curriculum" (Goto, 2013). The supplementary textbooks focused on raising awareness as well as increasing knowledge around radiation and the impacts of radiation. Instead of instilling fear among students, the supplementary materials were to be taught by teachers to mitigate fear through knowledge acquisition around radiation as science material. While the use of such textbooks was not mandatory, the swift move to publish such materials suggests the reliance and importance of textbooks considered not only as part of the "curriculum," but often as "the curriculum." It further suggests the ways in which textbooks and "curriculum" are connected with their social, political, cultural, economic, and environmental contexts. Such a move to rely on textbooks to pass on relevant information and knowledge to learners is not unique to the situation in Fukushima.

Through a meta-research method, Selby and Kagawa (2012) provided case studies from disaster-prone regions from around the world. Through their extensive documentation and case study research method, they questioned the effectiveness of a centrally driven "curriculum" that may not be able to address the unique needs of local communities. For example, a case study from Bangladesh revealed the ways in which disaster risk reduction-driven textbooks were integrated into a highly centralized "curriculum." Despite its intent to provide knowledge around disaster risk reduction to build resiliency among community members, the authors mentioned the difficulty of determining student learning outcomes as well as the lack of teacher learning support. In response to their findings, the authors pointed to the need for further teacher capacity building and policy-level discussions to address the gap between textbook-driven "curriculum" design and classroom activities.

Speaking on the unique needs of learners in displacement, Dryden-Peterson (2011) analyzed the changing nature of those in displacement, specifically in relation to refugee populations. Dryden-Peterson noted that although in the past, displaced populations were placed in refugee camps or secluded areas separated from the host nation, in recent years and in light of protracted conflict or inability to return to their home country, there is a growing need of host nations to provide quality educational services to all. In such contexts, teacher development must take into consideration not only the host government's "curriculum" but also the educational "curricula" of the displaced populations.

The case of Rwanda after the genocide can also add to this discussion of "what" knowledge becomes part of the "curriculum." In her study of Rwanda's journey in

rebuilding its educational system, Obura (2003) provided an extensive and detailed account of how the Ministry of Education and other local organizations were involved in the reconstruction stages. In particular, Obura provided insight into the ways in which "curriculum" transformed over the years. Rwanda experienced a violent conflict with a long history rooted in ethnic and cultural difference. To mitigate further conflict in the future, the Ministry of Education promoted human rights rather than incorporating the history of each ethnic group into part of the "curriculum." Instead of focusing on the unique needs, history, and culture of each ethnic group, the Ministry emphasized humanity as a uniting national force. For this reason, teachers were encouraged to incorporate teaching methods that focused on the common humanity based on human rights. Although incorporating learner's cultural, historical, and social capital tends to be discussed within particular educational discourses as positive pedagogical attributes, a decision was made with the understanding that in contexts emerging from violent conflict, differentiation of groups requires further coordination and consideration (Anderson, 1999; Engelbrecht, 2008; Low-Beer, 2001; Obura, 2003).

In the aftermath of a crisis such as violent conflict or natural disaster, communities are faced with the question of how to pass on or communicate particular knowledges in relation to the event experienced (Engelbrecht, 2008; Foster & Nicholls, 2005; Torsti, 2007). Often, there are multiple debates around these decisions and eventually the decisions made are reflected in textbooks. In particular, this becomes of central concern for school academic subjects such as history or social studies where multiple perspectives and interpretations of a single event are expected to be printed as part of a textbook. However, such conceptualizations of textbooks as "curriculum" still

assume “curriculum” as “course of study” and fall back on the certainty implied by the question historically embraced by the “curriculum” field—the idea of “what knowledge is of the most worth?” (Spencer, 2009).

Much research has been conducted on the impact of conflict and disaster on “curriculum” experienced within schooling; much of this has focused on how textbooks do or do not include multiple perspectives in relation to school subjects following an identity conflict (Cole & Barsalou, 2006; Freedman, Weinstein, Murphy, & Longman, 2008; Hodgkin, 2007). Engelbrecht (2008) is one author who explored such topics through a mixed-method approach of textbook analysis. In this study, the author focused on “curriculum” development around history education in post-apartheid South Africa. Through an analysis of history textbooks from a South African primary school to explore how identity was being addressed, Engelbrecht highlighted three phases in which South Africa approached history education. Through quantitative and qualitative analyses of these textbooks, the author noticed there was a neglect in addressing the past as certain histories were silenced—in this case, White European history—in an attempt to give voice to historically marginalized groups. The author concluded that South African history textbooks struggle to provide multiperspectival narratives of South African history. The analysis pointed to the possibilities as well as the challenges of incorporating multiple “voices” and “experiences,” despite the intentions to do so. While the study pointed toward the power relations that impact what knowledge will become part of the “curriculum,” it reinforced humanist assumptions of “voice” and “experiences” as truth. To this point, Scott (1991) wrote of the humanist supposition that “knowledge is gained through vision; vision is a direct apprehension of a world of transparent objects” (p. 80).

In referring to how historical events have been documented, Scott noted that "experience" has been taken as "truth" and documented through writing to further transmit and solidify as fact.

While contexts are different, Low-Beer (2001) attempted to explore the complex relationship among conflict, identity, and textbook representations of the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The end of the Bosnian War immediately followed the end of Communism, and therefore, political and social upheaval were closely intertwined with educational services. Through the study, Low-Beer highlighted the different ways in which different ethnic groups were being represented in the history "curriculum." The author stated that despite the international intervention to reflect democratic and inclusive ideals in the "curriculum," it continued to reflect the unstable political and social contexts as the textbooks ranged across varying interpretations of the conflict. In this inquiry, the author, like Engelbrecht (2008), raised the question of how to represent multiple "experiences" within textbooks, which again highlighted the ways in which "experience" and "voice" have been taken as the very object reflective of truth and fact that need to be documented as "historical evidence."

Thus, while contexts are different, much of the literature mentioned above pointed to traditional conceptions of "curriculum" as well as "experience" and "voice" as transparently reflected through and in language.

"Curriculum" As It Relates to "Experience" and "Self"

Over the years, a multitude of research and literature has pointed to the significance of incorporating culturally, linguistically, and socially relevant "curricula" (Bartlett & Garcia, 2011; Fuller & Clarke, 1994; Ladson-Billings, 2001; Moll, Amanti, &

Neff, 1992; Singh, 2011). While each of these authors may range in methodology, context, and area of interest, the underlying spirit behind such scope lies in an interest to examine pedagogies that contribute to student learning and success. This is also of concern among educational discourses in conflict- and disaster-affected regions.

In some contexts, the classroom itself can become a site of conflict or violence (Burde, 2010; International Rescue Committee [IRC], 2006; Smith, 2010). Despite the fact that education has the capacity to provide stability and a sense of normalcy to children and youth, schools continue to be targets of violent attacks (Burde, 2010; Smith, 2010) and schools have the complex ability to mitigate as well as perpetuate further violence and confusion (Anderson, 1999; Burde 2010; INEE, 2010a, 2010b). Although teachers are often seen as the most important factor in schooling "experiences" in post-crisis contexts (Dryden-Peterson, 2011; Kagawa, 2005; UNESCO, 2014b), teachers themselves can be survivors of violence as well as perpetrators of division and conflict (Davies & Talbot, 2008; INEE, 2010b). In a case study of schools in Afghanistan, Burde (2010) noted the different ways in which government schools become the target of violent attacks. In this very case, to minimize gender inequities, government schools served as the primary source of educational provision; however, they were also susceptible to violence. To minimize this risk, Burde suggested community-based schools as popular intervention programs chosen among humanitarian organizations. This is because once teachers and staff members are trained by external organizations, they can continue providing services as those who are most familiar with the local needs.

Teachers in post-crisis settings need support not only to teach school subjects but also to address issues of psychosocial support in order to support the well-being of their

students and community members (IRC, 2006; Kos & Zemljak, 2007; UNICEF, 2007). The IRC's Healing Classroom Initiative delves into issues of teacher identity, "experiences," and motivation to ensure teacher retention. To better understand the "experiences" of teachers, the IRC conducted a mixed-method assessment of their teacher development program in Northern Ethiopia. Through this assessment, they found that the teachers were able to see improvements in their teaching pedagogies. However, those who were nominated to serve as a teacher despite their lack of qualification felt that they lacked confidence as a teacher. Based on these findings, the IRC adapted their teacher development programs to build on the teachers' "experiences" and resources (Kirk & Winthrop, 2007). The assumptions underlying this article are that "experience" can be captured, documented, and represented. While recognizing the importance of "experiences," how would such conceptualizations of teacher "identity" and "experiences" address the competing and conflicting aspects in how teachers may understand their senses of "selves?"

In a call for action, Moore (2007) spoke on the role of multiculturalism in creating a classroom that is culturally responsive to both students and teachers. In doing so, the author focused on the educational responses within schools following the 2005 Category 5 storm that swept through Florida, Mississippi, Alabama, and Louisiana—known as Hurricane Katrina. Moore compared the unique needs of students who relocated to other regions of the country after Hurricane Katrina by utilizing the Hollywood movie *Guess Who's Coming to Dinner*—a film about an interracial couple and their journey in addressing cultural values and perspectives that emerge as a result of interracial interaction. As students who were affected by the storm relocated to other parts of the

country, schools were unsure of what kind of support to provide to the newly relocated students. Students who relocated due to the devastating effects of Katrina came from diverse class and ethnic backgrounds and were placed in yet another different environment. Moore argued that due to these circumstances, the students needed a culturally responsive pedagogy grounded in multicultural education to address these differences.

Moore provided a brief overview of the significance of multicultural education and its potential as a transformative pedagogy. The author then highlighted the importance of schools offering professional development to teachers who teach in these linguistically, ethnically, and culturally diverse classrooms. This article suggested that the needs of the students are context-specific and therefore educators must have the necessary skills and sensitivity to address student differences and needs. While this may be true, such conceptions of “identity” are reflective of a unitary and static sense of “self” and, hence, the solution will be to provide further teacher development to entrust the necessary skills to the teachers so they can meet the “unique” cultural needs of the students.

Focusing on pedagogy and student needs in a post-Katrina-affected region, Robertson and King (2007) examined a project to develop instructional materials that incorporated student evacuees’ “experiences” and “voices” in the “curriculum.” The project was based on the Gao School Museum approach, which was based on Boŋ Feerey, a Malian concept that means “the process of opening one’s mind and accepting new ideas and approaches to integrate these new perspectives into your daily life” (p. 470). This project emerged from the direct “experiences” of students who survived the

hurricane, targeting those who had evacuated to areas outside of the New Orleans area and were experiencing displacement and loss, such as separation from their community, community-based activities, material loss, and misrepresentation of their group identities.

Based on the sense of loss and displacement, the authors proposed the Gao School Museum approach for teachers to incorporate student "experiences" and "voices" into the creation of "curricula," not only to educate the host community of the evacuee population but also to contribute to the healing process of students who have not had the opportunity to heal. The authors argued that instead of silencing these unique histories and "experiences" of the evacuees in other schools, teachers should incorporate these "voices," especially by incorporating Afrocentric knowledges and customs with which these students were most familiar. In this approach, teachers are also gaining training in how to incorporate and bring out these "experiences." Thus, the authors spoke to the importance of training teachers to be able to enact culturally relevant pedagogies. While the focus of this study was on capturing student "voice" and "experience," the authors reflected a particular interpretation of "experience" and "voice" as something that can be captured with the right tool.

Teachers are often looked to as leaders of their communities (INEE, 2010a, 2010b); however, they may not necessarily be involved in all decision-making processes. Carr-Chellman et al. (2008) explored the question of change through teacher "experiences" in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina. Seven lessons were highlighted via conversations with educators, who tend to be excluded from school reform decisions. The authors incorporated teachers' "voices" and "experiences" because they were the ones involved with the system, living out their "experiences" inside the schools on a daily

basis. The authors argued for the incorporation of teacher "experiences" and "voices" into educational reform decision making as they were the ones most familiar with student needs.

What assumptions are behind such conceptions of teachers as leaders? How might such assumptions impact how teacher subjectivities are constituted through teacher development that imparts particular knowledges of how a teacher might or might not be? How are "experiences" and "voice" being understood as part of representation? Such questions arise in reading literatures around teacher development and the knowledges that are to be imparted to the teachers.

"Curriculum" As It Relates to Inequities

What stands out in the review of literature around educational services in regions that have experienced conflict or disaster is the idea that the event or series of events is disruptive and endangers the provision of a safe environment to teach and learn. International organizations and national governments around the world have expressed their re-commitment to expanding quality, equitable, and inclusive education for all by the year 2030 (United Nations, 2015); thus, such disruptions may deter the achievement of such goals committed to equity and justice. Further, numerous research studies have pointed to the ways in which emergency situations such as conflict or natural disasters especially affect children and women (Burde, 2010; IRC, 2006; Machel, 1996; Nicolai & Triplehorn, 2003; Obura, 2003; Sinclair, 2002; Smith, 2010), while emphasizing the detrimental effects of such events on children and women (UNICEF, 2014a). As conflict or disaster exacerbates already existing inequities, it also impacts how "curriculum" is envisioned or developed at the governmental level. It further complicates how the content

of the “curriculum” is translated to the students via teachers, reinforcing the “top-down” approach that “curriculum” is “the very life of the school” (Obura, 2003, p. 92). Obura stated that access to education creates opportunities for wealth, employment, and status, and thus the desire for certain contexts to prioritize education. In essence, she argued that educational inequity contributes to the widening of national divisions. While we still see regions where basic human rights are not observed or respected (Obura, 2003; Sinclair, 2010), a proliferation of human rights frameworks has also been integrated into the “curriculum” so that teachers, students, and communities have become aware of their basic rights (Bajaj, 2011; Sinclair, 2010; Tibbitts, 2002).

Not only do conflict and disasters create inequality but, in some cases, they fuel already existing inequities. In studying the impacts of Hurricane Katrina, Hardy (2007) noted that President Bush “pledged not only to launch one of the most massive public reconstruction efforts in history, but also to confront in a head-on manner the realities of race and poverty that Katrina, in all its horror, had laid bare” (p. 64). Many of the survivors of Katrina were displaced. Such conditions exacerbated already existing inequities that rummaged the city. Hardy noted that poverty rates in Louisiana and Mississippi were 23% and 24%. However, after the storm, these rates went up to 38% in New Orleans alone. Not only did Hurricane Katrina cause disruptions to schooling, Hardy argued that the storm worsened economic inequities in the city, ultimately magnifying the inequities that were affecting students in public school systems. Thus, school reform-driven “curriculum,” if based on a foundation of inequity, will continue to perpetuate inequity.

Focusing on the power inequities and how different stakeholders addressed such inequities, Beabout (2007) examined the ways in which five stakeholders—United Teachers of New Orleans (UTNO), Orleans Parish Schools Board (OPSB), State of Louisiana, Algiers Charter School Association (ACSA), and Mayor Ray Nagin's volunteer committee—responded to the educational needs of New Orleans after Hurricane Katrina. Through the lens of structural and cultural change in school reform, the author highlighted the ways in which stakeholders gained or lost control over the educational system. Through media reports and primary sources such as public information to engage in chronological analysis, the author highlighted how stakeholders who proposed cultural changes were successful in achieving structural changes in the educational system while also maintaining or gaining some control over the schools. Thus, the article not only pointed towards the pre-existing inequities in pre-Hurricane Katrina, but also the ways in which the disaster became intertwined with the political and economic constraints of the city.

On a national scale, Selby and Kagawa (2012) made clear the national disparities that may make certain countries less prone and prepared for disasters. For instance, the authors documented several countries that have been able to integrate a centralized disaster risk reduction "curriculum" while others are challenging to streamline such "curricula" at the national or local level. Although this is beyond the scope of this literature review, Selby and Kagawa point to the multiple ways in which inequities can impact nations, states, communities, and individuals.

Such concerns over schooling "experiences," "school reform," and "curriculum" reinforces the question asked by curricular theorists "what (and whose) knowledge is the

most worth?" and if and how the "curriculum" can be "designed" in order to mitigate division and inequity. In essence, such concerns are suggestive of inequity conceptualized as power being possessed and, hence, with the right apparatus of knowledge, inequity can be mitigated. Foucault (1972) wrote:

> if one tries to erect a theory of power one will always be obliged to view it as emerging at a given place and time and hence to deduce it, to reconstruct its genesis. But if power is in reality an open, more-or-less coordinated (in the event, no doubt, ill-coordinated) cluster of relations, then the only problem is to provide oneself with a grid of analysis which makes possible an analytic of relations of power. (p. 199)

The literature mentioned above conceptualizes inequity as being "caused" by an external entity, and thus can be challenged to break away from. While acknowledging the very structures that contribute to inequities mentioned in studies above, Foucault's conceptualization of power exists and is constantly circulating within relations complicates how inequities that affect schooling "experiences" can be identified and analyzed and how these can and will take on different effects.

Teachers in "Post-Crisis" Contexts

Numerous researchers have focused on the many factors that impact the teaching and learning "experiences" of students and teachers in post-crisis contexts. Some have documented the dangers of teaching in post-crisis contexts and the impact such conditions have on schooling (Burde, 2010; Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack [GCPEA], 2014; INEE, 2010b); on teacher identity and how these too affect teacher motivation (INEE, 2010a; IRC, 2006; Kirk & Winthrop, 2007, 2008; Oxfam-Novib, 2009); the challenges teachers face when adopting unfamiliar pedagogical skills (IRC, 2006; Kirk & Winthrop, 2007; Obura, 2003); and the relationship between teacher

conduct and teacher compensation (INEE, 2010a; Van Nuland, 2009). While some of these factors may not be unique to post-crisis contexts, already existing conditions in low-resourced regions can make teaching challenging (Frisoli, Frazier, & Hansen, 2013).

Historically, teachers, particularly in the United States, were seen as those with values and morals that are exemplary role models to the community (Waller, 1965). This view has not changed much to this day as well as globally, and in particular, in disaster- or conflict-affected regions. In such regions, there is a desire for safety and normalcy; moreover, teachers are looked to as leaders of their communities (INEE, 2010a; Shriberg, 2007; Weldon, 2010). Truby and Richards (2005) focused on three teachers who told their stories around Hurricane Katrina. One of the teachers discussed her interpretations of surviving Katrina and the days following as she searched for employment opportunities. In her words, she shared the overwhelming amounts of help and support she had received from friends and strangers. She commented, “I am not used to getting help in this way. I am always the one giving help” (Truby & Richards, 2005, p. 25). This quote speaks to the expectations placed on teachers and the expected role they serve in their communities as leaders, providers, and protectors, and how such roles can shift depending on time, context, and place.

As seen in Truby and Richards’ report, disasters, conflict, and violence in some instances may temporarily or permanently displace individuals or groups of people from their place of residence. Of particular relevance to this research is how such devastating events can affect not only the physical infrastructures of schooling but also the emotional well-being of educators (IRC, 2006; Kos & Zemljak, 2007; Save the Children, 2013). Such was the case among many educators following Hurricane Katrina, which hit the

Gulf cities of the United States. Truby and Richards (2005) described how one teacher who evacuated from New Orleans to Florida struggled with her sense of belonging as her evacuation period prolonged. In this "experience," the teacher realized the amount of loss she "experienced" through the evacuation during her daily reading with her granddaughter, which ironically also reaffirmed her sense of "home" as it brought back memories of what she could remember of home before the hurricane. Here the author was referring not only to the physical place or dwelling which we often call home but to a symbolic space that one may call "home."

Survivors of the 2011 Great East Japan Earthquake also had to relocate due to the magnitude of the earthquake, tsunami, and radiation exposure that forced many to evacuate (Save the Children, 2012; UNICEF, 2012). As many as 160,000 individuals, voluntarily or involuntarily, evacuated their homes due to the dangers of radiation exposure. In a One Year Report, UNICEF (2012) provided case studies indicating how school infrastructures have been rebuilt over the last year since the disaster. With the assumption that children are drastically impacted by natural disaster, the UNICEF report focused on the rebuilding process as well as challenges faced by schools in the affected area. Many of the case studies mentioned in this report highlighted the relocation process of schools due to the damages caused to the structures of the building. If schools were intact and thus operable, they were used for temporary shelters; thus, additional supplies and spaces were needed to resume school. In many of these case studies, communities including educators and administrators were also survivors of the earthquake. Hence, although much attention was given to the rebuilding of school infrastructure, the report

also emphasized the need for psychosocial support to all those, including educators, impacted by the disaster.

In the aftermath of September 11th, 2001, teachers were also looked to for support while they themselves were in the midst of turmoil. Many teachers were confronted with the unsettling questions of "why" such a tragedy had happened in trying to make sense of the violent acts that led up to this day. For instance, Saltz and Grolnick (2006) stated that "history doesn't usually enter the K-12 school curriculum until we know for sure it's important and until its meaning is agreed upon" (p. xvi). While the teachers themselves were living the present history, there was not enough distance between their interpretations of their experiences and the actual event to be able to understand objectively and teach it as a subject to their students. To this point, Hochman (2006) described the controversies that arose among her students' families because of her decision to teach about Islam during her social studies class. Often, after catastrophic events, teachers feel a disconnect with the prescribed "curriculum," and they must make decisions on what to teach (Hochman, 2006; Tani, 2013). In this decision-making process, teachers seem to be acting out of a sense of responsibility to care for the psychosocial needs of their students as well as their sense of professionalism (Hochman, 2006; Lowenstein, 2006; O'Connor & Takahashi, 2013; Shriberg, 2007; Weldon, 2010).

A case study conducted by O'Connor and Takahashi (2013) pointed towards how the identity of a "teacher" is reflective of particular assumptions and how it is repeatedly understood and practiced. Comparative case studies from New Zealand and Japan after the earthquake highlighted the "voices" and "experiences" of principals, teachers, and students. The aim of the research was to provide recommendations around disaster and

school management. In both cases, interview methods were utilized to gather data. In the New Zealand case, storytelling as an approach was a means for the researchers to gather data, make sense of the "experiences," and represent the stories being told. The authors assumed that their gathered data showed that an educator's sense of responsibility in both cases—the future of the children's safety—was central to the leadership taken by either the teacher or the principal of the school. Most importantly, both cases revealed the authors' interpretations of an ethics of care that strengthened school communities and the relationships among individuals who play a role in creating the schooling experience.

Similarly, Alvarez (2010) focused on the complex contexts of teaching among diverse populations following Hurricane Katrina. In this study, Alvarez focused on the instructional practices among teachers who taught in the newly created Recovery School Districts. The author presented the teaching experiences of two teachers in particular who taught in schools with students affected by Hurricane Katrina. Although their schools were different, both of the teachers' interpretations of their "experiences" highlighted the challenges of addressing changes in student behaviors and living conditions. In many cases, evacuated students were placed in schools different from the one they had been attending pre-Katrina. The stress of living in unstable conditions led to poor decision making, involvement in self-destructive behavior, withdrawal, and/or distrust of adults. In addition to coping with their own trauma of surviving Katrina, the teachers often taught in classrooms with students from diverse grade levels as a result of the disaster destroying school materials, including student records.

Amid all the confusion and uncertainty, teachers were expected to teach based on pre-Katrina "curricula." Both teachers highlighted the challenges of relying solely on pre-

existing "curricula" as they created activities in relation to the experiences of the students to support the learning environment. This also included teachers progressing the lesson in small increments to accommodate the students' learning capacities. While attending to the existing "curricula," both teachers participating in the research incorporated narratives into their classrooms as an approach for students to talk about their "experiences." Both teachers' interpretations of "experiences" inside the classroom highlighted the importance of narrative and storytelling as a long-term approach in the healing processes following a disaster. While this research nodded towards traditional conceptualizations of "curriculum," it also highlighted how particular humanist versions of "narrative" were reflective of an assumed "reality" as well as teacher "identity."

Troubling "Curriculum" and "Experience"

I briefly mentioned the history of "curriculum" in the United States in the previous chapter as an entry point to considering the multiple ways in which "curriculum" has been understood over time and in different spaces. When surveying "curriculum" in the online education database with search terms such as "curriculum," "experience," and "teaching," numerous articles have conceptualized "curriculum" in traditional ways to point to the standardization of "curriculum" (Noddings, 2013; Taubman, 2009; Wermke & Höstfält, 2014) as well as globalization (Clothey, Mills, & Baumgarten, 2010; Law, 2014; Moon, 2013; Wermke & Höstfält, 2014) and their effects on schooling.

Lortie (1975) wrote a well-known sociological historical account of teachers within the school as an institution. Within this institution, teachers are expected to attend

to student needs in their classrooms while also acknowledging institutional needs (Hult, 2012; Lortie, 1975; Wermke & Höstfält, 2014). For instance, in standardization, teachers are tasked with the responsibility to adapt to the "curriculum" as they prepare their students to succeed both in and outside the classroom. In many cases, teachers committed to practicing equity in their classroom must teach the subject content while also communicating knowledge that supposedly prepares students to succeed both in and outside the classroom (Bjork & Tsuneyoshi, 2005; Underwood, 2012; Wermke & Höstfält, 2014). Wermke and Höstfält (2014) referred to this act of negotiation as teacher autonomy as teachers determine what and how they teach the "curriculum" within the institution of school. While my focus in this particular inquiry is not on how teachers actually teach the "curriculum," these factors point to the ongoing ways in which "curriculum" continues to be conceptualized as the object as predetermined subject-matter content to be developed and the multiple factors teachers may be negotiating inside and outside the classroom as they teach "the curriculum."

Focusing on the institutionalization of "curriculum" in public schools, Hopmann (2003) provided an international comparative view on how "curriculum" reform has taken place in Europe and the United States. The author argued that in recent times, "curriculum" reform has taken both a process and product approach with the hopes of investigating how such an evaluation impacts teaching methods and learning outcomes. While such "curriculum" evaluation has contributed to the adaptation and designing of new "curricula," authors such as Noddings (2013) and Charland and Cyr (2013) problematized the effects of standardized "curriculum." Noddings (2013) advocated for teachers to be able to teach creatively by relating the "curriculum" to daily life as much

as they can, while Charland and Cyr (2013) advocated for "curricular" reformers to include "specific local realities" (p. 471) as a way to create meaningful "curriculum" for the learners. While all these articles surely attend to the complexities of teaching and the interaction between those who engage with the "curriculum," they add to the continued view that "curriculum" is an object that can be adapted and developed. I am not arguing to drop this idea of "curriculum" as content to be designed or developed; I fully recognize that for those interested, invested, and committed to "curriculum" in one way or another, there will be aspects of the "curriculum" that will always require designing or developing. Yet, I also wonder how "curriculum" conceptualized as object can attend to the emotions, histories, interpreted "experiences," and desires—the subjectivities constructed in particular times and places via particular discourses—of the students and teachers who are directly engaging in learning and teaching inside the classroom.

The review of literature on textbook-driven "curriculum" reinforced the idea of "curriculum" serving as a course of study and pointed to the idea that students as well as teachers learn and teach, often in a linear progression. Many of the textbooks responded to the changing political, social, cultural, and economic contexts to take account of the complex realities of world events. However, in describing this process, the researchers contributed to reiterating traditional understandings of "curriculum" as content to be chosen, organized, and executed in a linear manner. The question remained in the traditional realm of "what" content is of the most worth, thus reinforcing the idea that contents represented in the "curriculum" are valuable knowledges that reflect an agreed-upon "truth." This appeared in the form of "universal truths" represented via the "curriculum" through particular frameworks, such as a human rights framework. Here,

once again, the literature attempts to investigate how knowledge as content has been chosen by the respective entities such as the central government or international organizations as legitimate knowledge to be included in the "curriculum." Such understandings or assumptions, I argue, cannot attend to the complexities of educational "experiences" that are mediated by relations of power and discourses that produce knowledges and subjectivities.

Persuaded by poststructural perspectives, I no longer understand "experience" as reflective of a reality that can be captured in language. "Experience" is an interpretation already had and cannot be expressed as complete and impartial; on the contrary, it is a site of contestation and conflict (Miller, 2005; St. Pierre, 2000b; Scott, 1991). While many of the authors attempted to capture the "experiences" of those affected by conflict or disaster to inform their study, the underlying assumption behind the authors' attempts in "capturing" the "narratives" remain within humanist assumptions of the "knowable self" as well as constructions of "narratives" reflecting humanist assumptions. The focus on capturing teacher "experiences" as these relate to their classroom pedagogy suggests that there is a unique and complete story experienced by a rational subject that can and needs to be documented. In some of the studies, such teacher identities were represented to inform future teacher development opportunities. The studies succeeded in "capturing" a unitary and stable portrait of these "experiences" which do succeed in being able to represent a partial telling—which, at times, are crucial in highlighting political, economic, social, and gendered inequities and injustices; however, they failed to address the poststructural concerns around interrogation of language that shift in relation to discourses of power. To trouble such a simplistic tale of teacher "stories," Miller (2005)

troubled the popular notion of unitary, reflective teacher categories in educational research. She argued that in order to re-imagine “normalized and descriptive identity categories” (p. 55) such as “woman,” “man,” “student,” “researcher,” and I add “curriculum,” researchers must narrate beyond telling unitary accounts of subject categories. Thus, the challenge for “curricular” scholars is to constantly revisit the idea that “knowledge and truth are not ‘pure’ but unstable and contingent” (St. Pierre, 2000b, p. 499). With this, there are no ultimate master “narratives” where there is an objective truth, knowledge or versions of “self” that are external to the knower. So how then do researchers ethically “do” research and represent their findings within particular orientations of qualitative research that rely on analyses and interpretations of data?

Traditional orientations to qualitative research necessitate that researchers collect data, organize their data, and make sense of their data under the assumption that data can be gathered and speak for themselves. Under such orientations, researchers are trained to capture “lived experiences” to later make sense of this data as factual. However, poststructural orientations challenge such humanistic assumptions of the rational self as well as the transparent relations between language and “experience,” and instead seek to highlight the processes of subject constitution because “experiences” collected as data are already interpretations. I delve further into this dilemma of engaging in qualitative data and representing data in the subsequent methodology chapter.

“Curriculum” as Discourse

Despite the undeniable changes in student enrollment in the temporary site schools in City B (Fuksuhima Minyu, 2016; Takeuchi, 2012), Fukushima prefecture had encouraged schools and teachers to focus on raising the academic skills of their students

(Takeuchi, 2012). In actualizing this task, the prefecture emphasized the significance of the teacher's role in conveying the subject content and, thus, the need for more teacher development. While teachers are a significant part of the schooling "experience," could "curriculum" be perceived otherwise—paying attention to the discourses that frame how teachers talk about their interpreted educative "experiences"—especially when the literatures I covered in this chapter reflect traditional understandings of "curriculum" as content to be predetermined and organized in a sequential manner? In asking this question, I am reminded once again of Pinar (2004) who wrote:

> The educational point of the public school curriculum is understanding, understanding the relations among academic knowledge, the state of society, the processes of self-formation, and the character of the historical moment in which we live, in which others have lived, and in which our descendants will someday live. It is understanding that informs the ethical obligation to care for ourselves and our fellow human beings, that enables us to think and act with intelligence, sensitivity, and courage in both the public sphere—as citizens aspiring to establish a democratic society—and in the private sphere, as individuals committed to other individuals. (p. 187)

While students may be increasing their subject knowledge, Pinar reminded us that the point of "curriculum" is not to produce great test takers or employees who will serve the business sector decades later. Pinar here suggested that "curriculum" can be imagined beyond the static notion of an object that requires development to serve the political or economic motives of those designing the "curriculum." Instead, he encouraged "curricular" theorists to "explore curriculum as a lived event in itself" that responds to the daily interpreted "experiences" of educators and students. In fact, his interpretation of "curriculum" suggests that it is the action of understanding in our daily lives that may lead to social justice.

To this point of understanding "curriculum," Miller (2005) attributed the significance of the reconceptualization of "curriculum" in relation to its initial goal of "understanding curriculum as intersection of the political, the historical, the autobiographical" (p. ix). Similar to Pinar's point of understanding "curriculum," Miller's quote suggests that the understanding of "curriculum" involves the daily interpretations of "experiences," knowledge(s), and beliefs that come into contact and at times contradict each other at the intersections of "curriculum" and interpretations of "experience." "Curriculum" is never neutral, objective, or a simple process of choosing and organizing content; rather, it involves the complex interplay of language, power, discourse, and interpretations of such understandings.

As I grapple with "curriculum" theorizing, I refer to Pinar et al. (1995) who reminded us that curriculum studies is a "field of study, a tradition of language or discourse" (p. 7), and, thus, he encouraged us to "understand the curriculum field as discourse" (p. 7). In the previous chapter, I briefly outlined the challenges and contradictions of trying to define discourse: Weedon (1987) wrote that "discourse exists both in written and oral forms and in the social practices of everyday life" (p. 108), while Cherryholmes (1988) wrote, "discourse refers to what is said and written and passes for more or less orderly thought and exchange of ideas" (p. 2). Cherryholmes added that "discourse, a more or less orderly exchange of ideas, is a particular kind of practice, and practice is, at least in part, discursive" (p. 9). Contrary to traditional understandings and concerns around "curriculum" as content, particular interpretations of reconceptualized "curriculum" focus on "knowledge construction and conditions, discourses, and power relations that structure the production and receiving of knowledge" (Miller, 2005, p. 140).

Thus, contemporary concerns of "curriculum" expand from "what" knowledge is of most value to that of "who" gets to construct "curriculum" under particular discourses and relations of power. In particular, poststructural orientations to conceptions of "curriculum" focus on how subjects' interpreted "experiences" around the "curriculum" are mediated and by which discourses.

Interdependency—An Inquiry Within and Without

Despite efforts by numerous international organizations, governments, and non-governmental organizations to provide quality education for all, the dire fact is that funding towards humanitarian aid continues to be a challenge (Dryden-Peterson, 2011; UNESCO, 2015). In particular, the education sector continues to struggle to secure and maintain adequate funding (UNESCO, 2015). One of the Education for All Report pointed out that the minimal amount of US $26 billion per year is allocated towards basic education services and funding, which is severely underfunded considering the proliferation of regions that are in need of such services (UNESCO, 2014a). Crises are no longer isolated events that happen in faraway regions. A protracted violent conflict in one hemisphere can raise oil prices in a region that is considered to be at "peace." A "guerilla" hurricane may hit a coastal city, thus devastating and displacing its residents to seek refuge in another city within the same state. Or, as in the case of Fukushima, an earthquake that causes a tsunami destroying a nuclear power plant can have economic consequences impacting national trade as well as the ways in which migration patterns impact hosting cities. Thus, no crisis or catastrophe is an isolated event; on the contrary,

"catastrophes are not all of the same gravity, but they all connect with the totality of interdependence that make up general equivalence" (Nancy, 2015, p. 6).

Much of the literature covered in this section points to re-conceptualizations as well as the continuous need for traditional understandings of the "curriculum" that require development and design. Recognizing the interdependent nature of my research, I could not separate myself from the interpreted "experiences" that were shared with me as outside of myself. To accommodate these complexities of doing research as a novice researcher, I chose specific methodologies that allowed me to attend to the crisis in representation as well as to complicated notions of "experiences" and the rational self. More is discussed in the chapter to follow, in which I describe the methods and methodologies that I incorporated in this inquiry.

INTERLUDE—IN ANTICIPATION OF AN ENCOUNTER

I signed the email using my Japanese name instead of my American name, believing that this may grant me access to the individuals residing in Fukushima.

Gibson… Takahashi…

How do I perform these different selves in the spaces I am about to enter as a doctoral student researcher? Although I was born and raised in Japan, I was raised in the Kanto area and have no connection to the Tohoku area where Fukushima is located—although my grandmother tells me her ancestors migrated from Niigata to the Tokyo area. I know nothing about the region—I am not familiar with the culture, history, politics, or dialect of the region. Would I be perceived differently? Will the different dialects affect the way we communicate?

I feel extreme anxiety when I put on my "researcher" hat as a student engaging in doctoral research in Fukushima. This anxiety reminds me of a book I encountered as a student pursuing a degree in international educational development. Anderson (1999) outlined examples of humanitarian and development workers who maximized their efforts to save lives while minimizing conflict and division fueled by humanitarian aid work in areas such as health, sanitation, and education. Good intentions do not necessarily reap expected results. If this were the case, who am I to go into Fukushima as if they have a "problem" that needs to be analyzed and resolved? What is the problem?

What kind of role(s) was I to play? Was I expected to know all the answers to the problem(s) identified? How do I interpret and represent the stories and experiences

shared with me? What frames my interpretations? How much of myself do I disclose to the participants and at what stage? With such questions in mind, I stand on the platform observing a milieu of movements such as the cleaning crew scurrying in line to board the approaching bullet train, businessmen in their suits with their carry-on suitcase, and tourists on their way to their next destination…

III - METHODOLOGICAL CONCERNS AND RESEARCH PROCESS

While traditional discourses of "curriculum" tend to be "disconnected from diverse person with hopes, dreams, bodies, and desires" (Miller, 2005, p. 17), "curriculum" scholars such as Miller (2005) and Pinar (2004) have employed autobiography as a research method as well as "curriculum" discourse, not only to disrupt static notions of "curriculum," "knowledge," "experience" and "self," but also to interrupt technical conceptions of "curriculum" as content whereby students' understandings of content can be measured by "objective" instruments such as tests.

In this chapter, I first describe how narrative inquiry and autobiography as modes of qualitative inquiry as well as autobiography as a dominant "curriculum" discourse over the years have been utilized as forms of "curriculum" research and why I chose to incorporate these methods of inquiry for this study. I then discuss participant recruitment, criteria for selection, and data collection and analysis for this inquiry. I end this section by presenting the limitations of this study, especially as based on choice of methodology. Throughout, I grapple with the ontological and epistemological investments and tensions in writing this section called methodology as I attempt to engage with poststructural understandings of "research," "autobiography," and "curriculum."

Enlightenment Versions of Narrative Inquiry

Referring to the challenging work of interpreting qualitative research, Denzin and Lincoln (2000) noted, "qualitative research is endlessly creative and interpretive" (p. 26).

In engaging with this interpretive process, “multiple criteria for evaluating qualitative research now exist, and those that we emphasize stress the situated, relational, and textual structures of the ethnographic experience” (p. 27). They continued to note that this very interpretive practice of “making sense of one’s findings is both artistic and political” (p. 26). Narrative inquiry is one mode of qualitative inquiry that involves such an interpretive process.

As I search how other researchers have understood and incorporated narrative inquiry as one mode of qualitative research, I am overwhelmed with diverse definitions and interpretations. Chase (2005), in her earlier work, attempted to describe “narratives” as an “oral or written and may be elicited or heard during fieldwork, an interview, or a naturally occurring conversation” (p. 652). Referring to Barthes (1977), Chase (2005) noted that “narratives” can be found in every reach of one’s life experiences. Referring also to Barthes, Reissman (2008), while shying away from defining narrative inquiry, suggested that “narrative” is “present in every age, in every place, in every society” (Barthes, as cited in Reissman, 2008, p. 4). She further problematized the expansive possibilities of narrative inquiry and the need for boundaries as “narrative has come to mean anything beyond a few bullet points” (p. 4). Similarly, Clandinin (2013) raised the importance of defining “narratives,” given the expansion of diversifying interpretations of narrative research.

Acknowledging how the field has expanded over time, Chase (2005) noted that narrative inquiry “is a field in the making” where “researchers new to this field will find a rich but diffuse tradition, multiple methodologies in various stages of development, and plenty of opportunities for exploring new ideas, methods, and questions” (p. 651). Chase

went on to note that narrative inquiry is interdisciplinary in that it incorporates multiple perspectives, methods, and theoretical orientations. In her later work, Chase (2011) thus modified her definition of narrative inquiry as "meaning making through the shaping or ordering of experience, a way of understanding one's own or others' actions, of organizing events and objects into a meaningful whole, of connecting and seeing the consequences of actions and events over time" (p. 421). Narrative inquiry, from this perspective, has been incorporated as one way of making sense of and ordering individuals' often complex and complicated experiences. Clandinin and Connelly (2000), Clandinin and Rosiek (2007), and Clandinin (2013) are all examples of researchers who incorporated narrative inquiry to attempt to "study experience" (p. 13). The undergirding assumption that distinguish their research methodology from other forms of narrative research that incorporate "narratives" as forms of inquiry and representation are their ontological and epistemological assumptions that are constructivist in nature as well as primarily based on Dewey's notion of "experience." These assumptions rest on the idea that individual "experiences" occur within continuous interactions within society and "narratives" highlight the social, cultural, and linguistic aspects that affect such interpretations of their experiences (Clandinin, 2013). Hence, while acknowledging the complexity and fluidity of "experience," these researchers utilized narrative inquiry as a method to understand, order, and make sense of supposedly always accessible "experiences" had by the research participants.

Such varying definitions of "narratives" suggest that it is a form of oral or written texts that can supposedly be retrieved by the researcher to represent the "other" through analysis because "narratives" as a unit of analysis, according to the above authors, are

fully intact as they emerge from individuals and, thus, available for extraction by researchers. Such interpretations of “narratives,” narrative inquiry, and construction of “story” seeped in Western assumptions as mode of qualitative research have been incorporated by many researchers as a way to analyze, make sense of, and communicate the “experiences,” “stories,” or “narratives” of others (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Clandinin & Rosiek, 2007; Riessman, 2008). However, narrative inquiry has also been taken up from poststructural orientations to challenge such versions of narrative research (Miller, 2005; Squire, Andrews, & Tamboukou, 2013), which are discussed in the following section.

Feminist Poststructural Critiques of Narrative Inquiry

Narrative inquiry as a methodology has been utilized in the realm of educational research as a way to study experiences inside the classroom (Chase, 2005; Clandinin, 2013; Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). In fact, some researchers such as Clandinin (2013) have argued for narrative inquiry as educational research as a practical way to study “experience” that informs research and teaching practices.

While narrative researchers such as Chase (2011) and Clandinin (2013) have acknowledged that “experiences” are fluid and relational, the assumptions undergirding their research methodology are based on Enlightenment assumptions of the unified “self” as a rational being who is capable of interpreting and making sense of his or her own unique “experiences.” It also suggests that individuals have a unique “voice” that can be extracted from their “experiences” and that “meanings” can be derived from such interpretations of their “experiences” in a fully knowable manner. Various scholars have challenged these very notions of the unitary, authoritative, and linear representations of

the "experiences" and "voice" in qualitative research (Britzman, 1995; Fine & Weis, 1996; Henry, 2003; Jackson & Mazzei, 2012; Miller, 2005; Weis & Fine, 2005; Weis, Fine, Weseen, & Wong, 2000).

Feminist poststructural researchers, such as Miller (2005), have challenged and questioned the very idea of "narratives" being shared to simply "tell your story" because often, such "narratives" are associated with "voice" and "identity" that reflect the humanist notion of the unitary, authoritative, and rational "self." For instance, Miller problematized the often-used tactic for teachers to "just tell your story" especially in U.S. teacher preparation programs and the resulting "teacher narratives" as reflective of "modernist notions of the Enlightenment individual that many of us in the United States have grown up with, where the dominant narrative in education includes belief in students' linear, sequential, and measurable academic progress as well as "personal" development" (p. 51). In an attempt to highlight teacher "voices" and "experiences," teacher "narratives" have often been utilized in modernist versions of narrative inquiry, thereby reinforcing the "unified, singular, and essentialized versions of the 'self,' 'experience,' 'other,' and 'voice'" (Miller, 2005, p. 52). Feminist poststructural work thus aims to interrupt such retelling of the unified essentialized "self" towards that of multiple and fluid versions of the "self."

While Clandinin (2013), too, viewed "experience" as fluid, her theorizations of "experience" are conceptualized and represented as linear, authentic, and something that can be excavated through data collection and analysis. One way in which humanist versions of narrative inquiry differ from feminist poststructural assumptions is that they do not acknowledge perspectives that insist that individuals do not have immediate access

to agreed-upon “truths” or universal “meanings” in relation to what they have “experienced.” Rather, poststructural theories contend that “experience is a linguistic event” (Scott, 1991, p. 93). As described in previous chapters, feminist poststructural understandings are based on the assumption that subjects are discursively and materially constituted. Similarly, taking a Foucauldian approach to narratives, Tamboukou (2013) described narrative as being “understood through structures and forces of discourse, power, and history” (p. 88). Feminist poststructural investments suggest that “narratives” of one’s “experience” are not fully formed, linear, complete, and/or objective—instead, they are always contingent on relations among power, language, and discourse, and, hence, the need to “explore and theorize social or cultural contexts and influences, including historically specific educational discourses, on constructions of the “selves” who have “experiences” (Miller, 2005, p. 52).

Drawing from poststructural orientations to language, I took up narrative inquiry as I incorporated “narratives” as a unit of analysis for this inquiry. Here, I understand “narratives” as sites where subjects re-present their interpreted understandings and knowledges that are socially, culturally, historically, and politically contingent. Such conceptualizations of “narratives” have allowed me to attempt to interrupt humanist representations of the unified and fully intact “self” as well as standardization of “curriculum” as preconceived content to be taught.

The Reconceptualization of “Curriculum” and Autobiography

Contemporary works of autobiography as “curriculum” theorizing can be traced back to Pinar’s notion of *currere* developed in the 1970s during, what Miller (2005),

Pinar et al. (1995), and Pinar (2004) referred to as the "reconceptualization" of the "curriculum" field. Influenced by existentialism, phenomenology, psychoanalytic, and Neo-Marxist frameworks, questions around the "curriculum" shifted from those that focused on "what knowledge is of the most worth" to questions around how individuals "experience" knowledge, learning, and the processes in which and by whom these knowledges are deemed important. Autobiography became one mode of inquiry—especially framed within existential, phenomenological, and psychoanalytic perspectives during the initial years of the reconceptualization—in which researchers explored such questions around one's own "experience," "learning," and "curriculum."

Currere is a Latin version of the term "curriculum" and can mean to "run the course" (Pinar et al., 1995). Considering the tendency to understand "curriculum" as a static object such as a lesson plan or "course of study" that can be disseminated by a teacher to her or his students in sequential stages, Pinar et al. wrote that the "curriculum" had "forgotten the existing individual" (p. 519). *Currere* as a method allowed researchers to "acknowledge, and to examine as knowledge, the interwoven relationships among one's conceptions, perceptions, and understandings of educational experience, one's contextualizations of that experience within sociopolitical worlds, and one's constructions of curriculum as both reflecting and creating those worlds" (Miller, 2005, p. 151). While recognizing traditional notions of "curricular" discourse, which are concerned with practical questions around behavioral orientations of learning, reconceptualizations of "curriculum," such as "curriculum" as autobiography, shifted the understanding of "curriculum" as development to "curriculum" as being experienced. Since early reconceptualizations of "curriculum" as autobiographical text that examined

the relationship between educational “experience” within particular sociopolitical environments and how that affects and constructs what can be considered as “curriculum,” autobiography continues to be relevant to educational research by challenging Enlightenment assumptions of a fully rational and sovereign self, for example, by feminist poststructural scholars who work to examine power in relation to discursive constitutions of the subject.

Feminist Poststructural Versions of Autobiography

Autobiographical work, more specifically, autobiographical work within feminist poststructural orientations, examines relationships among language, subjectivity, and power to interrogate ways in which cultural, sociopolitical, and historical discourses both construct and are constructed and how these affect the ways subjectivities, teaching, learning, and the “curriculum” are interpreted (Miller, 2005). Miller also outlined the ways in which Enlightenment-inflected autobiography has been incorporated over time by various feminist researchers who initially attempted to include women’s “voices” and “experiences” as legitimate forms of “curricular” knowledge. In contrast, feminist poststructural versions of autobiography attempt to question “experience” by constantly kneading, reworking categories that assume individuals as complete, unitary, and fully self-knowing (Miller, 2005, 2006; St. Pierre, 2000b; Weedon, 1987, 2004). I am persuaded by the idea that “experiences,” unlike previous definitions as mentioned within humanist versions of narrative inquiry (Chase, 2005, 2011), cannot be represented as if directly accessible and in linear, holistic, and mechanistic ways because they are temporal, situated, discursive, contextual, and interpreted. Leigh Gilmore’s work on

trauma, memory, and narratives is one example of how poststructural versions of autobiography challenge the notion of "selfhood" and the limits of representation.

Gilmore (2001) utilized "narratives" as "limit-cases" to show the dilemma of self-representation through autobiographical tales of trauma. In an example of a limit-case, Gilmore focused on how the writing subject's "narratives" coincide with the stories of the other being written, thus highlighting the "irresolvable narrative dilemma" (p. 72) as the writing subject asks, "Whose story is this? mine? ours? how can I tell them all?" (p. 72). In illuminating the relational aspects of "narratives," she attempted to complicate and reinvent the "narrative I," which is counter to traditional autobiographical work where the subject "I" is an omnipresent self who writes to know his or her self. This concept of the "narrative I" is central to my methodology for this particular "curricular" research I conducted as I incorporated poststructural perspectives in relation to autobiography to interrogate dominant discourses that the teacher participants as well as myself as "researcher" used to "draw their [our] own ever-changing portraits and trace as well as interpret multiple versions of their [our] educational experiences, perspectives, assumptions and situations" (Miller, 2005, p. 152).

In exploring autobiography as a method of inquiry, I also refer to Smith and Watson's (2010) poststructural theorizing of what they identified as the constitutive elements of autobiographical subjectivity: experience, identity, memory, space, embodiment, and agency. Drawing from Scott (1991) who argued that "experience" is "at once always already an interpretation and something that needs to be interpreted" (p. 96), Smith and Watson (2010) argued that "experience" is mediated by all of these constitutive elements and is already an interpretation of an interpretation—thus

suggesting that "experience" is never complete, is in flux, and requires the constant questioning of one's own interpreted "experiences." Smith and Watson further stated that there is no unified or coherent "I" in telling autobiographical accounts and that no "I" exists prior to autobiography. Referring to Francoise Lionnet's work, Smith and Watson (2010) wrote that "the narrated "I" is the subject of history, whereas the narrating "I" is the agent of discourse" (p. 73). Despite traditional understandings of autobiography where both the narrated "I" and the narrating "I" are one and coherent, scholars such as Gilmore (2001) and Smith and Watson (2010) suggested that the "I" are multiple, discursively constituted to a great extent, and must be interrogated at all times. This means that the boundaries of I, as a researcher, and the teacher participants, as research participants, are blurred, and it is necessary to constantly trouble humanist representations of the "self."

Confronting the Crisis of Representation

Traditional or early forms of qualitative ethnographic research were interested in presenting an objective reality of an "exotic" world. Many qualitative researchers in the field of ethnography studied the "other" with the hope of presenting such objective reality (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). Building on such traditional forms of ethnography, the modernist phase placed more attention on highlighting the "voices" and "experiences" of the "oppressed." In post-positivist-oriented forms of research, data often are understood by researchers to "speak for themselves," and it is up to the researchers to "organize what they have 'seen, heard, and read' in order to make sense of and represent what they have learned" (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012, p. xii). It was not until the mid-1980s when a moment

of crisis, generated by poststructural perspectives, hit qualitative research wherein researchers were challenged with questions of how and why they came to these particular interpretations (Marcus & Fischer, 1986). Why these particular representations? What discursive framings are functioning in particular contexts to influence these interpretations and representations?

In addition to the crisis in representation, questions arose around whether traditional modes of evaluating and interpreting data were sufficient. In recent years, many qualitative researchers have noted the complexities of interpreting and representing data (Cho & Trent, 2006; Henry, 2003; Marshall & Rossman, 2011; Miller, 2005; Richardson, 2000; Van Maanen, 2011; Villenas, 1996). Mentioned numerously throughout this chapter, poststructurally inflected assumptions move away from traditional ways of understanding "reality" to the claim that there is no one "truth," no one "master narrative" (Lyotard, 1979/1984), and no way for a researcher to ever "capture lived experience" (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p. 19) because of the slippery nature of language and the power of what Foucault called discursive regimes (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012; St. Pierre, 2000b). While I am persuaded by poststructurally inflected questions that challenge the supposed "truthful" accounts of representation, the dilemma of having to represent "something" (St. Pierre, 1997) followed me throughout as a researcher engaged in this inquiry. Speaking to the challenge presented by the crisis of representation, Lather (2007) offered this question: "in theorizing distinctions between loss and lost in working toward research practices that take into account the crisis of representation, how can writing the other not be an act of continuing colonization?" (p. 13).

As a researcher interested in complicating notions of "experience," "self," and "curriculum," I aimed to address how discourses of power played into this research as I engaged with educators in Fukushima—How did the crisis in representation affect the ways in which I deemed what would "count" as "data" as well as chose to represent as "data"? How did I understand and interpret the "data"? How did I justify my research in this turn? How did I attend to my concerns around my role as the "authoritative" researcher as I re-presented the teachers' "narratives?"

"Validity"

Influenced by particular versions of quantitative research in legitimizing knowledge (Lather, 2013), qualitative researchers who work within positivist or post-positivist assumptions have relied on methods of trustworthiness to judge the "soundness of a qualitative study" (Marshall & Rossman, 2011, p. 39). Often, researchers refer to this part of the "research design" as validity—a strategy to ensure "the correctness or credibility of a description, conclusion, explanation, interpretation, or other sort of account" (Maxwell, 2009, p. 280). To ensure such a process and reflective of the assumption that objectivity can be taught and practiced, an amplitude of qualitative research methodology texts is in publication (Lather, 2013) to discuss how researchers can minimize validity threats (Maxwell, 2009). As such, based on traditional positivist understandings of validity, researchers such as Cho and Trent (2006) have approached validity in the form of "transactional validity" that involves an "iterative process between the researcher, the researched, and the collected data that is aimed at achieving a relatively higher level of accuracy and consensus" (p. 321). In enacting these strategies, qualitative researchers may incorporate triangulation, member checks, collaboration

between the researcher and research participants, peer debriefs, and/or self-reflexive practices (Cho & Trent, 2006; Marshall & Rossman, 2011; Maxwell, 2009) to address the problems of legitimizing knowledge.

However, with the expansion of various theoretical orientations to qualitative research methodologies in the 1970s, traditional strategies of validity were called into question with the moment of blurred genres and crisis in representation (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000; Marcus & Fischer, 1986). The postmodern turn in the mid-1980s, inspired by particular groups of qualitative researchers, challenged traditional norms and approaches to legitimize truth in the form of validity, trustworthiness, reliability, and objectivity (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). Unlike traditional approaches to validity driven by the need for supposed objectivity, qualitative researchers persuaded by poststructural theory, for example, challenged what had become established as research. With the inception of crisis in representation, researchers could no longer "capture lived experience" (p. 19) as no narratives of "experiences" or "voices" are simply waiting to be "found" by research, but instead require the interpretation and representation of what is already an interpretation (Scott, 1991). Within the crisis of representation, it is no longer sufficient to simply interrogate and make apparent one's own assumptions as if we can get to the crux of who we "really" are. Lather (2007) warned that "it is not a matter of looking harder or more closely but of seeing what frames our seeing—spaces of constructed visibility and incitement to see which constitute power/knowledge" (p. 119). In taking up these challenges around the question of validity, I am reminded of Pillow's (2003) "reflexivities of discomfort" (p. 188), which I explore below.

“Uncomfortable Reflexivity”

Self-reflexivity, according to Pillow, has become standard practice for qualitative researchers (Fine & Weis, 1996; Madriz, 1998; Villenas, 1996) as a means of questioning their own assumptions, interpretations, and understandings. While many researchers do not specifically define what they mean by being self-reflexive, many continue to incorporate this aspect as a way to explore the politics of representation (Lather & Smithies, 1997) and have even incorporated self-reflexivity as a measure of validity (Pillow, 2003). Common and Enlightenment-informed strategies of self-reflexivity used in qualitative research, Pillow argued, include reflexivity as recognition of the self, reflexivity as recognition of the other, reflexivity as truth, and reflexivity as transcendence. In describing these common strategies, Pillow was also critiquing such practices that are seeped in the Enlightenment notion of the “knowable subject” who is always accessible, rational, and able to speak the truth. Pillow troubled such engagement with self-reflexivity via three research studies that interrupted the humanist version of self-reflexivity as “confessional tale,” for example. Pillow warned her readers that this is no easy task, but she urged a move away from a humanist version of self-reflexivity as “clarity, honesty, or humility” (p. 192) and toward a “move to use reflexivity in a way that would continue to challenge the representations we come to while at the same time acknowledging the political need to represent and find meaning” (p. 192).

My autobiographical curricular inquiry is not an attempt to absolve these tensions around the politics of representation. However, I hope that autobiography as a mode of inquiry will allow me to “unsettle the ‘I’ of both the researcher and researched who is a

static and singular subject" (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012, p. 10) in an attempt to open static categories such as "curriculum" and "self."

Miller's Exploration of Transnational Flows and Mobilities: Working Autobiographically

In using autobiography as a method of inquiry, I turned to Miller (2006) who worked autobiography as a means of "feminist interrogations of transnational flows and mobilities as one possible means to hold varying perspectives on these phenomena in simultaneous yet often tension-filled relation to one another" (p. 32). In this article, Miller referred to her work published in 1996 with Elizabeth Ellsworth, in which they offered their readings of Patricia Williams' *The Alchemy of Race and Rights: Diary of a Law Professor* to explore "multiple and fluid identities" and their meanings for "working difference" in educational contexts as well as for educators teaching "about" multiculturalism. Drawing from various postmodern scholars, Ellsworth and Miller offered this political, social, personal, and situational work of "working difference" to refuse identity and static conceptions of difference, which often are conceptualized as already identified and known, and to work towards a notion of these as "works-in-progress." Miller incorporated her prior work of "working difference," in her work published in 2006, to conceptualize "curriculum" as "in-the-making."

Miller (2006) consulted scholars of various disciplines such as geography, communications, linguistics, anthropology, and sociology to understand how transnational flows and mobilities of people, ideas, and commodities interact with space and how this might affect conceptualizations of "curriculum." Such flows and mobilities, viewed from particular versions of feminisms, complicate and dislocate bodies and ideas

that used to be conceived only as rooted in particular locations, geographies, or categories. In this complex theorization of "curriculum studies as a worldwide field," Miller continuously interrogated static notions of the "self" and "curriculum" towards a "field and participants always in the making" (p. 46). I, thus, "work autobiography" in ways posited by Miller in her discussions of feminist poststructural perspectives as further informing and complicating her iterations of autobiography as I interrogate and complicate the notion of "experience" through my encounters with educators in Fukushima. I am interested in "working autobiography" in self-reflexive ways as "reflexivities of discomfort," as posited by Pillow (2003), in order to explore poststructural troublings of Enlightenment conceptions of "experience" and "curriculum" as these related to my interpretations of interactions with teachers in Fukushima.

As a person of Japanese and African American descent raised in Japan and having relocated to the United States, now inquiring into the recent incidents affecting educators in Fukushima, Japan, I found Miller's mode of inquiry—working autobiography—helpful when attending to the "flows and mobilities" of ideas, bodies, cultures, and technologies that are in constant flux. What she encouraged me to do here was to acknowledge the partial, incomplete, and contested nature of categories, interpretations, and representations of these varying categories, while also remaining within the discomforts of not being able to "fully know," thus remaining open for constant re-interpretation and de-definition. By "working autobiography," Miller was "kneading categories and separations" (p. 33) to push back against Enlightenment notions of truth and the rational, unitary "self" and to move towards constant interrogations of such. Such orientations of the "self" as constantly shifting allowed me to refuse "fixed and static

categories of sameness or permanent otherness" (Ellsworth & Miller, 1996, p. 247), which are central to my inquiry that problematized "curriculum" as preconceived content to be taught. Furthermore, it challenged me to interrupt the simple retelling of teacher narratives as transparent, true, and complete.

Nodding towards my multiple subjectivities, and yet slipping in and out of humanist understandings of how my world operates, I was interested in the possibilities of working autobiography as a primary mode of self-reflexivity of discomfort to interrupt the retelling of a rational, linear, and unitary "self" as I explored and challenged the standardization of "experience" and "curriculum." In this "working," I asked myself: How do I work the tensions that arise in the data collection methods and angles of interpretations and representations that I choose? How do I attend to my underlying assumptions in how and why I interpret in ways that I do, as well as to the contradictions in representing my interpretations of data while making clear my investments in poststructural epistemological and ontological assumptions?

Data Collection

Traditional understandings of qualitative research are based on the idea that it is an iterative process and requires systematic and rigorous planning and collection of data (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Maxwell, 2009). Referring to one of the assumptions around qualitative research, Denzin and Lincoln (2000) noted that qualitative research is a situated activity that "involves the studied use and collection of a variety of empirical materials" (p. 3). To understand and highlight the methods of doing ethnography as qualitative research, Geertz (1973) made reference and elaborated on the notion of "thick

description" to explain the researchers' involvement in fieldwork as they experienced as well as interpreted the phenomena observed within the context in which cultural, social, and material meaning was constructed. However, over the years, notions of "thick description" have come to refer simply to the collection of data related to the researcher's topic of interest by being a participant-observer or observer by capturing the phenomena of interest, conducting interviews, and/or collecting artifacts such as documents and letters and to represent these findings through text. While Geertz referred to "thick description" to explain the complex historical, cultural, and social processes of interpretation involved in doing ethnography, the notion seems to have evolved to refer to the collection of "rich data" at research sites (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Cho & Trent, 2006; Maxwell, 2009), suggesting that the "ethnographer is capable of producing truth from the "experience" of being there and that the reader is receptive to the truth of the text" (Britzman, 1995, p. 229). Such interpretations of "data" suggest that the more information collected, the better account the researcher can represent for the readers because subjects "say what they mean and mean what they say" (p. 230).

Elements of "Data" Constructed

I recognize that poststructural orientations to research have complicated my understanding of methodology as they question the authenticity of "data" as transparent (Britzman, 2003). For this reason, I struggled in writing this section of methodology, which is reflective of humanist notions of "data" that can be fully accessed and retrieved with the right tools and preparation. While I interrogate further my understandings of "data" later in this chapter as well as the tensions that poststructural theories generate in

understanding "data," for the purpose of this research inquiry, I interacted with the following forms of "data:"

- in/formal interviews,
- field notes,
- autobiographical memos, and
- artifacts including course of study, informational handouts created by teachers/administrators, blog content, and photos.

Fieldwork is interpretive (Britzman, 1995, 2003; Van Maanen, 2011); thus, while observations were noted in the form of field notes, which I wrote throughout this inquiry, I did not "collect" data in the form of classroom observations because I was not seeking a correlation between what was being "said" in the interviews and what was being "done" or performed by the teachers inside the classroom.

Study Participants

While I planned to use snowball sampling (Marshall & Rossman, 2011) based on my first informal interview session, the three participants were preselected by Mr. Jo, one of the administrators whom I met early in my visits to Fukushima. Once the superintendent designated Mr. Jo as my point person of contact, I sent him an email including the purpose of the research (Appendix A) as well as the following criteria for potential participants in this study:

1. teachers who are certified and teaching full-time;
2. teachers who were teaching at least a year prior and during the events that occurred on March 11, 2011;

3. teachers who are currently teaching in evacuation at the two satellite elementary schools; and
4. teachers who are willing to be interviewed.

I also sent a follow-up email to Mr. Jo so he could forward the email including my information (Appendix B) to the potential participants. Given the small number in the teacher population at these two school sites as well as the limited amount of time I was able to be present physically during the “data” collection period, I was not selective in terms of gender or age. In this decision, I recognize how gender and age may have affected the ways in which participants shared their interpreted “experiences” with me and how I interpreted the “narratives” I created. I also was not selective in the number of years the teachers had been teaching so long as they met the criteria I set above because I was not interested in looking for correlation between years of teaching and how they understood or interacted with the “curriculum.”

Once these criteria were sent to Mr. Jo, he emailed me back with three individuals who had expressed their willingness to be interviewed as part of my research (Appendix H).

In-person In/Formal Interviews

Although I intended to have two in-depth interviews at the end of the “data” collection period, I could only secure one interview session with each of the participant, each lasting approximately 70-90 minutes. The formal interviews were conducted in the summer of 2016 at the school site and during the school vacation period in an attempt to minimize inconvenience for the teachers. While the interview questions were designed with the hope of having a follow-up interview, scheduling these two in-person interviews

became a challenge as I lived overseas. Furthermore, despite my expectation, the teachers were only able to offer me one interview session each as they had professional as well as personal obligations to attend to. For these reasons, to accommodate the series of questions that had been prepared to ask during the follow-up interview session (Appendix G), I combined the interview questions (Appendix F and Appendix G) as part of the initial interview session. Interviews were conducted with teachers who "experienced" the disaster and were teaching in two of the elementary schools (Appendix H) located in Fukushima prefecture. While recognizing the limitations of ensuring absolute anonymity (Marshall & Rossman, 2011), I attempted to address this concern by providing acronyms for the three participants and schools, as well as for all regional references (see Appendix H). I also recognize these acronyms placed on geographic locations may confuse the reader. However, it was also my intent to protect the anonymity of the participants as well as to disrupt how readers are "reading" the text.

I also anticipated informal interviews to take place during the "in-between" spaces such as walking in the hallway, correspondences made via email, moving to and from location A to location B, or during small talk that occurred in the "insignificant" spaces that may not have made it into the research findings. Many of the informal interviews were noted as part of my field memos or field notes following each encounter as these informal interviews were often not recorded. The observational notes as well as field notes I constructed were an interpretation of these moments (Britzman, 2003).

Once I collected these interview "data," I transcribed the formal interviews that took place in Japanese verbatim (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). Since all of the interviews took place in Japanese, I translated these interviews from Japanese to English; however,

for the purpose of time, I only translated phrases and paragraphs that I incorporated as part of my analysis. In this act, I am aware of the ethical issues around transcribing and translating materials and the effects of such translation on both what and how researchers interpret and represent as their research participants' responses to interview questions (Cook-Sather, 2007; Marshall & Rossman, 2011; Temple, 2008; Temple & Young, 2004; Tilley, 2003).

In naming particular aspects of my methodology and in grappling with these ethical issues, I am reminded, via poststructural perspectives, of Ellsworth (1989) who troubled the notion of dialogue. She wrote, "Social agents are not capable of being fully rational and disinterested; and they are subjects split between the conscious and unconscious and among multiple social positionings" (p. 316). In reflecting on her anti-racist course taught during a turbulent moment at her university, Ellsworth offered her interpretation as well as critique of "critical pedagogy," which she argued was based on the attainment of unproblematized notions of democracy, justice, social change, and freedom. Ellsworth argued that based on the goals of critical pedagogy, engagement among teachers and students often occurs in classroom settings in the form of "dialogue" that attempts to prioritize student "voice." Through reflections of her anti-racist course, Ellsworth, however, was confronted with the impossibility of engaging in "dialogue," especially in classroom settings that are void of historical and political commitments that assume all participants are fully conscious subjects with equal opportunities to express themselves through language. Ellsworth's troubling of "voice" speaks against humanist orientations to "voice" and "dialogue" that assume rational subjects who are able to tell a complete recollection of their experiences but, on the contrary, are subjects incomplete

who will "ever fully know their own experiences" (p. 319). Such understandings of the subject and "voice" further challenged me to trouble how I engage in "dialogue" as formal and informal interviews.

While Ellsworth's work around "voice" and "empowerment" centered around the myths of critical pedagogy, Scheurich (1997) troubled and complicated positivist and post-positivist versions of interview. In reference to incorporating interview as a research method, Scheurich wrote, "The language out of which the questions are constructed is not bounded or stable; it is persistently slippery, unstable, and ambiguous from person to person, from situation to situation, from time to time" (p. 62). While not suggesting to do away with interviewing as a method of collecting data, the author was committed to postmodernist assumptions of methodology and pointed to "the complex play of conscious and unconscious thoughts, feelings, fears [that] cannot be captured and categorized" (p. 73). Like Britzman (1995), who questioned the humanist belief that an ethnographer can represent an account of "experiences" through fieldwork, Scheurich (1997) described the nuanced and shifting processes of interviewing to recognize that "there is no stable 'reality' or 'meaning' that can be represented" (p. 73). In this work, he also outlined the shifting and asymmetrical power relations between the interviewee and interviewer to problematize modernist understandings of "empowerment" and "voice." Like Ellsworth (1989), Scheurich (1997) took on a postmodernist perspective on "voice" and language to problematize the modernist assumptions that subjects are capable of telling a complete account of their "experience."

Fully aware of the complexities and assumptions underlying humanist representations of "voice," "experience," and "self" (Britzman, 2003; Miller, 2005;

St. Pierre, 2000b; Weedon, 1987), I incorporated interview as one method of “data” collection. In this decision, poststructural orientations to narrative inquiry helped me to constantly interrupt and trouble what I considered as “data” and how I chose to represent these “narratives” as “data” (Britzman, 2003; Miller, 2005; St. Pierre, 1997).

Grappling With “Data”

As I stay invested in poststructural assumptions around the “subject” and language, I am, once again, stuck in the “middle of things, in the tension of conflict and confusion and possibility” (St. Pierre, 1997, p. 176). In asking some of the questions that arose such as how I planned to account for nuances that may have gotten lost during the interviews and transcription of “data,” I recognize the assumptions I brought to this dissertation of a fully rational researcher who can “capture” and fully understand a reality through extensive fieldwork. How then did I justify how I “staged” and conducted my interviews? How did I work through the tensions that arose as I took field notes as if to “capture” a reality I “experienced” in the field? How did I articulate my understanding or interpretations of the translated conversations while attending to how I interpreted and translated the “experiences” shared or not shared with me as a researcher? How did I interrupt modernist assumptions around language and “voice”? Such questions brushed up against the very confidence incurred in doing traditional qualitative research that ensures the portrayal of “truth” through the collection of thorough “data.” As Britzman (1995, 2003) reminded her readers, most ethnographic studies are based on the assumption that a reality is waiting to be captured by an objective and rational researcher and that this “reality” or “truth” can be represented through language. However, I brought

up in previous sections how poststructuralist orientations to language and "experience" interrupt this notion of complete, rational, and fully conscious subjects "who say what they mean and mean what they say" (Britzman, 1995, p. 230). Given I am persuaded by particular feminist qualitative research methods that understand objectivity to be about "limited location and situated knowledge" (Haraway, 1988, p. 583), I am aware that the "data" I collected in the form of interviews, field notes, artifacts, and autobiographical memos, for example, are "always constructed and stitched together imperfectly" (p. 586).

In thinking about "data," I recognize the tensions I continuously grapple with as I acknowledge the crisis of representation, poststructural theories, and how these affect my understanding of methodology and the objectivity of such "data." In grappling with the signifier data, I think of St. Pierre (1997) who troubled traditional understandings of "data" that supposedly produce knowledge. Starting from poststructural assumptions that meaning is not fixed and knowledge is contingent, St. Pierre asked the question, "If we wish to engage in this risky poststructural practice of redescribing the world, where do we begin?" (p. 177). She began by questioning assumptions around the translation of "data" into language in the form of a transcript. St. Pierre troubled the notion of "data" here by pointing to the excessive nature of "data"—how does one represent "data" that exceed our own understandings as researchers? St. Pierre referred to such data as "data that were uncodable, excessive, out-of-control, out-of-category" (p. 179) that evolved into non-traditional forms of "data," which she called sensual, dream, emotional, and response data.

I recognize the slippery, partial, and incomplete nature of language as well as the impossibility of capturing "reality." Yet, I also understand that the nature of this inquiry

required me to collect information that can be categorized as "data." In this way, I constantly grappled with how I re-created the "narratives" shared with me as "data" as well as the other forms of "data" I generated in the form of field notes, artifacts, and autobiographical memos. Within this uncomfortable place of uncertainty, it is the notion of "situated knowledges" that allowed me to complicate traditional notions of the "curriculum" in relation to my researcher positionings as well as the interpreted "experiences" shared by the teachers. In the sections to follow, I further elaborate on how I engaged with this confusion and complexity of the supposed data that I "collected" and chose to represent.

Data (Engagement) (Analysis)

Traditional qualitative research method guidelines had me convinced that good research design should and could be conducted in a "systematic manner" (Marshall & Rossman, 2011, p. 205) to produce "valid" research. Any good research would be presented in an orderly and structured manner (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012; Lather, 2013). In creating such a text, researchers tend to analyze "data" in the form of analytic induction, comparative analysis, coding, writing memos, and/or clustering themes (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Charmaz, 2006; Marshall & Rossman, 2011; Swadener, 2005). As such, Marshall and Rossman (2011) wrote that all decisions about how to represent our "data" should be based on "sound reasoning, and a clear rationale" (p. 222). However, scholars such as Jackson and Mazzei (2012), Lather (2007, 2013), Mazzei (2013), St. Pierre (2013), and Wolf (1996) have troubled such foundational practices in qualitative research methodology. For instance, Lather (2013) and St. Pierre (2013) continued to critique and trouble humanist qualitative research methodologies through

theoretical orientations to postmodernism, which have evolved to what they referred to as post-qualitative. Lather (2013) situated qualitative research historically as she described the challenges of reconciling postmodern theories around voice, reflexivity, subject, and "experience," to name a few, with humanist qualitative research. Weary of their attempts to rethink qualitative research methodologies, Lather and St. Pierre (2013) turned to questions of ontology as a way to produce knowledge and how it can be produced differently. While this research analysis to follow was not situated within the post-qualitative per se, concerns around troubling of "the human subject," "experience," and "data" were of concern for this inquiry.

With poststructural assumptions driving my perspectives on the "subject" and "experience," I now found it difficult to engage in traditional forms of "data" analysis, which tended to involve a coding of "data" based on a particular theoretical framework that aimed to "make meaning" out of "data." Such interpretations of "data" reinforce the binary between the researcher and the researched, a linear and stable subject who perceives and "experiences" an object that becomes the point of research, and that somehow the "experiences" had by the research subject are authentic and a "reality" or "truth" to be captured by the researcher (Britzman, 2003). I have, thus far, referred to numerous scholars who have troubled such understandings of "data" and representation (Britzman, 1995, 2003; Ellsworth, 1989; Lather, 2013; Miller, 2005; Pillow, 2003; Scheurich, 1997; St. Pierre, 1987). Fully persuaded by the crisis in representation and poststructural assumptions around the "subject," I recognized there are no blueprints in doing qualitative research. However, I was interested in hearing how teachers talked about their interpreted "experiences" in relation to the March 11 earthquake and

"curriculum." My challenge was to question any of my attempts to re-inscribe a linear and static "narrative" of the teachers' interpreted "experiences" as well as my own interpretations of the interactions with the teachers. To engage in such reiterative work, I was inspired by Britzman's (1995, 2003) ethnographic narrative as well as Richardson's (2000) writing as method of inquiry.

I initially represented "narratives" in the form of transcripts, field notes, and autobiographical memos. I then revisited and rearranged these "narratives" according to "themes" as a way to help me better understand the ideas being shared in the interviews, for example. In this transcription, I identified what I perceived as recurring topics or themes (Riessman, 2008) that allowed me to further interrogate these assumptions represented in the writing. In creating these themes, I rearranged the interview transcription according to the recurring topics or themes. After transcribing the initial interview "data," I emailed the "data" to the teacher participants and asked if they would like to add additional notes or further explore a topic for a follow-up interview over the phone. However, none of the participants responded to this offer. I considered various versions of interview "data" as those that could be "analyzed." In reviewing and rewriting these "narratives," I hoped to interrupt my own interpretations of the interpreted "experiences" as well as interrupt humanist assumptions around "voice" as unitary and complete.

The interview "data" were also read in relation to and against the field notes and autobiographical memos through the process of rewriting or working autobiographically. The interlude section also served as a space in which I re-engaged with "data" working through my own assumptions around "home," "belonging," and "self." This was

attempted with the intent that this layering of "data" will highlight the culturally, socially, and historically contingent discourses that constructed my study of teachers' interpreted "experiences" as well as my researcher subjectivities (Miller, 2005; Richardson, 2000). It was in the processes of rewriting and re-engaging with new versions of such "data" that I hoped would allow me to "work difference" and interrupt conventional representations of the "self" as linear, unitary, and complete.

Limitations of the Study

Unlike traditional notions of engaging in positivist research, poststructural theories challenge any claims that a researcher can "capture lived experience" (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p. 19). I realize that my researcher assumptions are drenched in the humanist idea that "seeing is believing" (Britzman, 1995 p. 231) and, hence, I thought that I had to go to Fukushima to best conduct my research. On the topic of engaging in ethnographic inquiry, Britzman spoke of the impossibility of representing a holistic reality in doing ethnography. She argued that for the poststructuralist ethnographer, "'being there' does not guarantee access to truth" (p. 232). She further wrote, "these positions undermine the ethnographic belief that 'reality' is somehow out there waiting to be captured by language" (p. 232). Despite these claims made by Britzman around ethnography as only being able to tell partial and fictitious accounts, I still chose to collect much of my "data" in Fukushima. Just as Britzman's intent was not to represent the "lived experiences" or "narratives" of student teachers she had positioned as "participants" in her ethnographic study discussed in her book *Practice Makes Perfect*, as complete and intact but to trace the constitution of the "subject," my intent in "being

there" was not to capture the "experiences" had as absolute truth and complete. Neither was it my intent to question or doubt the teachers' interpreted "experiences" but rather to represent a situated "narrative" of my interpreted "experiences" in relation to the teachers participating in this study as a way of *working autobiography*. Hence, unlike conventional qualitative data collection that assumes "truth" to be captured and represented by the researcher, my poststructural orientations to narratives are reiterative, situational, and open to multiple meanings. Hence, this partial telling can be interpreted as a limitation from humanist orientations to qualitative research.

I also did not intend to triangulate my "data" based on traditional modes to confirm my study's validity, trustworthiness, and credibility. My autobiographically informed inquiry—especially in relation to self-reflexive processes of discomfort—was not an attempt in reflecting accurate accounts (Chase, 2011) or "'getting it right'—only getting it differently contoured and nuanced" (Richardson, 2000, p. 931). For this reason, some readers may claim that I am writing fiction not based on objective truths or facts or that this is not robust research. I am not "claiming to write science" (p. 926) nor claiming that either is higher on a hierarchy of knowledge production. I am only trying to represent my partial working "to know 'something' without claiming to know everything" (p. 928).

This brings up the last point around engaging in qualitative research that is predicated on the partiality of my interpretations. While I attempted to attend to the complexities of interpreting and representing the interpreted "experiences" of the teachers, I constantly grappled with the tensions of translating my interpretations of "experience"—both theirs and mine—into text. If poststructural assumptions complicate the notion of the "I" and "data," how can I as a researcher represent any "data"? How do

I give an account of myself and those I come in contact with while acknowledging the dangers of representation? Recognizing that "narratives" are shared in language and that "language is a constitutive force, creating a particular view of reality and of the Self" (Richardson, 2000, p. 925), I attempted to engage in "uncomfortable reflexivity." In engaging in "uncomfortable reflexivity" and autobiography, I recognize how reflexive work can be interpreted as being supposedly "narcissistic," "soft," and "individualistic" (Miller, 2005; Patai, 1994) because the focus tends to be placed on the researcher. However, the decision to engage in such self-reflexive practices is not to, again, identify an essentialized version of the self as researcher, but to engage in a reflexivity "not as clarity, honesty, humility, but as practices of confounding disruptions—at times even a failure of our language and practices" (Pillow, 2003, p. 192). The partiality of my own representations of the teacher participants as well as my own subjectivity are always incomplete and *in-the-making*.

INTERLUDE—TELLING A STORY ABOUT "I"

It is the idea of theorizing "experience" and interpretations of "experiences" that allows me to engage with autobiography as one curriculum discourse in order "[to] call into question both the notion of one 'true,' stable and coherent self and cultural scripts for that self" (Miller, 2005, p. xi). I am persuaded by such understandings of the subject because I constantly feel the limitations of borders as it relates to "self" and "home."

I identify as a person of Japanese and African American descent. I speak both English and Japanese fluently and feel culturally equipped in both spaces. Yet, I often find myself negotiating my subjectivities as I perform particular roles, depending on the environment and relations I encounter as I travel between geographical, political, cultural, and gendered boundaries. For instance, in certain encounters, I perform Patricia, while in different contexts, I perform Mito—which can never fully conform to the racial, ethnic, and cultural boundaries of being Japanese or African American. In these performances, some are confused to hear me speak Japanese fluently. Did I study Japanese in school? Was I an American simply interested in Japanese culture? Wait, you are Black? But you know nothing about growing up in Black America. Oh, you understand that joke? It usually requires a few conversations for some to understand my ethnic and cultural associations.

As a middle-class, heterosexual, multiethnic, Buddhist raised in a single-parent household in Japan, are categories I seem to recognize at this point in time as I write point me towards a sense of place—place that often is linked to ways in which I speak of

my multiple "selves." In doing so, I recognize the tensions in claiming this link between my constructions of "self" and place as it suggests an authentic, stable, and unified notion of the subject. My desire is to claim a geographic place I can call "home," even though this supposed "link" betrays me in conversations reminding me that I do not "belong" here or there. Then how do I interrupt my urge to claim these named "selves" in relation to "home" or 故郷 (furusato)—a place I supposedly hold dear to my heart through my imagined or actual constructions that have been mediated by gendered, cultural, political, social, economic, or racial orientations? How then does autobiography as a poststructurally inflected method of inquiry allow educational researchers like myself to interpret "experience" and senses of "self," knowing the poststructural versions of "the subject" imply any identity category as "permanently open, sometimes unknowable and therefore undesignatable fields of differences" (Miller, 2005, p. 55)?

IV—MY TELLINGS OF HIRO

After the first afternoon of meeting and offering what seemed more like a formal interview than the "conversation" (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009) that I had hoped to engage in, I sit up on my single-size bed at the hotel my mother and I had reserved for a few days in Fukushima to write my field notes. I face my laptop as I see my mother to my left doze off. While I attempt to write my field notes, I am thinking with Miller (2005) and Britzman (1995) who both interrupted my naïve understandings of capturing "teacher stories" as complete and coherent tellings of "experiences" that could be discovered and/or entrapped and represented by the researcher in the form of unmediated narrative inquiry. In this interruption, I am challenged to interrogate my own "self" as well as my researcher "self" autobiographically in layered and unfamiliar ways.

For instance, I noted to myself how I started off my conversation with Hiro by asking her to share her own personal as well as educational background and how she arrived to the field of education. I watched Hiro's eyes move away from me to their distant past and I listened to the ways in which she narrated her interpretation of the past in this particular moment. While I aimed to remain in the present in order to stay committed to this conversation, as Hiro began sharing her interpreted memories of her past, I, too, wandered in my own way, stumbling upon words to keep our conversation "on track." I am inclined to ask myself why I felt the need to lead this conversation in a way I felt that the interview remained "on track."

In this wondering I am, once again, reminded of Scott (1991) who wrote, "when experience is taken as the origin of knowledge, the vision of the individual subject (the

person who had the experience or the historian who recounts it) becomes the bedrock of evidence on which explanation is built" (p. 82). Such assumptions around "experience" have also been encouraged through textbooks on methods and "data" analysis that convey "data" as sites of truth and evidence—thus requiring extensive fieldwork as observation, interviews, and field notes that yield sufficient "data" to be interpreted and represented (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Marshall & Rossman, 2011). I realize that while my conceptual orientations allowed me to engage with how we spoke of our "experiences" in relation to a particular event—looking at spaces in which language slips and contradicts our sense of "self"—my habitual inclination to understand and represent every comment shared with me as the "truth" rubbed against one another. In the limited amount of time I had with Hiro, I felt inclined to ask as many questions as I could so that, essentially, I would have more "data"—assuming that more "data" would give me a better lens of analysis towards understanding curriculum.

As a former English language teacher who heavily interacted with a "curriculum" in terms of teaching content, I wondered how teachers' experiences could impact discussions around "curriculum" development that I, as a novice teacher, felt excluded from. How was "curriculum" being created elsewhere? What was the content that students needed for their future if not for the purpose of passing exams? What was the teacher's role in relation to the "curriculum" in preparing students for the future? Who made the decision of what to incorporate in the "curriculum?" What role did or could teachers have in this development process? How would teachers' experiences influence "curriculum?" And how could I engage with these questions differently if I were to conceive of "curriculum" as "experience"?

With these questions in mind, I was introduced to Anzaldúa (1987), Delgado-Bernal (1998), and Ladson-Billings (1995, 1997, 2001), whose work I felt had validated my own personal and educator "experiences" as a person of biracial, bicultural, and bilingual heritage. And I read these authors alongside Kliebard (2004) who took me on a journey into a particular understanding of the American "curriculum." These authors inspired me with the possibilities of understanding the complexities of identity in relation to my everyday realities as a former language teacher, current doctoral student, woman, daughter, and…the list went on. It was amid such wonderings that I encountered the reconceptualization of "curriculum" through Pinar et al. (1995). "Curriculum" had been and could be understood in various ways—"curriculum" as political, phenomenological, racial, gendered, poststructural, international, and autobiographical texts, to name a few. As I explored what Pinar et al. referred to as traditional understandings of "curriculum" and how it continues to be reconceptualized since the 1970s, I veered towards "curriculum" as autobiographical text.

In *Sounds of Silence Breaking: Women, Autobiography, Curriculum*, a collection of writings highlighting the complex work of autobiography and "curriculum," Miller (2005) re-engaged with her previously published works to re-interrogate and continue her "curriculum" theorizing around "gender," "autobiography," "research," and "curriculum," which has been deeply influenced by the reconceptualization of "curriculum." This idea that "curriculum" could be theorized and understood as more than linear development, design, or content to be taught exhilarated my academic interests. Miller further emphasized the need to conceptualize "curriculum," "identity," and "self" as *always-in-the-making* in order to challenge social, cultural, political, and

historical discourses that standardize and normalize the very daily acts of teaching as well as researching "selves." This idea of "always-in-the-making" not only *disrupted* my understandings of "curriculum" as predetermined content to be taught, but also of how I attempted to conceive of "identities" and "teacher stories" as following a linear progression towards growth and a coherent sense of self. With such understandings, what kind of work was required of me to remain engaged in this "difficult work" to de-familiarize every common-sense assumption I arrive at towards disrupting normalcies and standardization?

In this chapter, I interpreted the "data" I constructed from my encounters with Hiro, teacher and administrator from School T, to explore how she spoke of her teacher "selves" in relation to the Great East Japan Earthquake and how it continued to impact her as well as my own understanding around "self" and "curriculum."

Casual Conversations With Hiro

I was first introduced to Hiro during my last visit to the school preceding this interview. During the first encounter, we found out through our casual conversation in the corridor that Hiro's brother resides within the same prefecture that I often claim as my "home." Additionally, our conversation jumped right into our personal stories as if to minimize the distance between my role as a researcher and Hiro as a teacher and administrator working in School T. Hiro was the first "female" individual whom I was introduced to thus far in my visits to the schools and appeared younger in age compared to her male counterparts. My interactions with Hiro, I imagined, were different from my interactions with the other teacher and administrator participants whom I, in contrast, had

identified as "male." For instance, with Hiro, my choice of words and phrases was animated and informal compared to my interactions with the "male" administrators I had met thus far, assuming as if there are differences in speech patterns—perhaps a reflection of my own constitutions of gendered subjectivity based on discourses of patriarchy. Perhaps, also, I interpreted this "informal" interaction with Hiro differently from other encounters with the administrators because I chose to take off my conventional "researcher" hat, which I felt was needed when negotiating "access" to the school, to seek connection with Hiro.

Even after such a memorable initial interaction with Hiro, after a year when meeting her again for the interview session, I make note of the discomfort I felt as if I were starting the whole process of "getting to know each other" once again—especially considering that I was now placing the two of us in somewhat of a staged environment, where we sat facing one another with the iPad establishing, as well as recording, our distance—a distance that indicated that while I perceived Hiro as a colleague in our initial encounter, my understanding of our role somehow shifted where I perceived her as a "research participant" whom I, as a researcher, was supposedly going to represent by sharing her unmediated "experience" in response to my interview questions.

Because of my poststrucutral investments around discursive constitutions of knowledge, "experience," and "voice," I do not explicitly incorporate Black Feminist epistemologies or Latina/Chicana epistemologies as part of my methodology; however, in this moment of discomfort, I am reminded of Anzaldúa (1987), Villenas (1996), and Delgado-Bernal (1998) whose understandings around knowledge, "voice," "experience," and research are influenced by a particular ethos based on their historical, racial,

linguistic, and cultural "experiences." These authors made reference to and complicated their multiple and ever-changing selves as woman of color, researcher, mother, daughter, sister, and so on, to push against dominant discourses of privilege, research, and power that undermine the intersections of race, gender, class, and ethnicity. Taking inspiration from these authors, I prepared myself to do research as a "woman" of "Japanese" and "African American" descent in a particular region of Japan by being "aware" of my "privileged doctoral researcher" selves from a university I considered as "prestigious"—all of which gestured toward my complicity in humanist-based understandings of the rational subject who already knows who and what they know.

In this moment as I sat in front of Hiro, I took on subjectivity as a "researcher" by reproducing such discourses based on traditional qualitative research. But also reproducing patriarchal structures based on age and gender, I was constituted as a graduate student younger in age and professional "experience" in relation to Hiro as a seasoned administrator with whom I was requesting to hear her "experience." My perceived understandings as a "researcher" was complicated as they intersected with gendered, cultured, and aged subjectivities that I tried to reconcile because of my tendency to find relief in the guarantee of certainty based on conventional humanist understandings of the "self." However, feminist poststructural perspectives constantly remind me to interrupt every desire to want to represent a unified, rational, and coherent "self" (Miller, 2005; Richardson, 2000; St. Pierre, 2000b)—for meaning is not reflected in language but constructed through language and thus the possibility for constant engagements and redefinition.

I continue to grapple with these complexities and dilemmas as I write through my engagements with my slippery constructions of assumed "realities" and my as well as Hiro's conceptualizations of "curriculum" and "experience."

Earlier Influences to Hiro's Educator "Experiences"

As Hiro began retrieving recollections of her past, especially in relation to how she remembered the earlier years of her personal life, I remember being pulled into the ways in which Hiro described her surrounding environment growing up. For instance, as Hiro shared about her memories growing up in City G, she said:

> Hiro: あ、あのね、B 市は海がないんです。だけど、私は海が大好き。それはやっぱり、近くに S 島があったし、海の近くだったので、G 市で育ったので、だからかなって思うんですね。B 市の人にしては珍しく、珍しくなんて言うと、あれだけど、海とか好きですね…うん。だから、福島ってすごく B 市と今回地震の影響があった地域と、うーんとなんか気候が違うんですね。でもそういう事への、なんだろ、あんまり抵抗とかもない。海とか。海の近くの気候とかも大好きです。
>
> Hiro: So, City B is not close to the beach, but I like the beach. I think that is because I lived close to Island S and the ocean, which was close to where I grew up in City G. Unlike other people who are from City B, well I shouldn't say unlike, but, I like the beach. There's great variety in climate in Fukushima. For example, between Pathway where there was great impact due to the earthquake and City B, the climate varies greatly. But, I…umm…I do not have any resistance against such diversities in climate. I like the climate around the beach.

Hiro was born in a coastal city in a prefecture south of Fukushima and spent her early childhood days in this region until she started elementary school. Even though I assumed Hiro may not have much recollection growing up in this region, she told me that the basis of how she understood the world could be attributed to spending her earlier years in this region. Hiro and I wandered off in our conversation as we dwelled in this idea around unique regional characteristics as I chimed in the differences in characteristics I have noticed between Japan and the United States—my way of, once again, attempting to

make less my perceived distance between Hiro and my researcher self. Fully aware of the dangers of stereotyping, Hiro continued:

> Hiro: すごく風土って人柄とかに影響するでしょう。あ、するって言われる事も多いと思うんだけど。福島は、やっぱり、こう、三つの地域で、なんだろう、ちょっと気性みたいなものが違うって言う人が多いんです。
>
> Hiro: You know how the environment of a region influences the characteristics of its people? I mean, often times it is said that it has an influence. There are those who say the temperament differ within the three regions of Fukushima such as amongst City B, Innerway, and Pathway.

Hiro's personal connection to the beach, she suggested, hinted towards a characteristic of not "being from City B," considering City B is not a coastal city. While Hiro initially identified herself as being born and raised in City B, she later shared that her "base" can be traced to the prefecture further south of Fukushima, from where she traced the reasons for her "difference" originating. For example, she remembered that as an elementary school student, her Japanese intonation differed from her classmates who were born and raised in City B, thus highlighting her "difference" from her classmates. She also felt "different" in her demeanor. During her gym class as a new student—having learned ballet previously, as a first grader, she felt out of place as her ballet-influenced body movements did not match other students' expectations during gym class. She shared this episode as an example of her earlier "experiences" of having moved to City B and her perceived linguistic and cultural differences from her classmates.

Hiro linked her understandings of her sense of "self" to the meanings she constructed in speaking of place. She spoke of her "base" characteristics "originating" from a particular region. However, because of these very orientations to place, we later spoke of her shifting relations to City B in ways that she had been impacted by the Great East Japan Earthquake, which I pick up later in this chapter.

Making a Difference as a Teacher

I asked Hiro to tell me how she came to the field of education as a teacher. She responded by telling me that she became interested in teaching children after her parents, who were also teachers. As if I could obtain other "origins" to her teaching, I probed her further to recall any influences other than her parents that may have ignited her interest to become a teacher and she responded, 「うん、あー、うん、そうですね、思い出もないわけではないけど。どちらかというと、親の影響の方が多いかもしれないかな」"Uh…yes. It's not that I do not have any memories of other influential individuals. It's just that my parents had the most influence." Hiro referred to her parents, who were both educators with different approaches to teaching, as the most influential figures in pursuing her decision to become a teacher. Observing her parents' distinctive approaches to teaching, Hiro became interested in pursuing a career that allowed her to maximize her personal characteristics. She told me later that she believed teaching had a space that allowed individuality to manifest itself and that allowed her to ask the questions: *How would I approach teaching? What would I do?* While my interpretations of Hiro's "narratives" suggest as if I am able to identify the sole influence—an essentialized origin—to her desire to want to teach, Hiro helps me to pay attention to the various influences in her life as she reconstructs them in our conversation.

I refocused on Hiro who told me she chose to major in education. I am curious to know more about her process in choosing education as her college degree program.

> Hiro: うーん。えっと、なんか、小学校はやっぱり、6年間あるから。6年間のその人の成長の中の6年間って興味があったんですね。どんな風に発達してくんだろうとか。うん。後、きっとなんか、小学校だから、うーん、なんか、なんだろ、その人が成長していく中で土台じゃないけど、うーん、なんだろな、しつけに近い様な部分もあるのかもしれないし。なんか、そういう影響がちょっとでも、その、子供

達にとっての環境の一部になれる事は素敵な事かなって思って小学校と思ったのが一つと。高校はねやっぱりその、人生とか、日本の場合は大学進学があるから。直結する部分じゃないかと。だから、ここも面白そうだなって思って。中学校はあまり思わなかった。思いませんでした。はい。

Hiro: Well, I chose elementary school education because I was interested in being a part of the initial six years of an individual's development during their elementary schooling. You know because it is elementary school we are able to be a part of establishing the foundations of a student's growth…it could be called discipline, I guess. I thought that being a part of such an important environment of a child's initial years of schooling would be a wonderful thing as an elementary school teacher. I was also interested in high school education because of that same aspect of being an influential figure for building their foundation for life but also because I thought I would be a direct influence on how the students advance in life such as with the college entrance process. I was not interested in becoming a junior high school teacher.

Here, Hiro emphasized the importance of being an influential figure in a child's life and this was how she narrowed down her interest to teaching at the elementary and high school level. It is this idea that a teacher can make a difference in a child's life through academic as well as emotional support that solidified Hiro's decision to pursue a career as a teacher. Here, I am thinking of teaching discourses that assume students learn in linear progression and that the teacher's role is to support student learning and development over the years (Tyler, 1949).

In this conversation, Hiro also elaborated on her thought process of why she focused on education as her major. Just like she was interested in supporting the emotional and academic development of children during the first 6 years of their elementary schooling, she chose a concentration within her degree that allowed her to know how "curriculum" as content and structure is developed to further understand how subject content is developed throughout the various grade levels.

I prompted Hiro further to hear her speak about her educational "experience" in how they may have influenced her understandings of teaching. Hiro shared about her

practicum as preservice during her undergraduate degree. Similar to student teaching "experiences" in the United States, student teachers are assigned to a school for a designated amount of time—3 weeks for Hiro—depending on the particular requirements during this field experience. During this practicum "experience," Hiro recalled getting insight into teaching in general. Hiro talked about meeting her teacher mentor who was influential in the ways in which she learned to approach and interact with the students. When I asked what Hiro specifically remembered from this practicum "experience," our conversation evolved from speaking of the practicum "experience" to how we understood our origins of teaching:

> Hiro: そうですね。うん、元々だから、なんだろう、教育実習の時があのスタートもあるのかもしれないね。うん、その、教育実習でお世話になった先生もきっとなんかそういう子供達に気を使う人だったと思うから。うん、なんか、それが原点になってるかもしれない…しれないですね…進行形。今もあんまり出来てない事もいっぱいある。うん。けど、それは今も、でも、心がけていて。うん、なんか、元気じゃない子供には、子供、元気じゃないだろうなーって気がついた時は、必ず、とにかく、そのままにはしない様にしようと今も思ってはいます。

> Hiro: Let me think. Maybe it is the start of my practicum. I think my mentor teacher during my practicum was a very thoughtful person who was attentive with the kids. Yeah, I think this may have been my origins of teaching…it is still in progression. There are a lot of times when I think I still cannot do it to the best of my abilities. But, I am still trying to be the person who can take notice of children's subtle needs. For example, if there is a child who seems to be down and I take notice of this, I remind myself to not leave such a child alone.

In my representations of Hiro's interpreted "narratives" describing the influences on her decisions in teaching professionally, I realize my questions to Hiro may have provoked a particular understanding of "origins" to teaching that reflects authentic and coherent points of influences. However, in these above constructions of Hiro's "narratives," I also see tensions between her interpreted teacher "self" as static, situated solely in her past identification, and her desire to continue becoming a teacher. One of the

ways in which she imagined this perceived becoming was to be able to respond to her current students' academic and emotional needs as they remained in City B. Hiro was committed to this possibility of never reaching a point of mastery per se, but in constantly engaging with her own possibilities in becoming a teacher in relation to her students so as to be able to respond to the complex, shifting, and changing needs of her current students. In her perceived image of this becoming, she also associated herself as a lifelong learner and pursued further degree in counseling. She pursued a counseling degree as she saw this body of knowledge to help her respond to the expected as well as unexpected needs of her current students and their families.

In speaking of her practicum "experience," which influenced how she spoke about her ideas of supporting her students, I asked her to help me understand what she meant to "not leave such a child alone." She explained that for her it meant to constantly engage with her own reading of a child's physical and emotional expressions and to ask the students how they are doing, simply greeting them every day, or to keep an eye on them from afar even if there are no direct verbal exchanges made between Hiro and a particular student. This idea to "not leave any child alone" was crucial to how Hiro spoke of her role at School T where she taught at the time of the interview and how she began to articulate her understandings around "curriculum" as content as well as emphasizing the needs of the child first and foremost.

Listening to Hiro's thoughts on impacting a child's life as a teacher, I am reminded of Ladson-Billings (2001) who detailed the "experiences" of novice teachers in a new teacher education program to question the assumptions inherent in already existing teacher education programs to prepare teachers to teach in diverse classroom settings. At

the time of the writing, Ladson-Billings argued that schools are tasked with new responsibilities such as addressing health, psychological, and welfare issues that may disrupt or interfere with a child's school learning environment. She further argued that while schools continue to address such issues, "teachers cannot forget their primary mission—helping students learn" (p. 56). This underlying tenet of academic achievement is what runs throughout the new teacher education program "curriculum," on which Ladson-Billings based her study, that promotes teacher development and competency to teach in diverse classroom contexts. Such conceptualizations of the teacher's mission are produced within discourses that are, in turn, normalized and internalized by individual teachers.

Like the tenets set forth in the teacher education program designed by Ladson-Billings, Hiro referred to the importance of clearly communicating academic content to the students through language. Because language is important in conveying objectives needed to be learned by the students, as a teacher, Hiro shared how she would often reflect on her own lesson plans before and after a class by striving to meet what she referred to as "conventional" ways in which a lesson can be designed to support student learning. Hiro also believed the importance of offering opportunities for teachers to develop the necessary skills of teaching so they can offer a learning environment where students' learning and personal needs could be addressed. This belief stemmed from Hiro's understanding that while content knowledge as well as pedagogical knowledge were needed to teach, she believed that teachers, more than ever, needed skills, such as counseling, which is a skill that may be needed by teachers who are currently teaching at

School T in order to support the well-being—beyond supporting the academic development—of students as well as their families.

To this extent, Hiro talked about her own struggles in her initial years of teaching:

> Hiro: よく、教員の資質とか言われるんですけど。資質とか言うとね、なんか、生まれ持ったものみたいな感じになっちゃうから。そこにやっぱり身につけていく。うん、で、子供もそうなんだけど、先生方も力をつけてもらう見たいなのも学校の役割なんじゃないかって思うんですね。自分がダメダメで泣いてばっかりいて、いろいろ教えてもらいながら、そういう風になれたから。なれたからっていうか、若干ね。これが資質とかだけだったら、ちょっと、私なんか全然資質もない、なかったし。恥ずかしがり屋さんで。ぜんぜん親ともしゃべれない、泣いてたわけだから。だけど、その学校の中でね、うん、よく研修なんて言葉に使うんですけど、そういうのも、そういうのを、こう、入れていくのも、やっぱ、教育計画だと思うし。

> Hiro: I've heard people talk about teachers with a natural gift for teaching as if they are born with these skills. I think this is where the school has an important role to offer teachers, and of course, children as well, the opportunity to accumulate skills. I was always crying as a newly appointed teacher thinking I could not do anything and was supported by so many. If teachers had to be born with these supposed skills, I would never have been able to become who I am now because I was shy, always crying, and hardly able to converse with the student's parents. So when I think of professional development, I also think of how we can incorporate such opportunities as part of the curriculum.

Here, not only did Hiro refer to her past teacher "self" but to her multiple subjectivities as teacher, administrator, and curriculum developer to problematize this idea of an "innate skill." During her earlier years of teaching, Hiro struggled with this idea that teachers symbolize, to some extent, perfection or a mastery of some sort, which has also been questioned by researchers (Lortie, 1975; Taubman, 2009) as she struggled to enact these skills she felt was expected of her. While struggling with these enactments, she attributed her own teacher "growth" to the support provided by fellow colleagues, mentor teachers, and in-service professional development programs.

Conventional notions of "curriculum" have primarily, and for a long while now, been conceptualized as content to be predetermined, developed, and taught in a linear

manner with little or almost no space for teachers to respond to the immediate students' needs. In my constructions of Hiro, I represented her "narratives" of how she juggled the realities of teaching and living up to the competing expectations of teaching that she had internalized as her own in interacting with various students, teachers, and administrators. In attempting to understand these school discourses around teaching and "curriculum" that contributed to the way Hiro spoke of her teaching "experience" and relationship to her school, I feel the need to refer to my initial encounters with teachers and administrators at School T and Q who have also contributed to the production of such school discourses of learning and development.

School Goals and Objectives as the "Curriculum"

My first trip to City B included remnants of the Great East Japan Earthquake: the bullet train from Tokyo to Fukushima stopped inside a tunnel due to an emergency shortage of electricity following a minor earthquake. While growing up hearing my Japanese grandmother grind into me the importance of conserving resources such as electricity, even 3 years after the earthquake, I did not take notice of the many posters posted throughout the Kanto area calling for 節電 setsuden or conservation of electricity (Cable News Network [CNN], 2011; Masaki, 2012). After such a momentary stall, I find myself in a city in Fukushima, which I have since given meaning to find links to my own sense of belonging, to continue my journey further east to the temporary office of the superintendent.

My initial encounter with the superintendent in the summer of 2013 suggested that he was familiar with potential questions to be asked of him. I only had to ask my first

prompt question before he shared how he was involved in the processes of how, when, and why Town A evacuated to City B where we were meeting. This made it somewhat easier for me, as someone keen on learning about the school, to facilitate this conversation as many of his decisions reminded me of factors impacting education in times of crises, which I described in a previous chapter. As I looked around the room I was led into, I realized the reasons for such comfort. I noticed cards, posters, and photos of the superintendent's interactions with not only the community of Town A but also with City B, the media, journalists, and notable individuals who supported Town A in light of the recent events. The superintendent carefully described the history and process of how Town A completed its journey of evacuating from one geographical location to another—a "narrative" he may have become familiar with telling.

The impacts of how one town evacuated its educational facilities to another city are reflected in its educational management vision as well as its "curriculum" following 2011. The education directory published in 2013 by the Board of Education—which consisted five to six members including the superintendent at the time of this writing—of Town A begins the directory by providing the history as well as its geographical background. It then works through the more recent events of the Great East Japan Earthquake and how the evacuation process pushed the Board of Education to reflect on its foundational assumptions around school education. Upon reflection, discussion, and research, the Board of Education came to the conclusion that the foundation of education is based on 人間関係 or human relations. This was a common term that came up in many of my interactions with the teachers as well as the administrators throughout my visits, which followed my initial meeting with the superintendent.

My first site visit to the two schools—School T and School Q—where I collected my "data" was during the coldest month of 2014—half a year after my initial encounter with the superintendent. In this second visit, I am introduced to the education consultant Mr. Jo, who later became instrumental in establishing my relationship with the school(s) and teacher(s) I encountered during this research. I identified and categorized Mr. Jo as about 5'4, a slim, middle-aged man in his 60s with silver hair. He appeared to be a reserved man as I struggled to make eye contact with him and engage him during my conversation with the superintendent. After my second visit with the superintendent, Mr. Jo became my designated contact person. Later that day, Mr. Jo and I drove over to the elementary schools that have been relocated about 20 minutes away from the superintendent's temporary office in City B.

Once we got to the school, I was led to the office of one of the principals and realized that two schools were in operation at one school site. While one of the principals was not present that day, I had the opportunity to engage in discussion with the other principal who was generous in sharing his time, resources, and thoughts on the recent events leading up to the relocation of the school. At around 1 p.m., the principal suggested we walk around the school. Some students were inside the classroom talking to the teacher, some others were in the hallway and enthusiastically greeted me with a big "hello," while I saw a few others holding a broom and rearranging furniture. It was cleaning time where the whole school is engaged in cleaning their school. The principal told me that cleaning took place after lunch every day. Some even greeted me in English and I found myself commenting on the students' enthusiasm to engage with me in English. In commenting on the students' English engagement with me, I am also

reminded of my "foreign-ness" at this school, despite my efforts to introduce myself using my Japanese name thus far.

The principal from one of the elementary schools gave me a copy of their "curriculum" for the school year 2013-2014. The "curriculum" included a breakdown chart of the school management vision starting with the school goal and key objectives for School Q:

School Goal: 粘り強い子供 (nebari duyoi kodomo) – Tenacious children

Key Objectives: 伝える力を高めよう(tsutaeru chikara wo takameyou) – Let's enhance our ability to communicate.

For academic years 2014-2015 and 2015-2016, School Q's goal remained the same; however, there was a slight change in key objectives in relation to the schools operational vision:

Key Objectives: 考えをもち伝え合おう(kangae wo mochi tsutae aou) – Let's formulate our own thoughts and communicate these thoughts.

According to this "curriculum," the school goal drew from the Fundamental Law of Education, School Education Law, Course of Study, and the Convention on the Rights of the Child. In addition, it also recognized the unique circumstances which the school community faced in relocating to a new geographical location where facilities continue to be shared with another school. With this as foundation, the school vision expanded to its detailed objectives of how to achieve this school goal to support the academic, mental, and emotional development of students. I later learned of the school goals and objectives for the other elementary school, School T, as the following for the school year 2015-2016:

School Goal: みんなと大きく育て (minna to ookiku sodate) – Grow[n] big with everyone

Key Objectives: 考えをもち伝え合おう (kangae wo mochi tsutae aou) – Let's formulate our own thoughts and communicate these thoughts.

While these documents were helpful in understanding what values underlie these two schools' everyday practices, it also highlighted conventional ways of understanding the "curriculum" as course of study, which has been reconceptualized and theorized by "curricular" scholars such as Pinar (2004) and Miller (2005) in the U.S. context to take into consideration the social, historical, political, racial, and cultural contexts that situate everyday practices. My initial skepticism of such conventional understandings of the "curriculum," however, was interrupted and complicated during my interview with Hiro who touched upon her interactions in establishing school goals and objectives as a teacher and administrator at School T.

"Kyouiku Keikaku" = "Curriculum"?

In one of our conversations, we talked about how the 2011 earthquake and evacuation have impacted teaching practices for Hiro. In such instances, Hiro shared how she was more than ever interested in reflecting on her own "experiences" as an individual as well as an individual who is part of School T to identify the needs of the children and families at their school. She believed that while teaching could be done as one gains teaching "experience," the "kyouiku keikaku" or "curriculum" that often begins with the vision of the superintendent or school principal must be thought out in reference to the needs of the individual schools.

> Hiro: だから、その子供達をよく見て、うちの学校では何が必要かってのを考えて、教育計画を作らなくちゃいけないし。決めたら、ちゃんとやらないといけない

> と思う。そうですね。教育計画は、だから、どの学校も似たり寄ったりにはなってたりするけど、やっぱり、その学校学校のオリジナリティーの欲しいものだなと、うん、思いますね。
>
> Hiro: In order to create the curriculum, we need to understand the kids and think about what is needed at our school. Once we decide, we need to follow through. Many schools have similar curriculums, but I think the curriculum can reflect each school's originality.

Hiro expressed the above need she felt was essential in providing not only educational support but psychosocial support to the students and their families from Town A—needs based on social, cultural, economic, and political contexts that constantly shift and change how, when, and what types of support are needed by the students and their families. Hiro wrestled within tensions of addressing the students' changing sociocultural needs as she struggled to "know" what exactly she could offer to her students. Hiro constantly wondered how school "curriculum" could potentially address the students' needs. In light of the events that occurred after the Great East Japan Earthquake and the current context in which Hiro was situated, she was committed to offer a school "curriculum" where she could pride itself on originality.

While Hiro doubted the idea of an innate talent in being able to teach, Hiro expressed her belief that teaching could be done with "experience"—"experience" would drive an individual to be able to lead a class and support students' academic learning; thus, it was also her belief that a detailed "curriculum" would allow a teacher to follow through in obtaining educational goals when the focus was to be based on the students' and families' needs. This "originality" of a "curriculum," perceived by Hiro, would be driven by the needs of the students and families of the school. Thus, while covering the "curriculum" was of importance, it was even more crucial that, according to Hiro, teachers are able to center the students' needs as best possible. Situated within the tension

of addressing the uncertainties of remaining in City B as well as the changing needs of her students and their families, Hiro referred to the need of also supporting and improving the teachers' own pedagogical practices through "experience" while utilizing a "curriculum," based on student needs, that scaffolds learning and development.

In hearing Hiro speak of her understanding around teaching "experiences" and its relation to "curriculum," I felt tensions as I recognized my "self" as researcher attempting to think about teacher "experiences" with Scott (1991), Britzman (1995), and Miller (2005), who constantly interrupted my conventional understandings of how we understood our tellings of "experiences." Within these tensions, my earlier assumptions around "experience" and "curriculum" are magnified as I continued to desire to seek points of certainty and comfort in "knowing" Hiro better while attempting to remain within conversations to complicate understandings of "curriculum," which was also reflected in how Hiro spoke about her wanting to "know" how to best support her student needs while struggling within her daily work as administrator "developing" the "curriculum."

I referred back to Hiro's earlier teaching "experiences" to attend to these tensions and explore further how Hiro spoke of her teacher "experiences" and her reference to the "curriculum" at School T.

Organizing "Curriculum" and Lesson Plan

In talking about Hiro's earlier practicum and teaching "experiences," she remembered feeling anxious and uneasy during her first year of teaching at a public school. When I asked her to tell me more about this anxiety she felt, she told me:

> Hiro: あーんとね、なんかね、なんか45分なんですよ学校って授業とかね。その45分の中で、こう、子供達がその時間その時間でおぼえなくちゃいけない、理解しなくちゃいけない事ってあるんだけど。多分出来てないなって思う様な授業になっちゃう事があった。それは私が、こう、子供達の意見とかコーディネート出来なくて、バア〜って自由にしゃべっちゃって、全然まとまんなくなっちゃったり。逆で、まとめようとして自分一人でしゃべっちゃって、子供達がああーってなっちゃってたり。する様な授業もいっぱいあって。んん、もう、そんな時は涙が出ちゃった時もあった。

> Hiro: So, classes run for 45 minutes. And while students are expected to memorize and understand particular things in that time I, most likely, was not able to do the things I was supposed to do during the class. What I mean is that I was unable to coordinate the students' opinions or thoughts so the kids would start talking freely with no guidance or meaning. Instead of coordinating, I would end up talking the whole time losing the kids' attention. I had a lot of classes like that and I cried when I led a class as such.

Hiro recollected many instances earlier in her teaching career where she felt the challenges of leading a class of 30 or so students because of her perceived inability to cover the "curriculum" as well as lesson plans without incorporating the students' thoughts. Hiro struggled in these moments as she attempted to perform her teacher subjectivities implicated within historical discourses of teaching that assume particular teacher expectations of student engagement and academic success that have been over the years complicated and questioned (Ladson-Billings, 1995; Lortie, 1975; Taubman, 2009). Hiro did not abandon her teaching post despite moments of her perceived feelings of failure. I asked her what was it about teaching that kept her going back to her class.

> Hiro: はい、はい。んんん。一つはやっぱり、一回担任した子供達だから、一年間、やっぱ責任感ですね。途中で投げ出すわけにはいかないっていう気持ちと。あとは、うんん、今日ダメだったら、あの、次の日に向けて準備をする。準備をするとやりたくなるから。だから、結構泣いたりしても、次の日チャレンジしに行く。試してみる。っていう、なんか、その繰り返しかもしれない。私はね。
>
> Hiro: One of the reasons is because I had a sense of responsibility towards these students I had for homeroom. I cannot just throw the towel in and abandon my post. Also, if today did not work out as I had imagined, I will better prepare myself for the following day. When you prepare for something, even if you had lamented over something the day before, it makes you want to try it out the next day. For me, I think it was the repetition of such.

Hiro attributed her ability to continue teaching to the "models" on which she based her style of teaching and lesson planning in her earlier years of her teaching career. She continued to engage in learning as a teacher by reading up on materials that pertained to teaching and lesson planning. She also shared that she would observe other teachers whom she wanted to learn from in order to reflect on her own ways of teaching. Hiro took every action to best prepare herself for her lessons and interactions with her students as to respond better to every situation that may present itself in the school environment.

Hiro's earlier engagements with her lesson plan as part of content to be covered is suggestive of conventional understanding and practices of "curriculum." While Hiro's "sense of responsibility" prompted her to engage in "self-reflextive practices" as well as study to improve her teaching pedagogy to better meet her students' needs, in turn, Hiro is constituted of as well as constituting her teacher "self" as a responsible teacher. Despite learning the importance of preparation earlier in her teaching career, she shared one of her memories at a graduation ceremony seeing off her first class of students who comprised her homeroom class:

> Hiro: うん。でね、いつもね、うんと大事にしていたつもりだったの。うん、つもりだったっていうか、本当にそう思ってたんだけど。卒業式の日ね、すごく嬉しくなっ

ちゃってたんだよね私も。すごく嬉しくなっててね。その子ね歩くことがね上手に出来ない子だったの。でもその子はね、一生懸命ねお花をね私に渡したかったの。だから、いつもだったらね、普通の毎日だったらね、一番最初にその子をね私の近くにって事をしてたの。だけど、卒業式の日はね、なんかワアーって、こう、他の子達ももうなんかすごいハイになってるでしょ。ファーとか言って。でわーって私の周りにいて。で、その子がずっとね渡せないでいたんだよね。それになんかね気づけないで、ね、いた事は今も忘れないですね。うん、なんかそういう所で、ああ、ちょっと私はちょっとそういう風に、こう、三年間やってきたって言ったって、こうやって、一番大事な時に出来ないのかなとかね。

Hiro: So I thought I was taking good care of the students, including this one student I had who was physically challenged. When graduation ceremony came, I was so happy. So, on any other day, I would have been looking out for this particular student as a priority. But when all the other students came for me, because I was overwhelmed with joy, I neglected to look out for this student the way I had done for the last three years. And all this student wanted to do was give me flowers. I will never forget this moment—It made me think about how I was unable to respond at the most crucial moment.

Hiro's tellings of her enactments of a "responsible teacher" collided within this never-to-be repeated moment with this particular student. In her response to the students, Hiro examined her own teacher "self" that necessitated her to envision different ways of being and responding to students. It is in this collision that I find possibilities to imagine "curriculum" as well as "self" that are in constant motion and open to change. While dominant educational discourses of accountability and teaching situate teachers to enact particular versions of being a "teacher" that enables the successful development of a child in a progressive manner, it is in this moment when Hiro struggled to respond to the immediate needs of her students that she is also able to open further possibilities of becoming that may enable her to respond to her students' needs instead of continuing to perform the "responsible teacher." Hiro's constant wonderings of how the school "curriculum" can respond to her current students' changing needs is just one example of such.

My versions of Hiro's interpreted "narratives" suggest ways in which her multiple "selves" worked within tensions in relation to the changing family, community, and educational discourses leading to and following the Great East Japan Earthquake. For instance, Hiro's understanding of "curriculum" often collided and shifted as she tried to enact traditional notions of the "curriculum" in relation to her multiple enactments of her "selves." Such moments of collision are of importance when thinking about "curriculum," in this context where Hiro is situated to explore possibilities of imagining multiple "selves" as well as multiple enactments of "curriculum" that can respond to the evolving and changing needs of students and their families.

Hiro's Connections to School T

Before the 2011 earthquake, Hiro had been teaching as a public school teacher in City B where the two evacuated schools are currently located. When I asked Hiro to tell me why she chose to relocate to School T, she shared the following:

> Hiro: なんかね、きっと生活とか変わっちゃって、大変だろうって思いますよね。思ってるんだけど、そうとも言えないのね。それさえもプラスに思ってる人もいる。色々いる。うん。で、あ、私、なんか、こう、勝手に決め付けるのも良くないなと思ったんですよね。B 市はね被害が少なかったから、なんかこう決めつけちゃうみたいな。「大変なんだろう」とかね「かわいそうだろう」っていう、こう。でもそれだけじゃないだろうと思って。あ、もっと、こう、同じ福島県民なのに知らないなと思ったんですよ。知らないし、被害がなかった分本当それで済まされちゃったら、将来ね、同じ福島県民としてどうなんだろうと思って、強く希望して、A 町とか F 町とかの学校に行きたいと。ま、教師だから、学校に行きたい。で、実際にいろんな子供達に接して、それが事実だと思って、受け止めようと思ってね。うんで、希望してきました。
>
> Hiro: You know, we might think that the people's lives have been changed and that things must be hard for them. Or so I thought, but I realized that this may not be the case. Some may transform such difficult times into a positive opportunity. There are diverse experiences. And I thought that it is not good for me to judge their experiences based on my own assumptions. There was not as much damage

> here in City B and there was this sympathetic perspective that those who evacuated might be having a hard time. But I thought that cannot be the only thing. I realized that even though we are all from the same prefecture of Fukushima, I did not know anything about their experiences and realities. And as fellow residents of Fukushima prefecture, just because there was a difference in the level of damage, I questioned such an attitude of indifference. Since I am a teacher, I applied to teach at one of the schools in the county heavily affected.

As described in previous chapters, while the nuclear power plant is located in Fukushima prefecture, the effects of the nuclear accident following the earthquake and tsunami had varied effects in the region. For instance, as Hiro described above, the effects of the explosion on residents of City B were not as "severe" compared to residents of Town A, especially considering that residents of City B were not required to evacuate their hometown. Following the series of events since the earthquake, many of the voluntary and involuntary evacuees had settled in City B at the school where Hiro was then teaching:

> Hiro: だから、震災が起きた時はいわゆる普通に B の学校にいたんだけども。そこで、あ、私震災が起きた時はその、また違う学校にいたんだけども。そこにね、E 町の子とかね、がね、避難をしてきました。で、いろいろお話を聞いてね、で、なんかね。その元々、だから、そういう子、そういう子というか、なんだろ、明らかに元気がない状態で来ましたから。うん、で、仲良くなろうと思って。よく話をして。うん、でも、なんか話をして行って。なんだろうな、それまで、経験したことのない話を、なわけですよね。子供から聞くにはびっくりしちゃうような経験をしているんですね、その避難っていう。うん、で、そんな事をしている間に移動になって。あの、学校が変わったんです。で、そこには、あの、その頃ね、ここ A 町なんですけど、F 町の子供達もたくさん B 市に避難してきてたから。F 町の子達がいっぱいいたんですよ。

> Hiro: So when the earthquake happened, I was teaching at a school in City B. Students who had been affected and evacuated came to the school I was teaching. And I started conversing with them. And so, those kids…how do I say…they obviously came with low spirits. So I decided to form good relationship with them by talking to them. But the experiences shared with me as I started talking with them and listening to them were experiences that I had unheard of in terms of the evacuation. And amid all that I was transferred to another school in City B where there were other kids from one of these evacuated towns.

While there were physical damages and the uncertainty of radiation effects on residents throughout Fukushima, Hiro's response sheds light on how the unprecedented series of events affected residents not only from evacuated towns but also in the city that was hosting the evacuees. For Hiro, it was important to interact with the families and students who experienced the earthquake and subsequent evacuation instead of assuming the challenges of living in evacuation based on media reports (*Fukushima Minpou*, 2011, 2012) and her own assumptions. While Hiro was impacted at the personal level as well, as a teacher she took it on as her own mission to become familiar with the "experiences" of the students.

While Hiro gave meaning to her "identity" through identification with Fukushima as a place, within this identification, she recognized how her students were differently identifying with Fukushima, thus requiring her to reflect on her own sense of "self" as a resident of Fukushima who "experienced" the earthquake. It was important for her to understand and relate differently to her students who had been evacuated and her response to this was to request to relocate to School T. The earthquake and subsequent events disrupted and dislocated communities, histories, "experiences," and traditions; however, as I constructed Hiro's "narratives," these unprecedented events invited questions of how one's sense of community and belonging are being constituted while constituting in relation to the "experiences" of others.

During our interview, two of Hiro's students stopped by to celebrate Hiro's birthday and gift her with a card. In an excited conversation between the students and Hiro, the students giggled as Hiro pointed out to me that they were laughing at her choice of words, which apparently differed from the students' dialect and intonation, placing

Hiro's sense of belonging differently in relation to the students. After the students left, Hiro pointed to the fact that one of the two students was planning to leave the school after the end of the summer term.

> Hiro: もう決まってて。うん、それはだから、親御さんがこれからの生き方、決めたからね。だから、その決めた時にね、それを、こう、子供にとっては、子供にとってもか、なんか、こう、苦しさを伴う結果、決定をすることもあるわけですよね。ね。うん。しょうがないんだけれども、じゃ、その、しょうがないけれども、何か、こう、気持ちをちゃんと整理できて、新しい方向に向かって行けるように送り出してあげたいとかはしたいと思いますよね。
>
> Hiro: It has already been decided based on the parents' decisions about how to live. So when that decision is made, for kids, well, the process of coming to this decision or result can entail pain or difficulty for the child as well. It can't be helped. But if it cannot be helped, I want to be able to support them to sort out their feelings before they move towards a new direction.

In interacting with the families of the children attending the school, Hiro realized that many decisions continued to be made. Some families had made decisions of departing City B and thus no longer "living in evacuation" with other residents of Town A, based on economic opportunities elsewhere as well as over their health concerns. Other families decided to "live in evacuation" in City B with other residents from Town A until further information was to be disseminated about returning to Town A. Over the years since 2011, many children had left the school[1] and in this departure, Hiro observed the many difficult decisions that accompanied these decisions to leave City B. She struggled to understand better how and what processes underlie these decisions made by the families—one of them being how "curriculum" is being developed every year at the school.

[1] The number of students who continued to enroll at the satellite school was approximately 573 in April 2011. Six years after the earthquake and evacuation, this number continues to decrease (*Sankei News*, 2016).

When I asked Hiro about the process of creating the "curriculum" for the school year, she walked me through the timeline of revisiting the school "curriculum" for the upcoming year. While the foundation of the "curriculum" is based on the requirements set forth by the Ministry of Education, Hiro also shared how the teachers got together every year to add "originality" to the "curriculum." Every year, teachers were required to set up one-on-one meetings with the parents of the students from their homeroom class. The purpose of this meeting was not only to discuss educational and personal progress made by a particular student, but also to gather concerns, thoughts, and needs of the parents in relation to their child(ren) so that these needs could be translated into the development of a "curriculum" for the following year. For this reason, when I asked Hiro what she thought was crucial for the school at this moment, she stated that it was important to understand why some families continued to choose to remain with Town A in evacuation.

> Hiro: 近かったから。学区だったから。え、なんでそこにいるのなんて質問さえもしないですよね。考えないですよね。でも、ここにいる子供たちの親御さんはみんなでもやっぱり必ず思うところだと思うから。うん。それ、その思いをね、ま、なかなか出してはもらえないかもしれないけど。明らかに、こういうことがあって思うところがあるんだったら、うん、お話を聞いて。例えば、A 市のことをね、子供に残したいっていう思いが強ければ、そう言ったカリキュラムを増やすって手もあるじゃないですか。

> Hiro: How do families choose schools for their children? Because it was close to their home. Because they resided within the school district. Often times, we do not even think about why we are choosing to be in one particular geographic region. But I think the parents of our children at our school think about these things. And if they are, despite the challenges of having candid conversations about these topics, if the parents are struggling with their decisions, I want to hear what the parents are thinking about. For example, if some want to leave behind the tradition and cultures of Town A to their children, we can increase the hours of such subjects in the curriculum.

Due to the attentive efforts of the teachers, it became apparent to them that, since the evacuation, the children of the school were showing signs of obesity. Conversations with parents as well as observations revealed that due to a change in lifestyle, students were getting less exercise in their daily life. For example, while students were residing in Town A, they would walk to school and play outside more often; however, since the evacuation, students spent less time playing outside as well as walking to school. It was Hiro's belief that the "curriculum" be created with the understanding that it be an essential tool in actualizing the objectives of the school—she even referred to the "curriculum" as a framework for the school. Moreover, at the center of this objective was the growth and development of the child who is nurtured by the teacher and community surrounding the child—all of which reflect educational discourses of learning in progression with the support of the teacher.

I heard Hiro speak of "curriculum" predominately as an object to be developed or created. I also heard Hiro refer to the tensions that arose when speaking of the "curriculum" as enactments of educational discourses set forth by the Ministry of Education to cover certain subjects while attending to the unique needs being shared at the parent-teacher conference. Hiro recognized the importance of continuously attending to the pressing needs of the students of School T and for the operations of the school, especially considering uncertainty arising from living in evacuation; however, such conceptualizations bumped up against Hiro's enactments as administrator when she spoke of "curriculum" as development and design. Driven by her constitution of a teacher "self" based on a sense of responsibility towards her students, Hiro strove to provide a

"curriculum" that could respond to the evolving needs of the students within discourses of uncertainty following the evacuation.

Hiro referred to her "origins" of teaching in relation to place of which her parents were one. Within these relations, Hiro discursively constituted her multiple "selves" while also constantly envisioning different versions of her teacher "selves" as well as "curriculum" that have been framed by the wider historical, social, and political discourses of uncertainty and development impacted by the earthquake and subsequent evacuation. Hiro repeatedly referred to the need of being able to respond to the academic and social needs of her students in relevance to their cultural, social, and historical contexts, especially as related to how she conceived of the "curriculum." While conceptualizations of traditional notions of "curriculum" as course of study often collided with her desire to want to respond to her students, these moments of collision also created possibilities for continued wonderings of versions of "self" and "curriculum" that always ended in "it's in progression."

INTERLUDE—THE TRANSLATING I'S

My researcher "selves" are implicated in disparate, incomplete, and yet sometimes coherent spaces that necessitate I engage in constant self-reflexive practices—practices that challenge my "understandings" and representations of any transparent and coherent subjects. What follows are constructions of my interpreted "dialogue" between the multiple "selves" as a methodological tool to address self-reflexively the multiple "selves" in operation as I perform my researcher "self." Pillow (2003) warned that "a tracing of problematics of reflexivity calls for a positioning of reflexivity not as clarity, honesty, or humility, but as practices of confounding disruptions—at times even a failure of our language and practices" (p. 192). These constructions as well as reconstructions are not an attempt to triangulate my "data," but rather are discursive constructions of the various "subjects" that are in workings throughout the research process.

> Chicanos and other people of color suffer economically for not acculturating. This voluntary (yet forced) alienation makes for psychological conflict, a kind of dual identity—we don't identify with the Anglo-American cultural values and we don't totally identify with the Mexican cultural values. We are a synergy of two cultures with various degrees of Mexicanness or Angloness. I have so internalized the borderland conflict that sometimes I feel like one cancels out the other and we are zero, nothing, no one. A veces no soy nada ni nadie. Pero hasta cuando no lo soy, lo soy.
>
> Gloria Anzaldua, 1987, p. 85

Patricia (English Language Teacher): As a former language teacher, I am familiar with pedagogies that actively incorporate the students' linguistic, cultural, and social knowledge (Bartlett & Garcia, 2011; Gay, 2010; Moll et al., 1992; Sealey-Ruiz, 2007) into the classroom environment. Having taught English as a second

language as well as a foreign language, I attempted to incorporate my understanding of the students' home language and cultural knowledge into my lesson plans with the hopes that it will support their language learning process. Yet at the same time, I am guilty of discouraging the students from using the language they most felt comfortable using. I encouraged students to come to an English-Only-Zone classroom to "immerse" themselves in the target language. Of course, it was not a decision made on my own. It was based on school as well as already decided English Department policy, which I then interpreted and enacted in the classroom. While I wanted to support the students' language learning "experience," I wonder what message I was conveying to my students. Perhaps, this may be one reason I had lots of pushback from my students during the first few months of the school year.

Patricia (Student): I definitely felt punished speaking Japanese at the international school in Japan I attended from kindergarten to high school. While I was not given an explanation as to why I was prohibited in using Japanese, a language I used at home, I also learned—sometimes the hard way through detention—that I was to accept certain ways of being in order to become a member of this school that promoted "global citizenship." Despite that, I constantly resisted this rule because here is this "international school" established specifically for expat families and returnee students located in the heart of a port city in Japan prohibiting the use of a language used in the very country the school is located. I don't mean to undermine the school mission and objectives, but I share that to say

how from an early age, I unconsciously and consciously “experienced” “my world” through language.

Patricia (International Educator): Tell me more about “experiencing” “my world through language.”

Patricia (Student): Well, for example, I spoke only Japanese at home. Many of my friends and I often spoke *Japanglish* knowing we were not allowed to do so on school premises. By senior year of high school, we did not care for this “rule” so we spoke *Japanglish*, English or Japanese during recess, extracurricular activities, or even during class—whatever allowed us to communicate best. Also it was during my sophomore year when we read *Kokoro* during our World Literature class that I started to think specifically about language and how it relates to our experiences. My English teacher, who was from Florida, was one of my favorite teachers. When she introduced this classic Japanese novel translated into English, she asked us why this book retained the Japanese title, *Kokoro*. Some of us who spoke Japanese and English fluently suggested a few English words such as *heart*, *mind,* and *spirit* but also felt that the original term *Kokoro* could not be translated into English fully.

Patricia (Doctoral Student Researcher): I continue to struggle with how I understand and use the word “curriculum” in this dissertation as well as how I engage in the act of “translating” the “data” into what I claim as “narratives” of the teacher participants. By having to consider translating the term “curriculum,” it adds another layer of complexity for me. While I was familiar with this term having taught as an English teacher, I was not sure how this same word would be

understood by the research participants because it would be interchangeably used with *kouikukeikaku* and *curriculum* every time I brought it up in conversation. Because of my graduate studies in the United States, the English word "curriculum" evoked a certain understanding for me, which is not evoked by *kyouikukeikaku*. What was being evoked in the research participants every time I brought up this term but would use it interchangeably with *kyouikukeikaku*? By "curriculum?" And how were these phrases interpreted and translated by these teachers?

Patricia (International Educator): I was recently at a conference discussing how international educators wear various hats as an educator, diplomat, counselor, et cetera. In this discussion, we spoke about the frustration international students studying in the United States have shared of not being able to express their feelings in English, not only due to linguistic challenges but because of the very point we are referencing. Some students express that the way they talk about their feelings in English almost feels "empty" because it does not always reflect the nuances and sensibilities that they are able to express in their home or dominant language.

Patricia (Doctoral Student Researcher): Right after that conference, I started looking into this idea of translation because I realize I was taking the act of translating for granted as a researcher. I mean, sure, as a novice researcher embarking on her research, I addressed some of the ethical concerns that may arise in conducting research in a language other than English but it was just that—I *stated* my

concerns around the ethics of transcribing and translating but did not *interrogate* the act of translating nor the role of the translator.

Patricia (Student): Tell me more about this idea of the ethics of translation.

> When translating from one language to another, how do we ensure that we have shown respect for our research partners in representing their worldview and thoughts?
>
> Marshall and Rossman, 2011, p. 167

Patricia (Doctoral Student Researcher): I wanted to re-engage with how I am thinking about and representing my interpretations of the teachers I had interviewed in Japanese. I started rereading feminist poststructural understandings of language that challenge precepts of structuralism as well as other traditions such as phenomenology, existentialism, and psychoanalysis. These texts reminded me that language functions historically, socially, and politically, and is contingent and unstable (St. Pierre, 2000b; Weedon, 1987). If I assume language can no longer "capture" the essence of the object it tries to signify and that "meaning is thus transient and fleeting" (St. Pierre, 2000b, p. 481), how does this shift my understanding of language and, thus, translation? How would this feminist poststructurally inflected understanding of language affect how I approach translating as it relates to representation?

Patricia (English Language Teacher): Let's talk more about this dilemma or the difficulty…or even the impossibility of translation?

Patricia (Doctoral Student Researcher): As referenced in St. Pierre's (2000b) piece and elsewhere, Foucault noted, "everything is dangerous." To a novice researcher like myself, this statement constantly pushes me to stay engaged and to grapple with the ethical responsibility of translation and, thus, representation—what does

this act of translating produce or make impossible? What factors drive the act of translation and how do meanings evolve, if ever?

Patricia (Student): So, I see that in the methods section the intent to translate from Japanese to English has already been stated. How does this act of translating relate to representation or this idea of "curriculum"?

Patricia (Doctoral Student Researcher): To be honest, I don't think I thought of this act of "translating" as more than mere language or linguistic "translation." Translating was an act I engaged in outside of the interview context because it could only happen before in preparing my interview questions in Japanese or after the transcription text was created. Thus, I assumed translation occurred in somewhat of a vacuum and the responsibility of the translator was to ensure the accuracy of the original in the translated text. I think this also was the case in how I "experienced" the English "curriculum" as an English instructor—I simply inherited the English communications "curriculum" as if it was an object that I should translate as close to the original irrespective of the discourses that constituted my sense of being. I was aware of the difficulties of "translating" but only in terms of the nuances that might get lost in the act. But then I read Cook-Sather (2007), revisited Minh-Ha (2011) and Butler (2000), who then led me to cultural literary critics such as Walter Benjamin (1968/2002), Paul De Man (1986), and Homi Bhabha (Rutherford, 1990).

In *The Task of the Translator*, Walter Benjamin questions just that—is the task of the translator to serve the original, thus attempting to reproduce the original as best they can or to serve readers by creating something new from the

"original?" Benjamin argued that the task of the translator is not to serve the original or the reader, but to achieve a *pure language* where translations are not mutually exclusive but "supplement one another in their intentions" (p. 257). Drawing from Benjamin, De Man (1986) further elaborated on this question of intent through the example of the German word *Brot* and the French word *pain* to illustrate the contradiction between one's intent and the actual word one has used to represent their intent. There is a breakdown between the signifier and the signified, thus making the task of the translator complex more so than the view of translating the original or creating a new version. In fact, in an interview with Rutherford (1990), Bhaba drew from Benjamin to articulate his point of *cultural translation* in arguing that meaning is constructed via the very differences incurred between the signified and signifier. Furthermore, Bhaba insisted that it is within this displacement or self-alienating aspect of the intent of meanings made from cultural practices that suggest culture is always open for redefinition and translation, which leads to his conceptualization of *hybridity*—"the importance of hybridity is not to be able to trace two original moments from which the third emerges, rather hybridity to me is the 'third space' which enables other positions to emerge" (p. 211).

All of these authors were looking at "translation" not only from a linguistic perspective but also as it relates to the act of interpretation and representation—critical reference points for me as I work poststructurally in this dissertation research. Cook-Sather (2007) also embarked on this task as she described a series of research projects that she considered to engage successfully

in redefining and complicating existing ways of understanding identities, interpreted "experiences," and power relations. In doing so, she highlighted how "translation" is a "never-finished process of change that enables something—a text, an experience, a lesson, a setting, a person, or a group—to be newly accessible to comprehension and communication" (p. 830).

Patricia (English Language Teacher): So tell me more about this idea of "translation" as transforming.

> While "translate" is most often understood as making a new version of something by rendering it in one's own or another's language, it is not that part of the term's meaning that I am primarily concerned with here. Rather, I emphasize the term's more nuanced forms, where it means to bear, remove, or change from one place or condition to another, to change the form, expressions, or mode of expression of, so as to interpret or make tangible, and thus to carry over from one medium or sphere into another, or to change completely, to transform (*Webster's New International Dictionary*, 2nd Edition).
>
> Alison Cook-Sather, 2007, p. 830

> No poem is intended for the reader, no picture for the beholder, no symphony for the audience.
>
> Walter Benjamin, 1968/2002, p. 253

Patricia (Doctoral Student Researcher): This idea of "translation" I have been introduced to via these scholars reaffirms poststructural understandings of language. My interpreted representation of the ways in which teachers have spoken about their "experiences" is already no longer what it may have been the moment I am facing the transcripts that I have drafted and construed as "data." You might wonder what then becomes of this transcript when I further translate from Japanese to English and vice versa. In the process of translating from Japanese to English, I often found myself trying hard to find the best phrase to get

at the *essence* or *nuances* that we spoke of earlier, as in the example of *Kokoro*. And in this process, I questioned whether I had been able to "get at" what was being told to me. My deeply rooted humanist-influenced assumptions nudge me that my translation must be accurate and, hence, I followed the best practices suggested by the Institutional Review Board to translate the already translated English back to Japanese. But what I produced in the end became so foreign… was this still "close" to the "original"? Or did it become something else? While understanding the slippages of signifiers and reading one author after the other who questions the idea of the rational subject who speaks what she/he/it means—I was the translating researcher who assumed that the text sitting in front of me had an essence that required my translation.

Patricia (Student): Doesn't this require us to speak about the role of the researcher in relation to the research participants?

Patricia (Doctoral Student Researcher): Yes, this idea of translation and language pushes me to acknowledge that all foundations are contingent (Butler, 1995a)—despite conventional understanding that our "realities" simply exist waiting to be named by language. Poststructural understandings of language challenge this idea by describing how "realities" are produced as foundational through language and discourse. We are complicit in these structures because we continue to reproduce "realities" that organize our daily activities. Similarly, by taking on the role of the translating researcher whose aim was to "capture the essence" of what was being told to me in Japanese, I established and maintained this artificial distance between myself as researcher and the teachers.

Patricia (English Language Teacher): Is it simply enough to just name this? I mean, how else could have this relationship been reversed, if anything?

Patricia (Doctoral Student Researcher): Numerous authors have warned me that "naming" it is simply not enough as it is not a "confession" of doing research in the field. But the point of doing research is to interrogate the very norm that I have taken for granted.

> To be constituted by language is to be produced within a given network of power/discourse which is open to resignification, redeployment, subversive citation from within, and interruption and inadvertent convergences with other such networks.
>
> Butler, 1995b, p. 135

Patricia (Doctoral Student Researcher): I sought the responses of the potential research participants after I transcribed the interviews to see if they would want to adjust or add further comments that they may not have been able to share with me during the interviews in an attempt to redefine the researcher/participant relationship by involving them in the "data analysis" process. However, as of now, I have not yet received responses from the teachers. And I constantly grapple with the possibility of what Scheruich (1997) said, "border on a kind of violence." Am I reducing these "narratives" as unified and immutable without the opportunity to rework them through the act of my interpreted representation, especially in the absence of the teacher's "confirmation" that they meant what they said when they said it as if to confirm its "validity"?

> As it has been repeatedly proven, the hallmark of bad translation is to be found in the inability to go beyond the mere imparting of information or the transmittal of subject matter. To strive for likeness to the original—which is ultimately an impossible task—is to forget that for something to live on, it has to

> be transformed. The original is bound to undergo a change in its afterlife.
>
> Trinh T. Minh-Ha, 2011, p. 37

> Just as a tangent touches a circle lightly and at but one point—establishing, with this touch rather than with the point, the law according to which it is to continue on its straight path to infinity—a translation touches the original lightly and only at the infinitely small point of the sense thereupon pursuing its own course according to the laws of fidelity in the freedom of linguistic flux.
>
> Walter Benjamin, 1968/2002, p. 261

Patricia (Student): It just seems overwhelming this “task of the translator.”

Patricia (Doctoral Student Researcher): I continue to grapple with this “task of the translator” in this research because my intent is not to assume the teachers’ “narratives” as complete, reflective of reality, and that they mean what they say and how they say it to me—although my tendency is to want and continue to do so. I would like to constantly urge myself to interrogate how I am arriving at defining “stories,” “narratives,” and “experiences” to rattle my own taken-for-granted understandings of doing research as well as how we talk about curricular “experiences.” During the actual interview, I strove to be attentive to both verbal and nonverbal cues, but am also aware that I will not be able to describe all these cues because I am weary of the idea that “good researchers” are able to represent their findings only if they are able to engage in systematically organizing their “data.” What happens to the complexities I mention just now if the representation of these teachers’ “stories” are reduced to mere simplicity that is contained in a vacuum of objectified numbers, generalizations, and decontextualized meanings?

Patricia (International Educator): It would certainly give a particular perspective to these “stories,” while it may not allow us to see others, I assume.

Patricia (Doctoral Student Researcher): Certainly. But as I continue to work poststructurally, my "goal," per se, is to attend to the research questions I have posed in Chapter I, but also to acknowledge how representation and translations are deliberate modes of expression that carry an element of the supposed "original" within the production of new interpretations that are once again open for further reiterations of the "original." An ongoing process…

V—BECOMING (UN)FAMILIAR WITH PLACE AND SENSE OF BELONGING

I am feeling a distance. An emotional distance from writing this section. A physical and temporal distance from where I am now and the time I interviewed the teachers. I suspect it is not only due to the fact that some time had lapsed between conducting the interviews and the actual writing of this chapter. Perhaps it could be due to the distance I staged in conducting the formal interviews. Or perhaps it could be due to the process of "translation" I have thus far been engaging in that renders research "on" the teachers freezing these moments in the text. Or it could be the contradictions generated from my own claims towards poststructural perspectives and the very writings I have been representing which seem to reflect conventional qualitative research processes of representing the "narratives" of the teachers, assuming they are true and reflect their realities.

In a naïve and desperate attempt to retract and reject this distance, I consume myself in watching Japanese television. My hunger for Japanese television was not assuaged as I spent hours in front of my laptop clicking on the next soap opera, comedy show, documentary, and news that kept uploading onto the website. If it was not the consumption of television, I was on my iPhone exhausting all the news headlines coming in through a newly purchased Japanese phone application. One such news that caught my attention was of a politician scoffing at a journalist who was asked to leave the room after the politician was questioned for comments made about voluntary evacuees from Fukushima for fear of radiation and its effects.

As I further searched for news articles on this matter, I came across newspaper headlines such as *Japan Minister Quits After Inappropriate Comment on Disaster Zone* (*The Tribune*, 2017), *Abe Minister Resigns Following Gaffe on Japan's 2011 Earthquake* (Takahashi & Nonomiya, 2017), and *Japan Minister Quits After Saying It Was 'Better' Tsunami Hit the North of Country* (*The Guardian*, 2017). Considering the massive reconstruction cost incurred since the earthquake and nuclear power plant disaster, the then-Reconstruction Minister commented at a Liberal Democratic Party event that "it was better that this happened in the north-east" (Lies, 2017). While inappropriate to compare the effects of disaster from one region to another—and given that we cannot know how much of an effect a disaster at the scale of the Great East Japan Earthquake could have had in other regions—Prime Minister Shinzo Abe later told reporters that "it [the comment] was an extremely inappropriate comment and hurtful to people in the disaster zone, an act causing the people a reconstruction minister works for to lose trust in him" (Lies, 2017). Based on this comment that received heavy bashing from the media, then-Reconstruction Minister resigned days after the comment was made public.

The Reconstruction Minister's decision to distance himself from his primary effort of contributing to the reconstruction of the still heavily impacted areas is not an uncommon scenario for Japanese politicians—make a mistake, try to fix/cover the issue, and resign from their current position if Plan A does not work. I am not surprised by this minister's resignation, as even the position of prime minister has been changed once every year since the Koizumi cabinet, which lasted almost 6 years. It seems stability in the form of a solid and lasting cabinet under the leadership of one representative, since then-Prime Minister Koizumi, is a false promise in the Japanese political arena, although

Prime Minister Abe has been in office since 2012 with changes in his cabinet throughout the years.

With 200,000 people killed and missing since the earthquake and tsunami, the Fukushima nuclear power plant meltdown forced 160,000 people out of their homes, and 100,000 of these persons were still living in displacement 5 years after the disaster (McCurry, 2016). Statistics reported by the Reconstruction Agency (2017) on a periodic basis revealed that the number of evacuees in the North-Eastern regions have decreased significantly over the years since the earthquake; however, the number of evacuees in the South-Western regions has remained constant. The same report from the Reconstruction Agency also revealed that the total number of forced and voluntary evacuees in 2012 were approximately 344,000. As of August 2017, the approximate number of evacuees has decreased steadily to 87,000. Despite the changes in the number of evacuees over time, these numbers are strictly from those who have chosen to be included as part of these statistical reports. Furthermore, different reports provided different numbers perhaps due to different data collection mechanisms, thus suggesting the challenges of grasping the gravity of this disaster on the lives of those it continues to affect. It is safe to assume that there are evacuees who choose not to be identified as an evacuee from Fukushima to avoid identification with the disaster, especially since reports of tension between evacuees and hosting communities has increased (Hino, 2016).

For example, tension between the evacuees and communities hosting the evacuees was first reported in City H 30 km away from the nuclear power plant. Media coverage (Wada, 2013, 2015) reported graffiti written on the wall of F City Hall that read "Evacuees, go home!" Wada (2015) speculated that such tension can be traced to feelings

of anxiety stemming from the sudden increase in population, differences in compensation for damage incurred through the evacuation, and lack of infrastructure available for the rapid increase in population. While City H continued to work on alleviating such relationships in their city, news broke out at yet another city in 2016. This incident involved a junior high school student who reported being bullied at a school this student started attending after voluntarily evacuating to a different prefecture (Hino, 2016). Following this case, series of other bullying cases surfaced, which resulted in research conducted by the Ministry of Education to survey the actual conditions of bullying that involved evacuees from Fukushima prefecture (Izawa, 2017; *Nihon Keizai Shinbun*, 2017). Of the more than 190 bullying cases reported in this survey, 13 cases were concluded as directly related to the Great East Japan Earthquake and subsequent evacuation.

As I read through these articles, my attention was drawn to the distinction made between voluntary and involuntary evacuees. I visited the Tokyo Electric Power Company website as well as the Fukushima prefecture website to find out more of the intricate processes concerning payment for damages incurred through the nuclear power plant explosion and subsequent evacuation. In these readings, I learned how voluntary and involuntary evacuees were categorized within the divisions of evacuation zones, difficult to return zones, and restricted residence areas, and how the differentiation affected what types of reparations they could file. According to the Reconstruction Agency (2017), of the approximate 90,000 evacuees throughout Japan, 35,000 residents had evacuated outside of Fukushima prefecture. How were these categorizations being made and who categorizes?

Anne Allison's *Precarious Japan* (2013) focused on the "experiences" and lives of the Japanese in contemporary Japan amid its rapid economic changes. In particular, she highlighted the precariousness of citizenship and security through her extensive fieldwork in Japan. Pointing to the precarious nature of security in post-war Japan, Allison (2013) wrote how Japan had been "caught by the instabilities and inequities of neoliberal globalism run amok" (p. 5). Following the post-war era of reconstruction that was structured around the pillars of family, corporation, and school, Allison argued that Japan experienced a transformation in relation to employment and life as it is reflected, especially, by the experiences of homeless individuals and youth (ニート NEET or 引きこもり *hikikomori*). Amid what she referred to as the liquidization of work and life, the Great East Japan Earthquake simply accentuated what was already a "gooey wasteland of death and debris" (p. 7). One such example is how "home" being a place of security and comfort for many became a place of insecurity and precarity as the government delineated spaces that were deemed safe and not safe due to radiation exposure after the nuclear power plant explosion. Thus, even after the government designated certain areas as safe to return, residents were:

> unconvinced that they can be safe here, many are leaving (or breaking up the family, leaving the husband behind) to take their chances as "nuclear refugees" (genpatsu nanmin) elsewhere in the country—an elsewhere that means not only forsaking one's community, home, and (former) livelihood but also entering into what can be an alien and inhospitable terrain. (p. 12)

This discourse of (in)security also circulated in the 1960s, when the nuclear power plant was being constructed with the promise of safety and security housed within the capitalist rhetoric of progress during the reconstruction stages of post-war Japan (Goto, 2013; Takeuchi, 2012). It became a site for economic security as well where residents were

promised employment once the power plant was established. However, this notion of security, according to Allison (2013), began to dismantle as the "experiences" of security in the "home" began to shift with the rise in political instability in the 1990s. Such instability was characterized by an increase in domestic as well as youth violence, changes in hiring patterns, and a series of natural disasters highlighting the vulnerability of supposedly secure infrastructure. Changes in these social, cultural, political, and economic contexts did not occur as isolated instances but affected how the people related to one another within these contexts, thus challenging any notion of guaranteed security and permanence. Allison argued, "for many, the present is fraught, particularly when the reference point is a past remembered, or reinvented, as idyllically stable: a time when jobs and marriage were secure and a future—of more of the same—could be counted on" (p. 118). So, who belongs and who decides who belongs to these "communities" such as families and corporations once produced as places of security? How are discourses of normalcy circulating that constitute and are constituted by this idea of belonging to a community?

Discourses around payments of damage compensation produce the idea of subjects who survived these series of events and are now "eligible" to receive certain compensation for the damages incurred. Geographical boundaries determine which subjects are eligible for such compensation and benefits, and, at other times, determine whether they are subjected to prejudice against the perceived "experiences" of residents (Tani, 2013; Wada, 2013, 2015). Discourse of security in Fukushima cannot be discussed without questioning the very idea of security as well as the foundation of an energy industry as a market that is given precedence over security as well as the production of

boundaries (Allison, 2013). These ideas of precarity (Allison, 2013; Butler, 2004) and "refugeeism" (Allison, 2013; Dryden-Peterson, 2011; Minh-Ha, 2011) are not unique to Japan. One can view such phenomena within other global "crises" characterized by cultural, political, social, and economic changes that produce particular representations and identifications of the "subject." Drawing on Arendt, who wrote "belonging to the community into which one is born [is] no longer a matter of course and not belonging no longer a matter of choice" (as cited in Allison, 2013, p. 53), Allison (2013) argued that the rise in nation states resulted in assumptions that "refugeeism is the new ordinary" (p. 53). Are there fissures to these boundaries that constitute subjects who belong and who decides who belongs? What becomes apparent in these fissures that point to conventions and normalcies that are no longer? And if one's existence is a constant reminder of this fissure, what becomes of "I," home, and "us?"

I start with Allison (2013) to understand but one interpretation of the social, political, and economic contexts of pre-Great East Japan Earthquake to explore discursive practices that constitute or are constituted by social, cultural, and historical contexts available to the teachers interviewed in this study. In this chapter, I explored my conversation with Nao, teacher from School Q, who was the assistant homeroom teacher for the third grade at the time of the interview, through a feminist poststructural lens on language and discourse (Miller, 2005; St. Pierre, 2000a, 2000b; Weedon, 1987) to reconsider how taken-for-granted assumptions around "belonging" and "home" can be imagined otherwise.

Engaging With Nao's Memories as a Student

> Nao: そこを目指そうとなったきっかけは小学校2年生の時の担任の先生のこう子供の関わり、ま、私も2年生だからこう、うる覚えな記憶もあるんですけど、すごいこう子供に寄り添った、うん、先生だなっていう、あったかい先生だなっていう。でこう、メリハリもつけてくれるしっていうのを2年生ながらに感じていて、自分もこういう先生になりたいかなっていうのが一番最初のスタートです。

> Nao: The reason why I aimed to become a part of the education department was because of my second grade homeroom teacher. This is from a long time ago so my memory is fuzzy but I remember my homeroom teacher being someone who was able to relate to her students. Someone who was warm at heart and yet also exercise explicit meaningful objectives when the students needed it. Even though I was in the second grade, I was observing her and thinking I would like to become a teacher like her one day.

Nao referred to his second grade teacher when he spoke of his decisions to choose education as his career field. When I asked Nao to talk about some of her qualities that stood out to him, he chose to describe her ability to keep an eye on each and every child and the sincerity Nao felt as a student on the receiving end. When I asked him to share an episode that may have stuck out to him, he constructed images of this teacher as a caring teacher in ways that he felt happy when she praised him for getting a good grade on a writing test. As he recreated his memory, he realized that it was not a particular episode, specific quality, or skill that stood out to him, but rather the *interactions* he had with her that stood out to him. Nao chose to share with me episodes he recalled that triggered a feeling of comfort, care, and security in describing his interactions with this teacher—a positive attribute that has been described as needed in a teacher-student relationship (Gay, 2010; Ladson-Billings, 2007; Mercado, 1993; Noddings, 2008), but is also problematized for constructions of categories such as "woman" and "teacher" in essentialized and compartmentalized versions that do not explore its effects of contingencies as well as the situated-ness of any such categories (Miller, 2005).

Nao continued to tell me about the influences that triggered his interest to pursue a career as a teacher:

> Nao: まあ、それはでも、多分出会った全部の人だと思います。いろんな人の価値観、考え方、行動から多分今の自分になっているので、うん、先生だけ。こう、取り入れた部分は多分先生から得たものって多いと思うんですけど。逆に、こう、反面教師として、ああ、それはやらない方がいいかなっていうのは多分別なのを見てそう感じた部分もあると思うので、全部が先生だけっていうものではないと思う。
>
> Nao: Well, I think it is a mixture of all people whom I have met. Various people's values, ways of thinking, and actions have all contributed to how I am now, so, it's not solely because of that one teacher. Perhaps, I may have incorporated some skills or perspectives that I learnt from that one particular teacher but I have also learnt what not to do from others.

From this conversation, Nao spoke of his initial intent to become a teacher stemming from his encounters with his second grade homeroom teacher as well as the various encounters he had with individuals throughout his life. For example, Nao briefly spoke about his track and field coach who was strict in enforcing school code of conduct but interpreted by Nao as a sign of care for the students. Nao later explained that while his goal of becoming a teacher started off as a mere "dream" during elementary school, by junior high school he had considered various other career options, especially when the junior high school he attended offered career seminars as part of their school career education and development efforts. Nao's decision to become an educator was still vague during his junior high school years; however, he actualized this decision eventually when he pursued the field of education at a university located in a region further southeast of his hometown.

In this conversation, Nao shared that after completing his undergraduate degree, he pursued a master's degree to explore the connection between a child's psychological

well-being and lifestyle habits. When I asked him to share with me his recollections of graduate school, he mentioned the challenges of balancing study and extracurricular activities. He clarified by talking about his daily routine as a college student while focusing on his studies being a part of the track and field athletics team necessitated that he be able to manage his time productively. This way of life continued through his graduate school years as he challenged himself to engage with both study and extracurricular activities:

> Nao：なんかこう、自分の中で、あの、よく後輩が忙しいから何が出来ませんって言うのを聞いてて、そうなのかなって思って。忙しいから出来ないって結局、なんか、逃げなのかなと思って。でも、出来ないけどやらなきゃいけない事は、やっぱり、やらなきゃいけないし。うん、どうやってこう、効率良くやるかっていう方法を私は考えます。もう、出来ないから、じゃなくて、どうやってやるのか。って考えて、こう、優先順位をつけながら、一応やってたつもりです。
>
> Nao: My juniors would often complain how they were not able to do something because they were busy. But I was not sure if that is how it goes. It sounds like someone is running away from their problems if they make an excuse to not being able to accomplish something for lack of time. Whether you have time or not, if something needs to get done, it must get done. Instead of focusing on the "I cannot do this," I prioritized the order of things that must get done by asking myself "what must be done to get this done?"

Nao talked about the challenges of keeping up with his coursework, attending to the daily track and field training, and staying committed to his own master's research project, while also ensuring he was getting sufficient rest. Although these activities seem to have no relevance to how he understood teaching or himself as an educator beyond the research he was engaging in, Nao talked about how his graduate school lifestyle informed the ways in which he approached teaching:

> Nao: 見通しを持つことではその時の経験が武器になっていると思います。多分、大学院の時ほど今は、忙しくないと言ったら、語弊があるかもしれないんですけど。結局、朝起きて、ひたすら院生室で研究して、勉強して、途中、夕方、夜、２時間、3時間練習して帰ってきてまた研究して、寝て、起きて、の繰り返しなので。

今はもうちょっと流石に余裕があるので、うん、だから、こう、忙しい中をどう乗り切るかってなった時に、やっぱりその優先順位。何を最初にやらなきゃいけないのか、何をやらなくていいのか、の区別が出来るようになった事が、こう、うん、こう、この現場の中でもある程度次何、次何、いつまでに何をやんなきゃっていうのの整理はしやすくなったのかなとは思ってます。

Nao: I believe I was able to acquire the skills to have an outlook because of my graduate school experiences. Although this may not be the best way to phrase—I don't think I am as busy as I used to be when I was in graduate school. I mean, I would wake up in the morning, go to the lab to look at my data, study for my classes, then go to two to three hours of track practice, come home and look at my data, sleep, and then start all over again in the morning. Now I have a little bit more time to myself so when I am encountered with the challenges of feeling like I do not have enough time to accomplish all the things I would like to accomplish, I am able to prioritize in the order of importance. This is something that I am able to apply in the classroom as I arrange all the things that must get done especially against deadlines.

In these statements, I perceived Nao as someone who valued relationships with others—especially in relation to how his actions may impact those around him. Perhaps, this may also be due to the discourses he internalized over time, which also constructed his sense of belonging as well as being a "teacher." I also heard Nao's child-centered approaches to teaching as he spoke of his master's project when he shared that「子供です。はい。大人がどうこうっていうものには視点はおいてないです」—"the focus is on the child. My focus was never on what or how adults think in terms of children's well-being." When I asked him where this interest stemmed from, he told me that it was based on his desire to help support and improve the life of children. Starting to hear the common thread of child centered-ness in Nao's path to becoming an educator, I asked him about his process of choosing to obtain his teaching licensure and returning to Fukushima to teach:

Nao: 結局、私の中で、あの、よくこう、大学に行って、その大学先で就職する方とかもいっぱいいたんですけど。でも、私はもう、学生の間だけいて、で、やっぱり、福島で育ったので、福島の子供を育てたいという思いしかなくて。なんか、向こうで頑張ってきて、向こうの子供達とも知り合ったりとか。うん。震災以降もそれ

こそ、こう、いろんな、その時持ってたというか、データ取らせてもらった子たちから、こう、お手紙とか頂いたりはしたんですけど。でも、やっぱり、こう、福島の方を育てたいと思ったので、そこに迷いはなかったです。

Nao: When it comes down to it, many people tend to find employment where they went to college. But I was located in the southeast region only during my college years. I was raised in Fukushima so I wanted to raise children of Fukushima. Of course, I worked hard during college and got to know the kids well who sent me letters after the earthquake. But even with all that, I had no doubt that I wanted to raise children of Fukushima.

While Nao believed he had forged good relationships with the community where he attended college and graduate school, he was certain about returning "home" to teach in schools located in Fukushima—a place Nao spoke of in relation to his sense of belonging. His return to teach in Fukushima reminds me of Allison (2013) who described the economic, political, and historical discourses around neoliberalism that shifted how relationships were being understood as well as enacted. What was once considered secure in materiality in the form of employment, familial, and communal ties, according to Allison, were already shifting towards the unknown well before the Great East Japan Earthquake. Ties to his "home," despite these shifts in social, cultural, economic, and political discourses that produced division and separation, I understood to have outweighed the connections he established during his undergraduate and graduate school. I continued to read through my conversations with Nao to help me understand how he constituted "home" and his sense of belonging within social and historical discourses.

A Harmonious Place—Sensibilities of a Teacher-in-the-Making

Nao shared he was born and raised in Town E, located south of Town A. I asked him to tell me more about what he remembered about Town E. Although different in origin from the other teachers I interviewed, Nao referred to his memories of Town E in

relation to City B—perhaps his effort to help me understand it in relation to my own familiarity with City B:

> Nao：んんーやっぱりこうB市も似てるんですけど、すごい、こう、緑豊か、自然豊かな所で、例えば、小さい時なんかだと夏場にはすごい、こう、ホタルが多かったりだとか、あの、海辺の近くなのですごい浜風が涼しかったりだとか、んん、川にはこう鮭が上がってきたりだとか、本当にいろんな生き物とか自然と触れ合う機会が多い。で、こう、近所の人との付き合いも多いようなこう温っかい土地でしたね。
>
> Nao: Nnn…City B is very similar in the sense that my hometown is lush with green and full of nature. For example, there were lots of fireflies during the summer time. Also, since we were by the sea, the sea breeze during the summer brought temporal break from the heat. And…salmon would be going against the river. I had a lot of opportunities to interact with nature and animals. It was a place where I had a lot of opportunities to interact and forge relationships with our neighbors.

Nao's reference to his hometown is characterized by his recollection of a series of events and references to the geographic location that physically drew the community together. Curious about Nao's experiences growing up in Town E and their influences on Nao as a teacher, I asked Nao to tell me more about such events. Nao explained that while there were events that were part of the school "curriculum," many of the events occurred organically, one of which occurred during the salmon cultivation season. According to Nao, neighbors, friends, and families would gather by the river to share foods and enjoy the natural gifts unique to the season. While some events were directly associated with the school "curriculum" and had educational objectives, Nao primarily in this interview recollected the experience he had by being a part of the geographic location and community activities. This very space and place, with others, which are described later, became a site in which Nao formulated his understanding of belonging through these annual events that constituted his sensibility of belonging and originating from Town E.

Although Nao constantly reminded me that his memories of his childhood were mere memory and may not be accurate as an adult speaking in the present, I perceived his reference to Town E as reflective of what he described as a concrete place associated with feelings of harmony and unity that can be retrieved in his recollections of the past—a place past that renders a particular way of being as subjects as well as sensibilities that provided a sense of connection to members of the community from Town E through such memories. As I revisited Nao's interpreted "narrative" about Town E, I wondered how this assumed harmonious place may no longer remain an objective and tangible place for Nao in relation to the Great East Japan Earthquake. How does the signifier "home" continue to shift—for both Nao and myself—and how do I grapple with such changing memories, associations, and understandings?

Returning "Home" to Teach

While contexts are different, Pinar (2004) and Casemore (2008) recognized the significance of place in the daily "experiences" of Southerners in the United States and thus argue for a "curriculum of place" embodying these "experiences," histories, and cultures of the American South. Drawing from social psychoanalysis, the two authors described the history, cultures, and heritage of the American South, including the history of racism and its violence, to re-engage the public with the reconstruction of their past in personal as well as collective ways as a "curricular" project. Pinar (2004), for example, proposed a Southern "curriculum," in particular, that addresses the "repression of memory and history" (p. 243), especially among White Southerners in the United States, to reclaim moral responsibility as politically conscious individuals in self-reflexive ways. While my conversation with Nao did not touch upon the political implications of the

economic or historical development of Fukushima, Nao's affiliation to "place" is implicated in his interpreted memories leading up to his decisions of becoming a teacher (Smith & Watson, 2010). When I asked him to speak more on why he felt a strong connection to returning to Fukushima to teach, Nao stated the following:

> Nao：んんと、やっぱり、福島の子を育てたいというのをたどって行くと、やっぱり、2年生の時に夢として思ってたその先生が、こう、自分を育ててくれたっていう思いがあるから、だから、こう、自分も同じ福島に戻ってそういう事を福島の子達にしてあげたい。結局福島の先生に育てられたから、私も福島の子供を育ててあげたい。っていうか育てられるのであれば、是非っていう風には思ってました。
>
> Nao: After all, when I follow the thread of why I wanted to raise children of Fukushima as a teacher, it takes me back to the dream I started to have in the second grade. I felt that that teacher raised me, so I also wanted to return to Fukushima and raise the children of Fukushima. Or more like, if I could be given the opportunity to do so, I would have humbly taken the opportunity.

"Place" becomes an important aspect of Nao's path to become a teacher as he "narrates" his memories of his past while also recreating these new meanings of how he constituted his memories of becoming a teacher as part of his interpreted "experiences" (Smith & Watson, 2010). While Nao warned me that his "memories" of his "experiences" may suggest regionalism, he was adamant about reminding me that these "experiences" were not representative of the region and that his desire to return to Fukushima and teach was because of his own attachments to his "experiences" growing up. In fact, Nao's attachments and "memories" of growing up in Fukushima were what brought him back to Fukushima as a teacher.

I realize that in this writing, I have constructed Nao as someone who has geographical ties to "place"—"Fukushima"—and has, in a sense, constituted a sense of belonging around this "sense of place" (Casemore, 2008; Kincheloe et al., 1994; Pinar, 2004; Smith & Watson, 2010). Considering the devastating effect of the nuclear power

plant incident, Nao's recollection of Fukushima as a place of nature and community seemed to counter how it has come to be depicted through the media as well as by some of the other teachers who have shared their sentiments towards the future. While the Great East Japan Earthquake produces the idea of separation, division, and uncertainty, especially through the media reports mentioned earlier in this chapter, Nao's attachments to this place based on a memory he constructed from the past was around his interpreted sense of community, an appreciation of relationships, and a harmonious relationship with nature. Within these constructions, Nao continued to speak of a Fukushima based on his interpreted memories as well as a "place" that is to be interrupted, disrupted, and made unfamiliar with the series of events following the earthquake of March 11, 2011.

Interruptions to Nao's Sense of Belonging—3/11

At the time of the interview, 5 years following the earthquake and subsequent evacuation, Nao had taught professionally for 7 years. During his first year of teaching, Nao taught fifth and sixth grade math as a subject. Once he moved to the school in Town A, he was assigned his second year as a homeroom teacher for the fourth grade. Unlike the previous year when he taught only during math class, he recognized the sense of responsibility he felt as he realized that only he, as a teacher, could move the class forward in terms of academics and homeroom activities—a unifying entity for the class.

Nao's recollection and his regional sense of belonging is interrupted with the 2011 earthquake and subsequent tsunami when Nao was forced to evacuate his own home to a location that was designated "safer"—a local gymnasium located within Town E. Within 24 hours of this initial evacuation, Town E made a decision to evacuate its

residents voluntarily after news of the nuclear power plant explosion. Nao, too, followed this guidance accordingly and found himself evacuated further southwest of his hometown.

At the time of the earthquake, Nao had just become appointed as a homeroom teacher for one of the three classes in the fourth grade. It was his first year becoming a homeroom teacher after having taught math as a part-time teacher. He recalled feeling a renewed sense of responsibility from the time he was a part-time teacher supporting the homeroom teacher. From supporting math classes as a teaching assistant, Nao was now a newly appointed homeroom teacher who had to teach all subject matters to his fourth grade class and engage in classroom management. Nao talked about his sense of anticipation and renewed sense of responsibility when he first met his students during the opening ceremony of the new academic year:

> Nao: 最初は多分やらなきゃいけないという思いで多分、スタートの時点では結局子供もどういう子がいるのかとかってのも全くわからないので。で、担任もした事ないので、やらなきゃいけないっていう思いではスタートしてるんですけど。実際、あと、修業式があって、子供達と、こう、関わっていく中で、やらなきゃいけないというところからやってあげたいという思いには変わってったとは思います。
>
> Nao: At first I was operating from a place of obligation. I think it was partly because I did not know who and what type of students I would have in my homeroom class. It was also my first time being a homeroom teacher. But from the moment I began interacting with the students I realize that my sentiment has become that of wanting to support the students not from obligation but because I want to.

I asked him to tell me more about this change in how he perceived his initial sense of obligation to his students and he shared the following:

> Nao：んん、やっぱり、こう、子供たちが、自分が頑張れば子供達も答えてくれるし。子供達の頑張りにはこっちも答えてあげたいし。結局、教員と子供って、大人と子供であっても人と人との関わり合いなので、人と人とが関わりあっていく中で当然情とかも湧いてくるし。交流していけば、こんな事やってあげたいなとか、こ

> ういう風に変えてあげたいなっていう思いが出てくると思うので。そういう部分も、はい、強くありました。
>
> Nao: So, after all, when I persevere the kids respond to my efforts. I also want to respond to the kid's tenacity. Even though our relationship is of teacher (adult) and student (child), it is ultimately based on how one human being is interacting with another human being. Naturally, in such interactions, we form attachments to one another. When we interact with one another I think we start wishing to do things for the other person.

In constructing these "narratives" from the "data," I gathered that his initial sense of obligation shifted to that of wanting to support his students as a result of his daily interactions with his students as he perceived his interactions with his students as having an effect on their academic as well as social development. As an example of such efforts, Nao talked about how he approached his classroom management through the "10 *Ai*." The Japanese term *ai* can be translated to mean love (愛-*ai*) or to engage in an action together (〜し合う-*shi au*). Based on this same pronunciation but difference in meaning, Nao started with four action items to apply to his first homeroom class—to help one another (助け合い-*tasuke ai*), to encourage one another (励まし合い-*hagemashi ai*), to enhance one another (高め合い-*takame ai*), and to accept one another (認め合い-*mitome ai*):

> Nao: その、例えば、助け合いとか認め合いとかっていうのを学級経営上で常にコンセプトに入れてて。結局、何々し合うって、一人じゃ何々し合えないでしょって。何をするにも何々し合うためには必ず二人以上の人が集まって生まれるものであって。それの「あい」を育むことで、お互いにプラスの方向に育っていこうって。
>
> Nao: For example, I include concepts of helping one another and to accept one another as part of how I approach my classroom management. Ultimately, in order to engage or interact in an action, you need the engagement of another person. So I teach the kids when you have two people together that's when you are able to nurture the concept "to engage together" towards the creation of something positive.

Over time, these four items developed to 10 items facilitating the idea of engaging with one another to enhance positive behavior among the students. According to Nao, these items have become helpful especially in situations where students are working as a group and when certain individuals are tempted to act on their own will and impulse. Nao perceived their behavior to be potentially disruptive to the group dynamics. As a teacher, Nao is committed to nurturing, within these students, ideas related to engaging with one another in order to enhance positive interactions—qualities that, he believed, were already within the students. As a newly appointed homeroom teacher, Nao continued to work with his students on these qualities, thus recreating what he hoped could be an environment of care, safety, and belonging based on these tenets. During the time of the interview, he taught several grades and told me the following:

> Nao: 4、5、6年生。はい。でも面白いです。今までは同じ学年のいろんな教科を見てたのを、今度は同じ教科の違う学年を見るので、すごい系統生とかが見えたりするので、うん、だから本当にいろんなことを経験できるのっていろんな気づきがありいろんな学びがあるので。うん、大変だけど面白いなっては思います。はい。
>
> Nao: I teach fourth, fifth, and sixth grade science and integrated study. Until now I taught one grade and many subjects for that particular grade. But now, I teach the same subject for several different grades. I now get to see how ideas are related and developed over time. Being able to experience many things allows one to realize new things. So while there are challenges, I enjoy this new challenge.

In our conversation, Nao did not speak much about his lesson plans or make reference to the official school “curriculum” any more than his reference above when he spoke of the correlation between subject areas as a linear sequential development; however, his continuous reference towards an idea of “nurturing” what is already innately within a student not only reminded me of “curriculum” based on the idea that students learn in progression. Pinar (2004) reminded me that the task of this very inquiry is not to seek

clarity in how these teachers define "curriculum," but how they speak of their interpreted "experiences" as related to their conceptualizations of "curriculum" and to seek spaces in which these conceptualizations can be complicated. To this end, Pinar wrote, "curriculum theory aspires to understand the overall educational significance not only of the school curriculum, but of the 'curriculum' writ large, including popular culture, historical moment, life history, all intersecting and embodied in the specific students sitting in our classroom" (p. 249).

My construction of Nao's decision to teach in Fukushima is partly linked to how he gave meaning to his "identity" as a teacher as it related to his interactions with his students. For example, he spoke of his concerns about how stereotypes of the category "Japanese" were linked to having low self-esteem compared to other ethnicities (Loveless, 2015). His incorporation of the 10-*Ai* was an effort not only to support academic learning but to do the learning in action. Thus, while Nao was the teacher during the majority of the classroom hours, by enacting the 10-*Ai*, his students became student to Nao, student to other classmates, also also teacher in other instances.

Nao's understandings around his relationship and engagement with his students are not isolated from the social, political, and historical contexts available to him. In fact, the events following the Great East Japan Earthquake significantly impacted his understandings as well as connections to how he spoke of these shifting relationships.

Connectivity and Engagement During Evacuation

Following the evacuation, Nao temporarily moved to a city approximately 35 km southwest of his hometown until requested by the school administration to support the reopening of the elementary school of Town A in April of that same year (2011). Upon

news of this reopening of the school, Nao told me that he had no hesitation in deciding to relocate to City B to join efforts in welcoming the students back to the new school year.[1] While Nao had already been teaching at this school prior to the earthquake and evacuation, when I asked him why he chose to return to teach after the evacuation, he told me that it was not much of a choice but a notification from the prefecture informing him of his new hiring location. When I asked him further about the choice and decision to come back to teach at this particular school site, he told me:

> Nao：わからないですけど。あってもなくても、私はもうどっち道来れるものなら来たいと思ってたので。うん。結局ある日突然「さようなら」って言ってバッと散って下校したのがまさかこの離ればな、全国各地の離ればなれの生活になるとは思ってなかったし。当時、こう、所在確認で担任として、こう、各家庭に連絡はしてはいたんですけど。当然、電話連絡なんで、声は聞こえるけど、姿、表情は見えないので。で、こう、個人では、こう、やっぱ、集まるっていうきっかけを作れないので。で、学校が始まるというのは、やっぱり、みんなと会えるとかみんなの姿、表情が見えるという意味では、うん、ちょっと、こう、[inaudible]っていう感じがして。うん、是非来たいなっていう思いしかなかったです。だから、こう、多分選択肢があっても、私は是非行かせてくださいという返答をしたと思います。
>
> Nao: I am not sure whether I had a choice or not. Either way, if I did have a choice, I wanted to return to teach at this school. I mean, we said "goodbye" like it was any other day but since then we have all dispersed to many different locations. Right after the earthquake, I made phone calls to each and every one of my students to check on them and their whereabouts. Since I could only communicate with them via phone, it was hard to picture them or their facial expression through it all. As an individual it is very hard to get everyone together so the commencement of the new school year was a great means to see every student in person [inaudible]. That's one reason why I wanted to come to this school again. So whether I had a choice or not to return to this school, I would have expressed my strong wish to come to this school.

While Nao indicated that his decision to return to this school as a teacher was based on an administrative decision and less of a personal decision, I referred back to his initial reasons of choosing to teach in Fukushima after he obtained his teacher certification—

[1] Generally, the new school year begins in April and ends the following year in March.

Nao described his decision to return to Fukushima to contribute to the education and development of children in his own hometown that had supported his own growth and development. In hearing Nao's response, I wanted to know more about why and how this particular school and location had grown to have significance for his understanding of his own teacher "experiences," considering how he spoke of the administrative decision in returning to teacher at School Q. When I asked Nao what meaning or feelings teaching at this school evoked for him, he responded:

> Nao: 特別ですよね。何よりも、こう、初めて着任したのが Q 小。初めて担任したのが Q 小。初めて卒業生を出したのも Q 小。当たり前だけど初めてって一回しかないじゃないですか。その、いろんな初めてが、こう、ぎゅっと、こう、凝縮されて。後、もう、二度と起きてほしくないけど、この、全町避難を経験したのもうちの学校だし。その、やっぱ、思い出が多分違うというか。別に他に新しく行く学校を軽視するわけではなくて、やっぱり、いろんな事があり、良い事もあったし、辛い事もあっただけに、多分この学校で過ごした事っていうのは忘れないかなっていう。
>
> Nao: It's special. More than anything, this is the very first school I was appointed as a teacher. This is the very first school I had my own homeroom class. This is also the very first school I had my first graduating class. Of course, one experiences their "first time" only once and for me a variety of "first times" occurred here in a short span of time. I never wish for this to happen again but the whole town evacuation also happened within a town that houses this school. I feel like the memories are different. I don't mean to undermine the experiences that could happen at other schools; however, it is here at this school where I experienced both good and painful, and so I will never forget the times I spent here at this school.

While Nao, during the interview, was hesitant to talk in depth about his own personal experiences around March 11 even after 5 years (at the time of interview) since the event leading to the evacuation of residents, he touched on the impacts of March 11 through his professional relationship to his students and the particular school location.

Nao informed me that the students from Town A had become accustomed to farewell parties because of the increase in families deciding to relocate to other areas in

Fukushima or elsewhere. He elaborated by suggesting that in most elementary schools he is familiar with, a teacher might have one or at most two students who might transfer out of their school during the academic year. However, he emphasized that he had seen 10 students transfer out of his school since evacuating to Town A. Nao explained that should there be 10 students transferring out of this school, his students would experience 10 farewell parties; over time, the students had become accustomed to and eventually well-equipped at hosting farewell parties. Under such circumstances, it is important, said Nao, to relay the significance of relationships and connectivity among the students:

> Nao: なんだろう。それこそ、お互いに会いに来てくれるとか。結局会いに来ようと思った背景にはその会いに行きたい相手の姿が多分頭に浮かぶから会いにくるんであって。そういう風に、こう、実際離れてしまっても、どっかこう記憶の中とか気持ちの中にその人の姿があることが繋がりかな。
>
> Nao: When an individual makes the effort to see someone it is often because an image of the other person appeared in that person's mind. So even if one is apart from the other person, if that person's image appears in one's memory or feelings, we are somehow connected to that person.

Through multiple case studies, Weedon (2004) articulated how one produces a sense of belonging through memories of family and communities. Nao spoke of his interpreted memories of School Q and his students prior to as well as post evacuation in ways that referred back to the 10-*Ai*. While the 10-*Ai* were created to be practiced inside the classroom as ways to encourage the students' connections to one another, this connectivity extended beyond the boundaries of the classroom. While Nao saw many of his students leave School Q, his references to remembering and memories are implicated within the 10-*Ai,* even after his students left the geographical boundaries of his classroom and Fukushima. Nao continued to share that such "experiences" of being forced out of one's familiar surroundings might trigger a feeling of sympathy, which he also initially

felt towards the students and their current circumstances. Not only were the students forced to become accustomed to a place of different temperament, climate, and cultural heritage, but they were also expected to perform well academically in school while considering the uncertainties of daily life that they may have observed in their homes as well as in conversation with their classmates. Yet, the extensions of his connections to his students and their families beyond the geographical boundaries of Fukushima as place redefined how the students and Nao "connect" to one another in relation to place.

In listening to Nao speak of his interpretation of connectivity amid teaching in Town A, I was intrigued by his thoughts on time and how it related to teaching. Instead of feeling devastated or helpless amid the challenges of being torn apart by distance and impacted by the difficult life decisions families might choose to make for their future, Nao shed light on how such trying circumstances had allowed him to "reflect" as a teacher.

> Nao：ええ、もう多分震災とか関係なく、もう、私の主観でしかないんですけど。すごい自分自身が子供に育てられてるなっていう思いを。子供と、こう、親御さんに育てられてるなっていうのは A 町にいて感じましたね。やっぱ、子供を、スタート時点では、子供をどう育てるか教員だからっていう、なんかこう、目線で感じていたものがあったんですけど。もちろん、授業を教えたりとか、物事の判断とかをするきっかけを与えたりとかはするんですけど。でも、それって絶対に一方通行ではないなって。教えなきゃじゃなくて、それこそ、教えあう方向性が必要っていうか、あるんだなっていうのを現場に入って、この子達とこの親御さんと関わってすごく感じました。はい。うん。だからすごい、この、A 町にいた間の教員人生ってすごいこう自分の中で教員としても人としても多分一生、その、忘れられない財産にはなるし。多分、あなたにとって武器は何ですか、っていうか、強みは何ですかって聞かれたら、私は多分 A 町で過ごしたその8年間ですって多分。A 町で出会った人たちと過ごした思い出と経験が今の自分を大きく作ってくれてるので、それが私の強みですって多分、答えるかなと思うので。あの時震災があった時に A 町にいられた事、そして、震災後もこうやってこっちに来て A 町の学校に関われて、しかも、その間に2回も卒業生を出させてもらえたという事にはもう本当に感謝しかないです。そして絶対忘れないです。はい。

> Nao: What I will share with you has nothing to do to with the earthquake but is subjective. I really feel that I have been able to grow because of the kids and their families. Of course as a teacher we teach lessons and provide opportunities for students to be able to make decisions, so when I first started teaching I always wondered how I can raise students as a teacher. But having taught in the field and having interacted with the students and families at this school, I no longer think this is a one-way process. It is not about how to teach the students but how can we teach one another. So, the time I have spent here as a teacher and as a person will forever be my treasure. If I am ever asked what is your strength, I would refer to the eight years I have spent at this school. The people, memory, and experiences I have had here have molded me into who I am. I experienced the earthquake in Town A and have been able to continue my engagement with the school. And for that I am grateful because I was able to see off two graduating classes.

Not wanting to speak of his relationship with his students in relation to the earthquake, Nao instead spoke of the "experiences" he had and shared together with his students. Smith and Watson (2010) repeatedly reminded me that the act of remembering is a contested autobiographical act when "narrated memory is an interpretation of a past that can never be fully recovered" (p. 22). In this remembering, Nao engaged in self-reflexivity as he warned me, several times, that his "narratives" are subjective and thus open to further interpretation. In hearing Nao speak of his interpreted "experience," I am pushed to think of how Nao's interpreted "experience" relates to the reconceptualization of "curriculum." Place is often spoken of in relation to meaningful identity structured within cultural, social, historical, and political contexts; however, scholars have problematized and made strange such static versions of "identity" that shut out further imaginings of subjectivity (Casemore, 2008; Weedon, 2004). In this conversation with Nao, he chose not to relate his understanding of teacher "identity" to the Great East Japan Earthquake but to his students. It is in this engagement with his students, not the event, that his sense of "belonging" as well as "curriculum" in-the-making can be envisioned as Nao continues to evolve and shift within these relationships with his students.

Nao continued redefining how he understood his relationship with his students, given that the disaster continues to affect geographical redefinitions of boundaries based on levels of security and safety delineated by the government.

Redefining Boundaries and Belonging

The transcript I created reflecting my conversation with Nao highlighted how Nao spoke of his relationships and interactions in terms of bonds and connectivity with his students, teachers, and communities that surrounded him before, during, and after March 11. In hearing him speak of the ways in which his classroom size has been affected and his understanding of the importance of relationships, I cannot help but wonder how the decrease in student population is impacting the continued operation of this school in City B as well as Nao's sense of responsibility to "raise the children of Fukushima." I suspect changes in the student population not only affect the very physical existence of the school and individuals housed in the school, but also the sense of belonging associated with being a part of this community. While I have come to learn that decisions of remaining in City B or relocating elsewhere are based on various factors such as economic opportunity, health concerns, and educational opportunities (Takeuchi, 2012; Tani, 2013), I am wanting to explore Nao's comments around continued relationships with his students beyond the borders of Town A and City B as related particularly to a sense of belonging.

In conversing with Nao as well as constructing the interpreted "narratives" of Nao, I have been grappling with my own sense of belonging which stems from the ways in which I have spoken about my perceived fixed identities. For example, during my conversations with Nao, I shared about my occasional discomforts of growing up biracial

in Japan as I struggled to find a community to belong to. In constructing Nao's "narratives," I realize that my own struggle towards defining and knowing my own "self" stem from the idea of the "knowing subject" and the discourses that may be available for me to do so.

Part of Weedon's (2004) work in *Identity and Culture* has been helpful in understanding my own desire to define identity and the issues that arise when such definitions serve to maintain existing inequalities, inequities, and injustices in the spaces I occupy. For example, drawing from postmodern and postcolonial writers such as Homi Bhaba (Rutherford, 1990) and Gloria Anzaldúa (1987), Weedon (2004) referred to women of color who have conceptualized notions of *hybridity*. In explaining this idea of hybridity, Weedon outlined the history of the term that may have stemmed from the slave trade and colonialism that saw hybridity in terms of racial and/or ethnic mixing. However, scholars such as Bhaba (Rutherford, 1990) and Anzaldúa (1987) have theorized this concept of hybridity in ways that birth a complex interplay of what has been referred to as the *third space* or the *mestiza*. While histories and ethnicities of these scholars differ, the idea behind such conceptualizations of hybridity challenges the urge not only to define and categorize but also to deconstruct existing categories such as race, ethnicity, and gender that give rise to binary conceptualizations of such identities that maintain existing inequalities. Working with theoretical perspectives that may often be categorized as postcolonial and postmodern, Weedon also incorporated a poststructural lens to her analysis. This allows her analysis to challenge notions of the "knowing subject" to remind her readers that identities are not reflections of a reality, but are

produced through language and, thus, problematize existing power relations that sustain social inequities.

This idea of hybridity and Weedon's work around identity and belonging are helpful for me to understand how I relate to the various subject positions I am tempted to define, especially in thinking how these positions affect my relation to "home." For example, I occupy a space in which stereotypical understandings of being Japanese or Black female intersect within historical, political, and social discourses that allow certain enactments of such. At the same time, I also enact being Japanese and Black and female. Within these intersections, I find it challenging to delineate a clear boundary between these categories as well as how I relate to my own constructions of "home"—a place at times uninhabitable but that is also the very place that produces these positions.

In representing these identities as part of my autobiographical work, I am reminded of Bhaba who said, "the importance of hybridity is not to be able to trace two original moments from which the third emerges, rather hybridity to me is the 'third space' which enables other positions to emerge" (Rutherford, 1990, p. 211). In this writing, I am no longer occupying the positions I once recognized and described as I see "intersections" with the "narratives" I have constructed involving Nao's conceptualizations of belonging and "home."

I come to this conversation as a researcher interested not only in how Nao speaks of his relation to "home," but in how I am changed in understanding my own sense of belonging within a place I often refer to as "home." Nao's understandings of "home" as well as affiliations to Town A are produced within the "narratives" he constructs around his professional teacher "identity." In particular, Nao's meaningful affiliations to Town

A, in turn, constitutes a particular version of his teacher "self" that is positively associated with the school, despite the events that have separated him and his students. The ways in which we both understood, interpreted, and enacted our sense of belonging and "home" in this conversation become the very site in which we produced meanings and understandings of "home" and belonging, which became only possible within such iterations. Nao's focus on connectivity and engagement between individuals seems ever more critical—especially in post-311 Japan—where the perceived sense of engagement and bonds are, by some, considered to be breaking down due to increased movements among families relocating for reasons of economic and educational opportunities as well as physical and mental well-being. Perhaps this is one reason why School T and School Q had implemented research projects for students from Town A to get to know their hometown to highlight connectivity among people, geography, and culture. These seem to be, in fact, materials crafted to deny the false belief that one is isolated and efforts to maintain the traditions and cultures of Town A.

While conversations around "place" contributed to the ways in which Nao and I constructed our understandings around our sense of belonging, Weedon (2004) pushed me to interrogate these very assumptions that constitute our sense of being. My conversations with Nao reflect our habitual tendencies to speak of ourselves in relation to the meanings we give to "place." For example, I constructed Nao's "narratives" based on the ways in which he spoke of his multiple "selves" in relation to the ways in which he enacted the cultural and social discourses that were available to him as a graduate student, novice teacher, and "returnee" teacher in Fukushima. And in these constructions, Nao enacted the responsible and caring teacher who is committed to educating and

raising students who positively identified with Fukushima. Yet, the earthquake and subsequent evacuation disrupt these enactments when meanings associated with place are open for redefinition and identification. It is in this moment of re-identification that I met Nao who maintained such productions of the responsible and caring "teacher" amid changes in boundaries and the ways in which relationships were maintained.

INTERLUDE—SEEKING ENTRY TO A PLACE CALLED "HOME"

I have learned to tolerate this flight to Japan that feels as if it will never end—a competition with my own patience over a course of almost 24 hours. Time elapses in travelling through space that extends ahead of me for thousands of kilometers as the plane makes its way westward from New York towards the far east. I turn on the electronic map in front of me as the pilot turns on the "return to your seat" sign—a strategy I often take to calm my nerves during a flight and locate the plane on a live map, as if orienting the plane location against a map will smooth out the ride. Travelling from New York, my sense of time is disoriented as the plane physically crosses an imaginary and, yet, clearly demarcated International Date Line on the electronic and brightly lit map in front of me, even as my eyes tear up from exhaustion. The Date Line clearly cuts across the Pacific Ocean while zigzagging around a few countries like Kiribati and Samoa heading down towards the South Pole. Although imaginary, the Date Line signals a concrete difference in my mind—difference not only in terms of time zone and location but histories of its people.

As the plane makes initial contact, a few hours later, with the concrete and slows down to pull into the designated gate in Tokyo, I am overwhelmed with fatigue and relief. When the plane comes to a complete halt, many passengers around me jolt up to assemble their belongings and remain standing waiting for the plane doors to open. While it seems that I have arrived "home" in Japan, I feel my heart rate go up not only because of the excitement but also because I anticipate having to "switch" my mannerism back into being Japanese—will I be recognized as a "Japanese" woman? This questioning of

my own performances as "Japanese" and "foreign" are blurred within my illusory sense of "belonging"—like the International Date Line—imaginary and present. For instance, the phrases used to identify difference such as haafu (half Japanese) or gaijin (foreigner) functioned in my life to accentuate my perceived difference between my Japanese mother and myself as I was never fully Japanese. In the next few minutes, I anticipate switching from being an English-speaking passenger to being one of the "Japanese" passengers requesting re-entry to her "home" country. Passport in hand, I am back where I started—requesting re-entry into my supposed place of "origin." This physical journey back "home" should have been a repetition of the path I had already taken—an already familiar path following through the traces already travelled to bring me back to where I started. Yet, in this "home-coming" I am disoriented because I do not recognize this path nor myself in this once familiar place—a place of origin—a place I tell friends I am going "home."

Henry (2003) spoke about her process in engaging in fieldwork as her and research participants' "identities" unraveled in the process of her qualitative research. Unlike my naïve perception of "coming home," an undoing of a journey already taken, Henry wrote that "representing oneself at 'home' is a process that is located within complicated social and historical contexts" (p. 232). She acknowledged as well as problematized the taken-for-granted assumptions around representations that almost always involve power relations in doing fieldwork. In my own attempts in doing research in a place I constitute as "home," I find myself trying to claim an "insider" role while I am also constantly reminded that I am an "outsider" culturally, racially, and socially even in conversation with the teachers in Fukushima as I explain my racial heritage as well as

my private education background, while at the same time leaving out the part that I was raised in a single-mother household, afraid that the latter information would construct me as less than the knowledgeable researcher. Henry (2003) challenged researchers engaging in feminist qualitative research to challenge "any uniform idea of the researcher and conceptualizing the field as a site of complex power relations" (p. 239). In this very dissertation study, representing my interpretations of this research around "home" is a constant battle between my own habit to seek familiarity while also interrupting such tendencies as I construct "narratives" based on "data" I interpret—which are implicated in issues of power as I interpret, translate, and represent these supposedly unproblematic "narratives" as complete, authentic, and true. Such a habit surfaces in every one of my visits to Fukushima where I walk through space as if I will get a better connection to this place as well as with the teachers and administrators who "experienced" the Great East Japan Earthquake.

I do not hold any specific memories past or ties to this place called Town A or claim any ties to Fukushima other than the memories that have been shared with me. I feel like an "outsider" not having any ties to Town A and yet, at the same time, an "insider," as I expect myself to know the social cues expected of a Japanese woman. I remind myself time after time that it will be all right if I use a wrong form of Japanese phrases to express my respect to seniors because the teachers would understand that I am "different." Certain that I will not be able to step foot into Town A with these teachers, I attempt to compensate this perceived lack of affiliation by exploring the streets of City B on foot. I visit many of its historic sites such as the gracious castle in City B and memorial sites to learn the history of this place that now houses many of the residents of

Town A. What are the teachers, students, and families seeing, hearing, smelling, and feeling in this city? I walk through the sweltering heat and at other times the frigid cold of City B—a valley surrounded by mountains that contain the oppressive heat during the summer and snowfall during the long winter months—as if I will be able to get the answers to my questions.

During one of these walks, I visited a memorial site. A woman working at a gift store offered me an umbrella. Initially, I politely refused her offer until I saw a series of steep steps ahead of me. Expecting brief refuge under the black umbrella offered to me, I humbly accepted this offer and continued my exploration to visit the gravesite of young men who took as their mission to protect their history and culture during a turbulent time of uncertainty and change in the 1800s. The memorial site soars over City B and, as I climbed, I saw the castle far ahead that these young men may also have seen as they fought through the last days of a notorious battle in the region.

I made my way back down the stairs towards the store where the woman who loaned me the umbrella was waiting. After I reached her store, I ordered shaved ice and waited at a table as I surveyed the store to see what souvenirs I could bring back to my friends who reside in Japan and the United States. As I waited for my shaved ice to be served, the woman came over and asked me where I have travelled from and I responded "Kanagawa." To that, she shared animatedly how she used to take the overnight train to Tokyo in her youthful years. I found comfort in her dialect that Hiro had spoken to me about as she described the long journey she took to travel to Tokyo. I realized how the rapid economic growth of post-World War II Japan made my trip so much more convenient compared to this woman's recollection of travel to Tokyo. But in this

conversation, I was also thinking about the development plan for Town A and other areas affected by the radiation exposure. While discussions continue in realizing the development and investment of areas currently considered "difficult to return" or "restricted residence area" (Fukushima Revitalization Station, 2017), the question still remains—what will exist and be present to "return" to? Despite my assumption that walking through this path would allow me insight into the "experiences" of "home" in City B, this visit only raises more questions and does not guarantee me further insight into the "experiences" of teachers whom I have interviewed.

While Japan continues to be a place of nourishment as well as a concrete place for me to return to, it also incites a sense of discomfort. When I think of this place called "home," I am dumbfounded because even within the familiarity, I am always seeking permission for entry. To this illusory aspect of "home," Minh-Ha (2011) wrote, "home for the exile and the migrant can hardly be more than a transitional or circumstantial place, since the 'original' home neither can be recaptured nor can its presence/absence be entirely banished in the 'remade' home" (p. 33). Boundaries have been drawn and redrawn by communities, governments, and families for years as cities merge with another because of, for example, economic purposes. In such reconfigurations, what versions of "home" am I seeking? If the "home" I left is no longer existing in my return, what versions of "home" are being produced in my seeking re-entry? While not certain of the "home" that will be available to me, I step up to the port of entry officer with passport in hand, seeking re-entry envisioning the house where my mother prepares dinner as she waits to welcome me back "home."

VI - DISCOURSES OF CERTAINTY:
THE HABITUAL TELLINGS OF THE AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL "I"

While grappling with the tensions between "representing" the teacher's interpreted "narratives" and how my own understandings of "belonging" and "curriculum" intersected and sometimes rubbed against these "narratives," in this chapter, I translate what I interpreted as "data" based on field notes I took after an interview with Sora, an elementary school teacher at School T (at the time of interview), who spoke of her interpreted "experiences" of teaching before and after the events following the Great East Japan Earthquake. In setting out to engage in this "analysis," I attempted to work through how, in this interview, we were possibly discursively constituting our different "selves" as related to teaching and understandings of "curriculum." However, my engagement with the "data" took on a turn as Sora did not consent to being recorded during our interview session. In this "lack of" consent, I found myself wanting to describe Sora as I remembered, as if in this remembering I would be able to construct versions of Sora close to their most authentic form.

What follows in this section is unlike my previous chapters where I interpreted "data" in the form of the teachers' transcripts. In this chapter, I construed "data" from my field notes taken during and after the interview with Sora. I start off this chapter through a version of Sora I constructed from my field notes. I then continue to explore my own understandings of "belonging" and "self" through my interpreted representations of Sora as a way to engage self-reflexively in qualitative research. These self-reflexive

components of a poststructurally informed version of qualitative research are those which, I hope, will push me to engage with “curriculum” as an ongoing process that responds to both teacher and student needs.

Constructions of Sora Based on Field Notes

Sora was born and raised in City W, close to the Tokyo Metropolitan Area. Her family then relocated to a small town, known for its hot springs, in Fukushima Prefecture following her father’s injury affecting his ability to work. Because of her father’s injury, she started the school year in Fukushima and was confronted with a culture and dialect that were different from what she was familiar with. While she remembered encountering many differences, such as linguistic differences as well as mannerisms, between herself and her classmates, she did not associate difference as necessarily being a negative experience.

Sora became interested in teaching after meeting her fourth grade homeroom teacher, who was, at the time, about the same age as her father. She remembered this teacher as not only teaching subject content matter but also interacting with students outside of the classroom. This left an impression on Sora as a teacher being someone who cared. She also recalled how she somehow knew she would be good at teaching subject content matter because of her insatiable curiosity for learning. While other students, it seemed, would absorb all the information presented by the teacher as it was, she remembered raising her hand to express her opinion instead of accepting everything as fact.

After junior high school, she was certain she would pursue college education and chose to attend an all-girl’s high school that would support her choice of pursuing further

higher education. She then attended a school of education in Fukushima and chose Japanese Language as her concentration. When I asked her why she focused on Japanese Language, she said it was because she was interested in linguistics and emphasized the importance of being able to write and speak language correctly. I then asked her why she chose elementary school education in particular. She mentioned that her fourth grade homeroom teacher, mentioned earlier, had an influence in this decision. She also indicated that teachers get to spend significant time with the students during the elementary school years, and to make a long-term impact on a student's life, elementary school would be the opportune time to do so.

During her undergraduate studies, she engaged in a 6-week practicum after which she took the certification exam but, unfortunately, failed. Coincidentally, at that time, the Ministry of Education had set in place an opportunity for early career individuals to engage in a 1-year training opportunity. Sora applied for this training opportunity and taught third grade until she passed the certification exam on her second attempt. She then taught third grade in City J until she was assigned to teach at a school located at a town bordering Fukushima prefecture. There she taught a combined class of first and second graders of about eight students until this school merged with another school. This also coincided with her getting married and moving to Town F—a locale close to the nuclear power plant in Fukushima.

After this move to Town F, Sora experienced, once again, a different culture as someone who spent a significant amount of time growing up in the central region of Fukushima. Sora mentioned the difficulties of acclimating to the new environment due to differences in cuisine, dialect, and the climate. For example, Sora noted the differences in

vocabulary as well as intonation in the language that reminded her she was in a different geographical location that was not familiar to her. Sora also had to acclimate herself to the new climate where there was hardly any snowfall, considering that Town F is close to the sea with temperate climate. In describing what she perceived as differences, Sora mentioned the different dialects, vocabulary, and different foods after getting married—she had never eaten raw bonito which was, at the time, a delicacy in the coastal town she had moved to. In these movements, Sora had to become familiarized and de-familiarized with the various environments she inhabited during various phases in her life.

Interrupting My Approach to "Data"

In my desperate search to continue writing this chapter, I revisited St. Pierre (1997) who acknowledged and troubled this process of understanding as well as translating "data." She referred to traditional forms of "data" analysis when she wrote:

> with this received understanding of data in mind, we believe we must translate whatever we think are data in language, code that language, then cut up pages of text in order to sort those coded data bits into categories (we do this either by hand or computer), and produce knowledge based on those categories, which in the end are simply words. (p. 179)

However, my humanist-based assumptions doubted that I had these "data" that I could even attempt to translate even if I wanted to considering Sora did not consent to being recorded—what practices of research understandings had me convinced of this "lack?" And in this "lack" of data, what ethical responsibilities would I continue to gesture towards in the act of representing Sora? These understandings, however, needed to be interrupted as I read and recalled my memories with Sora through my constructed field notes.

In this doubt, I realized my assumptions gestured towards an understanding of "data" analysis immersed in humanism where "data," in the form of interview transcripts, gathered supposedly to reflect a holistic, complete, and objective reality waiting to be discovered and interpreted by the researcher—in this doubt, I am wondering what could happen if I engaged with my field notes in my act of remembering, which requires constant interpretation?

In revisiting the "data" I interpreted from my field notes, I realize that the "narratives" I then produced from these field notes are all my interpretations that are situated and temporal (Britzman, 1995; Haraway, 1988; Miller, 2005; St. Pierre, 2000b). In fact, I am reminded of this point as I reread Smith and Watson (2010) who wrote, "the concept of location emphasizes geographical situatedness; but it is not just geographical site. It includes the national, ethnic, racial, gendered, sexual, social, and life-cycle coordinates in which narrators are embedded by virtue of their experiential histories and from which they speak" (p. 42).

My constructed "narratives" of Sora above are an interpretation of my own memories that have been represented through my own social, cultural, political, and historical practices. Furthermore, these constructions are based not only on interpreted field notes but also on memories I recollected after the encounter—thus, any and all representations of Sora hereafter are all incomplete, partial, and at times contradictory. With this doubt in mind, I continue exploring how I am understanding Sora's interpretation of her "experience" around "curriculum."

Sora's Understanding of "Curriculum"

In asking Sora to tell me more about her initial years of teaching and if there were factors that became apparent to her as a "novice" teacher that influenced her teaching career thereafter, she referred to her experiences having taught in City J. She explained that teaching at this school helped her to realize the importance of being able to support the students to understand the subject content being taught. Sora recognized what she regarded as the importance of learning that happens in progression. As an elementary school teacher, she realized that if her students did not have a solid foundation based on subject content understanding, it would affect their success, academically, later in school. In fact, this became an important aspect of her teacher "identity" as she continued her teaching career.

Sora also mentioned that as an elementary school teacher, she made an effort to create opportunities for her students to establish good relationships (仲良く- naka yoku) with one another. For example, with a linguistic background, she valued the beauty of language in being able to utilize the various forms of the Japanese language and thus encouraged her students to be able to speak the various registers accordingly. While Sora did not go in depth on how she, as teacher, promoted such a culture, this idea of establishing good relationships undergirded her own approaches to teaching and relating to her students.

In helping me understand how she valued the importance of teaching subject content, she enthusiastically spoke of how it was crucial as a teacher that she be able to communicate the subject content as clearly as she can so that her students can build on this foundation as they advanced further in their studies. Sora's insistence on teaching

content so the students can continue learning progressively reminded me of traditional notions of “curriculum” that stands as content to be covered and taught to ensure achievement of learning objectives, which have been problematized over the years (Doll, 1993; Miller, 2005; Pinar, 2004). As a doctoral researcher exploring how teachers are understanding their role in relation to “curriculum” but wanting to problematize traditional understandings of “curriculum,” I struggle with this idea of conceiving of “curriculum” as content to be taught in linear progression as it assumes that, if taught correctly, it will support and ensure student learning. While I agree with Sora that one of the roles of the “teacher” is to support student academic achievement, I also understand my perspectives on teaching content and “curriculum” have been socially, culturally, historically, and politically constructed by the U.S. reconceptualization of “curriculum” and, thus, bumped against her conceptualizations of teaching and learning that I conceived as enactments of traditional “curriculum.”

As I struggled through my own understanding of “curriculum” in connection to how Sora spoke of her tenets, our conversation shifted to how she encouraged “good relationships” among her students. Like Nao who spoke of the 10-*Ai* to enact particular versions of the “curriculum” in ways to respond to the students, Sora also valued and encouraged such relationships in her classroom as well as among her students. While these tenets do not reflect traditional notions of “curriculum” as content per se, and yet if the reconceptualization of “curriculum” allows me to revisit my own taken-for-granted understandings of “curriculum” that attempt to standardize and unify our “self” as well as teaching processes that are separate from the social, political, cultural, and historical

contexts, what can Sora's tenets do to push me in ways where I can continue interrupting as well as rereading these moments?

My conversation with Sora quickly shifted to her enactments as well as perspectives on a new curricular initiative in the form of "Home Studies." These initial thoughts, attributed to her teaching, seemed to resurface when our conversation shifted to her tellings of her "experiences" around March 11.

Home Studies as "Curriculum"

Sora spoke about the joint efforts made by the two schools—School T and School Q— toward the implementation of "Home Studies," as part of the Integrated Study.

Integrated Study was incorporated as part of the Japanese national curriculum in the early 2000s following curricular reforms aiming to prepare students better for the future against the backdrop of national concerns around decreasing birth rates, rising numbers of the elderly population, and globalization (Bjork, 2009). Through this reform, schools were given flexibility in the content to be taught as part of the Integrated Study. This meant that unlike traditional lesson planning where students are perceived as passive receivers of "curriculum" content, both student and teacher were together able to identify topics of interest—based on topics such as health, environmental science, foreign language, information technology—for the students to explore, think for themselves, and express their thoughts. Drawing from the spirit of Integrated Study, the objectives of Home Studies were to create a space in which students and teachers could identify an issue or topic of their interest, seek further information through research, and present these findings as a way to strengthen community and creativity as learners seek innovative solutions to the issues identified. These "Home Studies'" projects, in the cases

that I saw during my visits to the school, resulted in research topics exploring history, folk tales, and geography of Town A.

While Sora appreciated the rich history and culture of Town A, she was also apprehensive of teaching *about* Town A in the form of Home Studies. Sora's apprehension made me recall my past conversations with Mr. Jo as well as other administrators from the schools. When we spoke about "home," our conversation focused on their interpreted memories of their hometown as it was before they evacuated and their uncertainties around returning to their "home." For example, one of my conversations with Mr. Jo focused on his last visit to Town A and his impression of his hometown becoming uninhabitable over the years since the evacuation. On another occasion when I was invited to lunch with Mr. Jo and a principal from one of the Town A schools, our conversation gravitated towards their last visit to their homes in Town A. In such conversations, I saw their facial expressions soften and tense up at the same time as their eyes wandered between the far distance of memory and what they now would describe as their reality.

Based on many of these conversations I initially had with the administrators, my understanding was that the common sentiment of those who "experienced" the earthquake and evacuation was to want to return to their respective "homes" now made uninhabitable. Yet, my conversation with Sora interrupted this understanding when she shared her concerns around teaching Home Studies as it stood. In this interruption, I am inspired to re-engage with my own connections to these "narratives" of these administrators I had previously interpreted.

Home studies as a place of tension. My conversation with Sora was the first time that my understanding of Home Studies and the idea of "home" in relation to Home Studies was brought to question. While the administrators I previously spoke to continued to envision Town A as their "home," Sora depicted an idea of "home" or ふるさと- *furusato* which, according to her, is a place where individuals spend time with their family. Sora's understanding of "home," to me, appeared similar to how the other male administrators such as Mr. Jo, for example, often spoke of "home" in relation to family as well as the physical geographical environment such as the sea, and how these memories encouraged their support for the implementation of Home Studies.

Yet, as I continued my conversation with Sora, she questioned the idea of "home" created through the eyes of the various administrators. Unlike the administrators who often connected their idea of "home" in relation to a specific geographical space, Sora spoke of home as a place where the students spend their time with their family; thus, they may no longer equate home with the ocean of Town A but with the mountains that firmly surround their current school located in City B. Additionally, she explained she believed many of the students were too young to have an active memory of Town A. She also believed that even if the students remembered and had an affiliation with Town A, she was skeptical of the feelings evoked in remembering Town A that could not be separated from the Great East Japan Earthquake. Hence, Sora questioned the administrators and school's decision to teach about a particular notion of "home" and time based on the decisions made only by the administration of the school.

Sora struggled with this particular notion of "home" that collided with her desire to want to leave space for other ways of envisioning "home." While recognizing the

importance of students having connections to their own *furusato*, Sora questioned the very idea of teaching about it as part of the "curriculum." Instead, Sora wanted the school to be a place where students, in retrospect, would feel grateful as graduates of this school as she felt that this idea of Home Studies was enforcing an idea that students may not agree with. When I asked her how she envisioned the students in fostering such a connection to Town A if not for Home Studies, Sora thought that if students felt good about having attended this particular school, they would naturally develop ways to contribute to Town A. She thought this was a more productive approach instead of students being taught to believe that they must contribute to their hometown, which were part of the teaching objectives of Home Studies, about which many students do not share memories as envisioned by the administrators.

In reconstructing these memories from my interview with Sora, I point to Sora's struggles in teaching Home Studies envisioned through an administrative top-down approach where particular versions of "belonging," "home," and expectations become part of the "curriculum." While Sora taught the Home Studies "curriculum" as a teacher, she struggled within the tensions of how notions of "home" were being defined by the administrators. Sora's struggles in asking "who decides ideas of home" and "who decides how to teach about home" force me to think about the hierarchical relationships between teachers and administrators who leave teachers out of the decision-making process.

Such a conversation with Sora complicated the ways in which I understood and responded to other administrators thereafter. For example, one school administrator shared his weariness of having participated in several interviews with journalists in the past and finding that the articles served only the media's interest instead of focusing on the "truth."

Due to such experiences, this particular administrator shared his hopes of being able to share the *shinjitsu* (真実) or truth with those who may not be familiar with the consequences that continue to affect regions impacted by the Great East Japan Earthquake. On another occasion, I had the opportunity to speak with yet another administrator who talked about his recent temporary visit to their hometown. In this conversation, the administrator shared the dilemmas of his elderly mother who had a strong reaction to the evacuation and spent the last few years of her life confronting the dilemma of not being able to return to her "home," considering the high dosage of radiation still present in the area. While recognizing that many of the current students do not have vivid, first-hand knowledge or memory of their hometown, this particular administrator spoke with the hope that the implementation of Home Studies would support the school's efforts to raise individuals who would contribute to the future of Town A.

Sora's struggle or questioning of Home Studies suggests a hierarchical school structure as well as gendered and nuanced interpretations of how notions of "home" are being translated into the Home Studies "curriculum." Additionally, in this questioning, Sora struggles in performing her "teacher" duties as it intersects with her subjectivities that are in conflict with what is expected of her within the structures of her school. Within this hierarchical and gendered structure of her school, Sora is grappling with the idea of a Home Studies "curriculum" that is potentially open for students to define and redefine what they perceive to be important and yet what felt enforced by the administrators. Furthermore, in this struggle, Sora is attempting to redefine notions of "home" that can be open for interpretation and re-interpretation.

In listening to Sora's struggles as a "teacher" within these tensions, I am also pushed to think about my own enactments as well as performances as "researcher" and the ways in which I approach doing qualitative research.

An Uneasy Dialogue

When I first sat in front of Sora for the scheduled interview session, I felt my muscles become tense. We greeted each other as we shook hands and I thanked her for her time in meeting with me. Feeling anxious from our first encounter and to minimize the time I was asking of her, I hurried into explaining why she was being asked to make time for me by pulling out the Informed Consent form. Having already rehearsed my somewhat-of-a-speech regarding the purpose of my doctoral research, I took note of Sora's facial expression to make sense of whether my explanation was clear—assuming my reading of her nonverbal cues was accurate. I saw Sora nod as I continued with my explanation of this research and moved forward in explaining the potential risks and benefits of participating in this research. Sora continued to nod, which I interpreted as being understood and moved forward—that is, until I reached the section where the primary researcher asks the potential research participant to make notations on the actual form on whether she or he consents to being recorded. While my expectation of the potential research participants was that they would all agree to be recorded, considering that they agreed to engage in this interview with me, I was taken aback when Sora checked off "I do not consent to be recorded" as she apologized for not feeling comfortable being recorded.

In this moment, the best I could respond to her decision was to ask her in lieu of not being able to record our conversation if I could take notes during our interview. I also said that I understood that this may distract from her responses, but it would be for the purpose of me being able to "remember" her comments as well as to follow up on her comments. In fact, internally, I panicked in this moment, convinced that I would only be able to collect "bad stories" (Weis et al., 2000) only to result in "bad writing" (Van Maanen, 2011)—a reaction based on my habitual inclination towards conventional western practices of collecting and interpreting "data" that assume "data" speak for themselves and that, once collected, these can be organized into decontextualized texts that reflect an assumed reality (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012; Scheurich, 1997; St. Pierre, 2000a; Weedon, 2004).

Informing and Consenting

As I recalled struggling through this encounter with Sora and our moments of informing and consenting to engage in my doctoral research project, I am thinking with Weis et al. (2000) who encountered "headaches and struggles" of representing their research around working-class communities. In their reflections of representing their research, they worked through their concerns around the "ethics of constructing narratives" with their research subjects. They wrote, "in our work, we have come to understand how the introduction of an informed consent form requires analysis as much as that which is routinely and easily considered as data, such as the narratives of our participants" (p. 42). While these authors seemed to assume "narratives" to speak for themselves, they too were aware of the poststructural task of self-reflexively engaging with their representational writing.

I pause at this invitation to interrogate my reaction to the Informed Consent. What did this "moment" do for me as researcher and how did it affect my relationship with Sora? Additionally, what were my assumptions that undergirded this moment of panic in relation to engaging in the formal institutional requirements that include participants' signings of "informed consent" forms as part of all research projects?

While my intentions to interview Sora and get to know her as well as others' "experiences" around the Great East Japan Earthquake was welcomed by the school administrators, my intentions and the decisions of the administration to invite me to the school as a researcher all seemed to have had effects that I was not able to anticipate. With a recording device in hand, I was ready to record Sora and represent a version of this encounter as text. In the process of "informing" Sora of the purpose of the research as well as potential risks in participating in the research, I was also establishing what I conceived as a distance between myself as a researcher and Sora the research participant. This distance contradicted any intent of mine to "get to know" the participants or to even "downplay" the difference I had staged through this informing process.

However, in her decision not to be recorded, I no longer recognized her as the potential research participant and myself as a researcher. While failing to recognize Sora as a research subject with hopes and desires immersed within social, cultural, and political contexts, I also failed to recognize my own positionalities within the category researcher. I assumed that in the informing and consenting to participate in this research, the "data" I were to collect would somehow become a "possession" of mine—the researcher—to interpret and represent. After all, conventional humanist discourse around ethnographic research speaks of collecting "data" in terms of "capturing" a reality. Weis

et al. (2000) wrote, “ethnographic method is more likely to leave subjects exposed to exploitation” (p. 45) in exploring the ethics of representation.

My constitution as a *researcher* permitted by the school administration to interview the teachers also invited the assumption that I would be able to “access” Sora’s interpreted “narratives” with the “confidence” to represent her supposed “reality” as it is. Yet, my certainty in anticipating and preparing for this interview was interrupted as I no longer recognized myself as *researcher* in Sora’s decision not to be recorded. My identification as a *researcher* resurfaced, when I, as a *researcher* felt an urge to disagree with Sora when she described “curriculum” as content to be delivered in a progressive manner. In that instance, however, I chose not to disagree or share understandings of “curriculum” that differed from hers in order to continue seeking her responses as a research participant. Who was “I” in this moment of discomfort? And who did “I” represent in this moment to remain silent? While Sora did not consent to being recorded, in my decision not to interrupt or engage her in conversations about the reconceptualization of “curriculum,” I continued with the “data” collection because I needed to “extract” this information from her.

In these last moments of the interview, something else happened when Sora urged me to share her thoughts with the administrators. I started my interview with Sora not being able to recognize myself as the *researcher* based on conventional notions of engaging in qualitative research. Yet, in Sora’s request for me to report her doubts regarding the ways in which Home Studies was being understood and implemented at the school, I recognized myself being constituted into positions I had not even anticipated prior. When I am tasked to speak to the administrators on Sora’s behalf regarding her concerns around “curriculum” content and the future of the school, I am constituted and

constituting myself as the rational *researcher* as well as an *advocate* who could speak to the administrators about a particular issue by representing a particular version of the teacher "narrative." Who is she referring to when she refers to the "administration?" How have I been constituted in this request? How will I reconstitute myself after this interview and meet with Mr. Jo, the administrator? What are my responsibilities as the *researcher* when tasked with such a request? If I choose to not share this information with the "administration," have I simply betrayed Sora's "trust" in me to pass on her concerns to the administration to effect any change?

In this moment of constitution, I am pushed to think about my own subjectivity as *researcher* and what this has done within my interactions with Sora. Sora's questioning of Home Studies as well as requesting for me to be an advocate for her allowed me to think about how I have internalized unassumingly my role as researcher who has the authority to be able to speak to the administrator within the hierarchical structures of this school.

Remaining Within Constructs

I started my interview with Sora assuming her consent will allow me to "record" her interpretations of "home" and sense of belonging as "narratives" with the intent to represent them as the *researcher*. In responding to my prearranged interview questions, Sora spoke about her "experiences" around the earthquake and curricular approaches the school was taking in teaching about issues related to "home." Her understanding of "home" pointed me towards the tensions and struggles she "experienced" as a "teacher" within the confines of a hierarchical school structure. Sora, while working within the

contradictions and dilemmas of teaching content with a particular objective to be achieved by the students, spoke of ideas such as "home" and "curriculum" within conventional curricular discourses of student learning and growth, while at the same time doubting how she could move such conversations for other interpretations to be a part of the "curriculum."

Additionally, Sora's decision to not be recorded interrupted my assumptions around "data" and representation. Furthermore, in this interruption, I am also challenged to interrogate my own understandings of engaging in qualitative research as *researcher*.

This chapter was an attempt to revisit my constructions of Sora's understanding around "curriculum," and "home" and in the while how I am being constituted and constituting my "researcher self." Such an attempt, I have argued, is crucial to move towards an understanding of "curriculum" that is open to questioning, responding, and grappling with multiple iterations of the very "experiences" as well as the "self" within social, cultural, historical, and political contexts.

VII—AN ATTEMPT TO CONCLUDE

My interest in how teachers perceive and translate the “curriculum” began during my initial years of teaching English as a foreign language at a high school in Japan. The head of the English department, at that time, handed me the “curriculum” for the English courses I was expected to teach. At first, I, unquestioningly, based my lessons off of this “curriculum” until a few months into the semester I found myself looking at my students disinterested in the content I was teaching that had no connection or “meaning” to their lives beyond the fact that they had to take this course to graduate.

My inkling academic interests stemmed from these initial years of teaching that made me wonder how “curriculum” could incorporate or even respond to the needs, interests, and desires of the students and teachers while exploring their contextualized and experienced lives. In particular, I felt the need to explore such curricular wonderings in contexts that experienced post-catastrophic events such as violence or natural disasters. While the literature review indicated much discussion around teacher “experiences” as well as “curriculum” as content, I felt that the literature did not attend to what Miller (2005) conceived of as curriculum *in-the-making*—to examine, question, and interrogate essentialized and compartmentalized notions of “curriculum,” “identity,” and “self” in order to move the field towards an understanding of “curriculum,” considering the ever-changing and shifting complex relationship between multiple “selves” as well as between and with “teacher” and “student.”

In this final chapter, I revisit what I attempted to do in in this dissertation while also addressing its limitations as well as implications for future research.

My Telling of Teacher "Stories"

In this research inquiry, I interviewed three teachers who had been affected, to some degree or another, by the Great East Japan Earthquake and were teaching at the two elementary schools that had been relocated due to the nuclear power plant explosion. Through interview transcripts, field notes, and autobiographical texts that I constructed as "data," I attempted to address the following research questions:

1. In what ways, if any, are teachers speaking of the "Fukushima disaster" in relation to their roles as educators?

   1a. How, if at all, do the teachers describe events of March 11, 2011?

   1b. How, if at all, do teachers speak of changes, disruptions, and/or continuities in their perceptions of themselves as educators post-March 11th?

2. How, if at all, do teachers conceptualize "curriculum"?

   2a. How, if at all, do teachers describe how they have habitually talked about "curriculum"?

   2b. How, if at all, are they talking differently about curriculum since March 11, 2011?

   2c. How, if at all, do teachers talk about what they perceive as their current students' needs in relation to "curriculum"?

3. How do my subjectivities affect how I am seeing, hearing, and reading post-March 11, 2011, Fukushima?

3a. How do my subjectivities affect my interpretations of my study participants' descriptions of their educator experiences both before and after the disaster?

3b. With what considerations of power and knowledge, in relation to my researcher identities, must I grapple, as a qualitative researcher who calls Japan "home"?

3c. How, if at all, do my current assumptions about "curriculum," now informed by reconceptualized perspectives, shift, and change as I research the "Fukushima disaster" and its multiple effects on current educators' efforts within this specific locale?

In Chapter IV, I interpreted the transcripts I constructed as "data" based on the interview with Hiro to represent how she constituted her sense of teacher "self" through various school and family discourses. Through her responses, I represented how Hiro spoke of her connections to teaching, which arose from her desire to focus the students' needs as a priority, thus constituting her teacher "self" as a responsible "teacher." While Hiro did not speak directly or delve much into describing the events of the Great East Japan Earthquake, she spoke of her role as an "educator" in relation to the effects of the earthquake, evacuation, and displacement. Due to the ongoing nature of the evacuation, Hiro spoke of her concerns over how the school was "responding" to the immediate and long-term needs of the students and families who chose to remain in City B, while some other families pursued other economic, health, and academic options by relocating. My interactions with Hiro suggested how local events intersect with wider local, national, political, economic, and cultural discourses that influence how she understood and spoke of her assumed "selves."

Following Chapter IV, I responded to the constructions I made of Hiro by interrogating my researcher understandings of interpreting, transcribing, and translating "data" through an autobiographical exploration of the narrating and narrated "I." In speaking with and through these constructions of the "self," I hoped to interrogate the assumptions that guided my decisions in interpreting "data" which helped remind me that the process of interpretation was an iterative process that required constant interpretation.

In Chapter V, through my interactions with Nao, I set out to interrupt my own understandings of "home" and sense of belonging as related to the reconceptualization of "curriculum." Through the "data" I interpreted, I represented Nao as a teacher who spoke of himself as someone with positive geographical ties to place, which influenced his decisions to teach at his current school. My constructions of Nao based on the "data" I interpreted suggested that he gave meaning to his interpreted "experiences" in relation to place, thus producing a sense of belonging in relation to his teacher "selves." However, Nao also did not describe in detail the actual events of the Great East Japan Earthquake. Instead, he spoke of his teacher "self" in relation to his interactions as well as relationships with his students which continued beyond the confined boundaries of a geographical place, thus enabling continued interpretations and understandings of "curriculum" in such contexts of uncertainty and change.

I followed Chapter V with another autobiographical exploration of my understanding of "self" to interrupt this desire towards a place of familiarity which became recognizable to me as the knowing subject in order to seek further iterations of my performing "self" in connection with changing social, cultural, political, and historical contexts.

In Chapter VI, I explored the impacts of the Great East Japan Earthquake in how Sora spoke of her understandings around conceptualizations of "home" as related to the "curriculum." Unlike my previous encounters with the other two teachers, Sora did not consent to being recorded. Thus, my constructions of Sora were based solely on my field notes as well as interpreted memories I constructed from the conversation already had. Based on my interpreted memory as well as field notes, which I construed as "data," I explored how Sora spoke of "home" and her sense of belonging as related to the earthquake and her teaching "self." Sora questioned the ways in which the idea of "home" was being constructed via the established "curriculum" mandated by curricular reform efforts. While reproducing a particular version of "home" through enactments of the "curriculum," Sora struggled with her enactments of this "curriculum" in the classroom as she questioned how notions of "home" could be imagined differently by every "student." In this very chapter, I also interrogated my own researcher "self" as it conflicted with Sora's assumptions, expectations, and perspectives of "curriculum" to continue my work of understanding "curriculum" and doing research.

Going back to the notion of the "complicated conversation," I engage in this conversation to interrupt and question how I have come to understand traditional notions of "curriculum" as content to be developed and/or designed towards understandings of "curriculum" that examine the social, cultural, political, and historical constructions of "curriculum" and "self," as well as how my researcher "selves" are changing in this interaction. I must explore the very understanding as well as discourses that have constituted my understanding of "self" as related to the discursive practices I engage in as well as I may have reproduced. To this end, in the previous three chapters, I attempted to

situate the three teachers' interpreted "narratives," which I constructed within social, cultural, historical and political discourses as they spoke of their teacher "selves." The curricular conversations I attempt to participate in, then, involve my continuous interrogations of any and every category, including that of "curriculum" and "self" towards constant iterations and possibilities of these varied versions.

Critique of Study—Limitations

I attempted to remain committed to my claims of feminist poststructural versions of curricular autobiographical work. In this doing, I feel compelled to raise some concerns that may be considered to have limited the scope of this study. Due to my own personal obligations as well as conflicting schedules, my encounters as well as interviews could only occur during the summer or winter school vacation periods. Additionally, these "data" were collected by the end of summer 2016. I grappled throughout this study with how I understood and utilized the term "post-disaster." When I first began conceptualizing this research, many of the affected areas in the Northern region were still undergoing recovery efforts, with many individuals living in temporary housing.

Seven years passed since I first began this research inquiry as well as initial interactions with the participants—thus, while most of the teachers who agreed to participate in this research were teaching in displacement at the time of the interviews, the particular context may no longer be considered "post-disaster" but the long-term recovery stage of development (Diaz-Agero Roman, 2016).

Below, I name other factors that may be considered limitations to my study.

Conflicting Conceptual Framework

Feminist poststructural perspectives have framed this very inquiry that has pushed me to question and challenge any notion of "curriculum," "self," and "data" that are represented as complete, impartial, and transparent. In analyzing what I construed as "data," however, I realized my assumptions, deeply immersed in conventional humanist orientations around the Enlightenment subject, influenced how and what I represented as "self," "identity," "home," and "data."

This meant that while I attempted to question and examine common-sense understandings of "curriculum," "self," "home," and sense of belonging, my habitual tendency was to rely on understandings based on the Enlightenment notion of the "knowing subject," which I problematize as well as critique. For example, my assumptions concerning "data" were immersed in the idea that it must be collected, coded, and narrated in order to supposedly ensure objectivity (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Marshall & Rossman, 2011; Maxwell, 2009). Furthermore, counter to poststructural assumptions on language, conventional qualitative research assumes that "data" such as interviews can be extracted, coded, and represented as they assume knowing subjects who mean what they speak (St. Pierre & Jackson, 2014). While problematizing such methods, my tellings of the teacher "stories" often read as a simple re-narration of what they said, as though they meant what they said. Since such conventional qualitative research assumptions collided with my supposed claims of feminist poststructural work, I had to engage continuously in the process of writing to interrupt every one of the tendencies towards humanist assumptions.

Furthermore, based on my own complicity within humanist assumptions of the knowing subject, I found it challenging to break away from the ways in which the teacher participants often spoke of their "experiences" as well as perspectives on "curriculum" beyond the constraints of which I trouble.

Partial Interpretation of "Narratives"

In framing this qualitative inquiry through poststructural troublings of language as transparent and reflective of reality assumed by the subject, I have also worked through conceptualizations of the "split subject." Language no longer reflects a particular known "reality," but "constructs the individual's subjectivity in ways that are historically and locally specific" (Richardson, 2000, p. 929) and because it is socially, politically, historically, culturally contingent and situated, every telling of a "story" or "experience" is partial, incomplete, and open for re-interpretation.

While I claim to represent what I unassumingly reproduced as transparent tellings of the "experiences" of the teachers interviewed in forms of a transcript, these tellings are similarly, partial, incomplete, shifting, and unfixed.

In an attempt to question the tendency to represent the teachers "narratives" as complete, I self-reflexively wrote through the interludes (Pillow, 2003). Thus, such claims of partiality, incompleteness, and contradictions may be considered a limitation of this dissertation from particular orientations to research that privilege the Enlightenment subject.

To Whom Do I Write? (Implications)

I have outlined in a previous chapter that this research is twofold in that I explore autobiographically how teachers speak of their "experiences" around a catastrophic event as it relates to their understandings of "curriculum," while I also remain committed to poststructurally inflected notions of language and the subject. I have also tried to represent, despite my challenges of refusing tendencies to represent my "selves" as knowing subject, how my own understandings around sense of belonging as well as researcher "selves" are being socially, culturally, historically, and discursively constituted. With these explorations, I attempt here to think about how and what implications of such a project might have in the field of "curriculum" studies—especially as it applies to contexts of having experienced catastrophic events such as a natural disaster, violent events, or conflict that may cause disruptions and/or interruptions to schooling.

"Curricular" Enactments and Continued Conversations

I have referenced and drawn from the history of the reconceptualization of "curriculum" theory in the United States since the 1970s to highlight not only the paths but the diverse ways in which it has and continues to be conceptualized across discourses of gendered, autobiographical, historical, institutional, international, psychoanalytic, racial, poststructural, and neo-Marxist texts (Miller, 2005; Pinar et al., 1995). I have explored the possibility of how "curriculum" as autobiography, more specifically with a poststructural lens, may open up ways for me to engage differently as well as continuously with the "complicated conversations" around "curricular experiences."

While I have been engaging with teachers who experienced a catastrophic event while continuing to teach in displacement, this research has aimed to explore how categories such as "experience," "identity," "home," and "curriculum" can be conceptualized as "always in the making" (Miller, 2005, 2006), in ways that allow us to think differently and respond differently to our everyday work.

While the "narrative dilemmas" (Britzman, 2003) of writing poststructurally have made me doubt not only how "effectively" but also if I have been—or even should be—able to represent what I intended for this research, I stay committed to the possibilities of the autobiographical act that theorizes memory, identity, agency, space, embodiment, and "experience" as constituted in discourse (Smith & Watson, 2010). The poststructural perspectives in which I have been approaching this autobiographical "curriculum" research allowed me to explore how subjectivities are constituted via discursive practices while also interrogating conceptualizations of categories such as "identity," "experience," "home," and "curriculum" that assume subjects as unitary, impartial, and complete rather than in process, in flux, and at times contradictory.

Such conceptualizations of the "subject," I argue, must be interrogated in the conceptualizations of a worldwide "curriculum" field of studies, especially when attempting to represent "curricular experiences" that "attempt to include or re-include unitary versions of subjects or 'voices' in local/global social/cultural curriculum narratives or constructs from which they previously have been excluded" (Miller, 2006, p. 45). Here I am reminded of Sora's struggles with the Home Studies "curriculum" that she perceived to be limiting possibilities for her students to imagine "home" differently from the administrators who prescribed the "curriculum." Her teacher "narrative" may

suggest the importance of including teacher "voices" in every and all curricular decision making processes; yet, it is not enough to simply layer these voices if they only produce a "curriculum" that reinforces pre-existing understandings that limit the possibilities of imagining "home" and sense of belonging. This is especially important in contexts such as Fukushima, with whole towns being displaced and relocated, where students and teachers such as Nao are being pulled and pushed by the changing geographical boundaries that require continued engagements to redefine boundaries of belonging as they change.

Autobiographical inquiry interrupts any notion of an essentialized notion of the "self" and "curriculum" by allowing constant interrogations as well as conceptualizations of how understandings of the "self" are constructed within social, cultural, political, and economic discourses.

Such an approach to "curriculum," unlike traditional conceptualizations of "curriculum," is needed in responding to contexts where schooling is interrupted due to natural or man-made disasters. Moll et al. (1992) encouraged teachers to incorporate the students' funds of knowledge into their classroom practice; however, in incorporating such pedagogies, teachers must also acknowledge that "narratives" of trauma may also become a part of their classroom discourse under such contexts. I understand that identity categorizations can, at times, lead to the notion of celebrating and protecting such identity affiliations; however, they can also lead to inequities, isolations, and prejudice against particular populations such as displaced populations as well as groups categorized as "Other," as in recent events occurring under the Trump administration (Association of International Educators [NAFSA], 2017; IRC, 2018).

This is where autobiographical "curriculum" inquiry—especially as informed by poststructurally inflected perspectives—allows constant kneading and redefinition of such supposedly static categories around the "self" and "experience," thus impelling responses to changing social, political, economic, and cultural discourses. This is especially needed in contexts where persons experience violence, natural disasters, and/or conflict. If educators are able to conceive of their teacher "identities" and student "identities," and to understand "curriculum" as inflected with all sorts of social, cultural, auto/biographical, and historical forces as well as particular discourses in play that frame what and who "counts" as learner, teacher, content to be addressed, and contexts to which to attend, perhaps they would also recognize how their teaching practices are implicated in social, cultural, discursive, and political framings of "curriculum" that may exacerbate or ameliorate differences or isolation.

Reconceptualizing Curriculum to Interrupt Policy

I have demonstrated in earlier chapters that while schools have been imagined and designed to offer a sense of safety, numerous other scholars have questioned such notions of "safety" (Burde, 2010; GCPEA, 2014; Taubman, 2009; Tyack, 1974). While discourses of school violence and safety have been researched and framed within specific contexts (Burde, 2010; GCPEA, 2014)—typically within non-Western contexts—recent media reports of school shootings in the United States have created grievances and debates among teachers, students, families, government, and local communities. While recognizing the risks ensuring safety, a superintendent from a state that experienced a school shooting shared in a news interview that "safety and security is the cornerstone to learning" and that "you can't learn unless you feel at home" (DesRoches, 2018). I myself,

working in higher education administration, recently participated in an "active shooter" training offered through the school safety department. Recent series of media reports around U.S. school shootings have suggested that what appeared to be events happening in a faraway region experiencing conflict or natural disaster is of concern right where one may be now. I am introduced to one "experience" after another advocating for gun control based on personal stories of anguish as well as the courage to speak out against violence.

I am also inclined to engage differently with these teachers', administrators', or students' "stories" as poststructuralist perspectives contend that subjectivity and meanings are constituted and constituting within language.

My field notes as well as interview "data" pointed to the tensions in how teachers were interpreting notions of "home" and the needs of the students in relation to the "curriculum" offered to students, such as Home Studies. Hiro and Sora wrestled with the idea of how best to respond to the students as they also continued to "experience" the Great East Japan Earthquake as they taught and enacted the "curriculum" content without knowing the duration of the forced evacuation. While curricular reform occurs at the national level, which eventually is left to the decisions of the schools at the regional level, what may happen if conversations around "curriculum" development that already occurred were to extend their perspectives, practice, and orientations beyond traditional conceptualizations of "curriculum," with considerations to how discursive practices are in operation throughout these various levels?

Interrupting Traditional Interviewing as Research Practice

Mishler (1986) drew from sociolinguists, anthropologists, and psychoanalysts to suggest that "narratives" can be captured by the interviewer "when interviewers allow

respondents to speak and when investigators are alert to the possibility and look for narratives, their ubiquity is evident" (p. 106). Suggesting that "narratives" exist everywhere and are simply waiting to be excavated by the curious researcher, Mishler also wrote in an earlier chapter that "an adequate understanding of interviews depends on recognizing how interviewers reformulate questions and how respondents frame answers in terms of their reciprocal understandings as meanings emerge during the course of an interview" (p. 52). Scheurich (1997) critiqued Mishler's conceptualization of "narratives" which suggests a universal understanding of "narratives" and fails to recognize that "interactions and meanings are a shifting carnival of ambiguous complexity, a moving feast of differences interrupting differences" (p. 66). Research interviewing does not occur in isolated contexts but is constructed socially, culturally, politically, and discursively. This means that any and all research interview as a process must also be examined and questioned.

Conducting interviews with the teachers in Fukushima provided various opportunities for me as a researcher to examine my own complicity as well as assumptions in how my political and social subjectivities were influencing my relationship with the participants. These relationships remained static at times where I performed my researcher role following the interview protocol, and yet were continuously shifting as I performed my researcher role intersecting with my aged, raced, and ethnic subjectivities. For example, during my interview sessions with teachers as well as administrators, I was constituting and constituted not only as researcher but also as an advocate to share their "stories" so that their "experiences" could be made public through my research. In this moment, the teacher as research participant was no longer an

objective interview participant answering my interview question, but a subject with desires, tensions, and contradictions. Additionally, as researcher, I was no longer able to view my role as an objective researcher "collecting" teacher's "stories" as I now had an ethical responsibility to re-examine my subjectivities as well as how I was engaging with this act of interviewing. Engaging in qualitative research, especially interviewing, has never been an objective act that occurs in a vacuum but is constructed socially, politically, and discursively, thus requiring qualitative researchers to continue working through their very own "experiences" of interviewing with and in relation to their research participants to continue the process of interpretation. This means that not only are we exploring our researcher "self" but also the process of interviewing.

Future Research Possibilities

In writing the limitations as well as the implications of this dissertation research, I am beginning to think about future engagement with this research. One aspect of this dissertation research focused on exploring how teachers spoke of their teacher identity and their understanding of the "curriculum" while in displacement. I would be interested to extend this interest of mine to other locations where school have "accepted" students who have relocated. This means that the research will be based not only in "affected" areas but may highlight the "struggles" and "challenges" of teachers in other regions who may be "hosting" displaced families. Recent series of political events as well as natural disasters have increased the number of displaced populations worldwide and many of these populations reside within cities. If "hosting" countries or cities are seeing an

increase in changing populations, what would such a research highlight? What would conversations with teachers who are teaching in "hosting" schools see, feel, and hear?

I would also be interested in engaging families as well as students in future research opportunities. This research will not be to represent their "stories" as truth and complete, but to attempt to represent the impartial, conflicting, and ever-evolving acts of identities to explore ways in which particular teaching practices and versions of "curriculum" can or cannot—or maybe somewhere always in-the-making—respond to such needs.

I am not sure how much of an impact this work has been able to accomplish in ways that I had set out to do. However, I hope that this work will at least trigger conversations and dialogue among individuals who may begin to think about the "experiences" of those who continue to establish a new place that they call "home."

EPILOGUE

> Permanent unsettlement within and between cultures is here coupled with the instability of the word, whose old and new meanings continue to graft onto each other, engaged in a mutually transformative process that displaces rather than simply denies the traces of previous grafting.
>
> Trinh T. Minh-Ha, 2011, p. 51

I began this dissertation inquiry to explore how a particular event in Japan would impact, collide with, and shift teachers' interpreted "experiences" around this event in Japan as related to their understandings of their "selves" as well as the "curriculum." Aligning myself with curriculum theorists who envision "curriculum" in ways in which students' and teachers' subjectivities, knowledge, language, power, and discourse interact with their experiences around the curriculum—thus understanding curriculum as racial, political, poststructural, autobiographical, and international texts (Miller, 2005; Pinar, 2004; Pinar et al., 1995)—I could no longer naively represent these teachers' experiences without gesturing toward the social, historical, and cultural discursive practices that mediated my own autobiographical act of interpretation as well as representation. I constantly grappled within and with these tensions throughout the dissertation process.

While recognizing the incomplete-ness as well as my own desire to carry on this conversation around my inquiry process, I continue here with my ongoing thoughts as I situate, explore, and question the rational, complete, and unitary versions of the "selves" that I constructed throughout this dissertation.

Practices of Methodology

In rereading and revisiting my previous dissertation chapters, I raise multiple concepts to explore throughout such as constitutions of the "self/subject," "teacher identities," understandings as well as enactments of curriculum, attachments to "place," "home," displacement, as well as sense of belonging. These thematic concepts interact, interconnect, and inform one another—for example, through case studies based in Great Britain, Weedon (2004) explored how actual as well as imagined meanings are produced through enactments of belonging and performances of identities within social, cultural, and historical practices. Furthermore, the reconceptualization of curriculum takes into account not only traditional understandings of curriculum as content to be organized in sequential progression, but also ways in which curriculum has been "experienced" within social, cultural, historical, and discursive contexts. Thus, these thematic concepts I explored are concerned with curricular experiences. I constantly grappled within the tensions of the poststructural claims I make and the actual doing of the research as I attempted to engage with these multiple thematic concepts through "autobiographical tellings" of the teachers' narratives as well as my own interpretation of these narratives. Furthermore, while I gestured towards these multiple thematical concepts, to provide adequate discussion of these interactions of concepts, this requires further methodological considerations that will allow me to focus on depth instead of on the scope of research interests for future research possibilities.

While recognizing via feminist poststructural orientations to curriculum theorizing that there is and can be no coherent or rational self that remembers things as they are nor means what it says and how it says it, or that there will be an essence of a

subject I can get to, I introduced verbatim interview transcripts in Japanese followed by an English translation, as if the distance between the "original" and the "new text" I created will be masked somehow, as if these texts had not been selected and edited through my own interpretations. In the many reiterations of the translations, I recognize the challenging interpretive and representational tasks of translating (Cook-Sather, 2007); however, in thinking "I must get the translations correct," I am recognizing my fixation as well as my obsession with particular versions of engaging in qualitative research that cannot dwell in the discomforts of not knowing. These tensions are not simply a result of my reliance on interview transcripts, but rather my complicity as well as deep-rooted understandings and reliance on language as mode of expression and meaning making.

Interview as research method, which I have questioned and grappled with throughout the dissertation, is but one mode of research methodology that can support partial knowings and understandings of a particular curricular experience. What other ways can I continue this exploration in an attempt to "know 'something' without claiming to know everything" (Richardson, 2000, p. 928)? Considering multiple qualitative explorations of partial knowings—such as through storytelling, painting, poetry, drama, and visual representations—what other ways of partial tellings would I be able to "knead" into these varied ways of partial knowings?

Practices of Power

Villenas' (1996) words struck my heart when I initially read this phrase: "researchers are also implicated as colonizers when they claim authenticity of interpretation and description under the guise of authority" (p. 713). I repeatedly gestured

towards my tension, almost a "fear" of enacting the authoritative "researcher" throughout this dissertation research inquiry. Yet, as I continue my "final thoughts" in this version of the writing, I wonder what I already made clear in terms of my grappling with the category "researcher" and what I chose to leave out that speaks to complex power relations that produced my multiple researcher subjectivities.

As a student who chose to attend one of the top schools of education in the United States, I took various research methodology classes that informed my understandings as well as practices of engaging in qualitative research. These courses introduced me to the various ways in which research processes and design would allow researchers to explore and attend not only to their research interests but the ways in which these research methods could speak to larger educational social justice issues. Acknowledging that certain research designs allow researchers to know some but not all aspects of their study, I constantly felt the tension of negotiating what it meant to be a "good student" at this school of education—a "good student" who must understand, memorize, and be able to eventually exercise these skills as a "researcher"—that was based on the final course grade that evaluated these performances. These tensions were not independent of the multiple subjectivities offered to me as "African American," "Japanese," "full-time international educator," "raised in an all-female household" as I continued to take up new subject positions within the discursive field of Teachers College. I grappled with these tensions of being a "good student," especially as I embarked on my doctoral dissertation as a representative of Teachers College requesting to interview teachers from Town A as a "researcher."

It is partly due to my association with Teachers College that is highly acknowledged worldwide that granted me the opportunity to meet the superintendent of Town A. Following my first few initial meetings with the superintendent, I was next introduced to another administrator from Town A who became my point of contact for any and all issues related to my dissertation, including those of seeking potential interests from teachers who would be willing to participate in my dissertation inquiry. Within these engagements with the administrators, I was also constituted as an "advocate," a "journalist," as well as an "expert" when I was "welcomed" to schedule meetings with the administrators such as the superintendent and principals. I was positioned as a "journalist" as I sat across the table from the superintendent recording our interview as well as the "narratives" shared with mem with the expectation that I would be reporting these "narratives" to the "research community" through my research presentations. Despite my uncertainty and doubts of enacting a "good student" within the institution that will eventually grant me a doctorate, I am now also constituted as an "expert" in the field. This is manifested in the form of a professional development session I am asked to lead.

After I inquired with Mr. Jo if I could help out with the end-of-semester duties, he proposed the idea of me leading a lecture about the U.S. educational system as part of an ongoing professional development series for the teachers of Town A. While I am not an "expert" on the U.S. educational system per se, I realized the effects of being a "researcher" from Teachers College in being granted "access" to the schools of Town A. While I was a "doctoral student" at Teachers College learning the ropes of engaging in qualitative inquiry within the discursive fields of Town A, I was no longer simply a "doctoral student" negotiating her understandings of being a "good student" and now

needing to negotiate the added complexities of being constituted as an "expert researcher"—which I did not anticipate prior to my interactions with the administrators. The teachers were willing to be interviewed but were not willing to exchange their contact information with me directly. My "expert" role definitely affected my presence within the schools as well as my research process and this is an area that will need constant situated interpretation, attention, and engagement.

I could continue to list all the "selves"—such as "African American," "Japanese," "female," "full time international educator," "raised in an all-female household," "doctoral student at Teachers College," "expert," "journalist," "advocate"—but who is this subject that I feel disconnected to?

An Address

Friends, colleagues, and professors would ask me, "So what does this research tell you?" "What will this research gesture towards?" "What is your contribution to the field?"

Field? What does and where does the field I would like to position myself entail? Where could I possibly fit in this mosaic of an educational field of research? Is it with those who design and develop curriculum who continue to prioritize content that can be organized and learning that can be measured in standardized ways? Or do I want to converse with teachers who are enacting particular versions of the curriculum amid the uncertainties of the current political, economic, social, and cultural contexts of our world today that fear differences and create boundaries in the name of security? Or do I want to engage in conversations with educational researchers exploring the desire to want to

know, yet questioning their own subjectivities and histories in relation to the very act of interpretation and representation? Or is it current doctoral students who are looking for a "map" to engage in qualitative research?

In imagining these possible conversations, I find myself shocked at my audacity to even claim to invite such conversations. Is this audacity an effect of the "researcher"? Or the "expert"? Or the "student"? Or the subjectivities that I cannot even claim or identify here? Or is it simply my audacity to begin to claim my own "voice" within the nuanced and layered spaces that I have attempted to maneuver? Not knowing who is speaking now but still wanting to claim something, I speak to those interested in curriculum design and development, and yet wonder how such practice can be made unfamiliar. I speak to teachers who, like Hiro, Sora, and Nao, are grappling with their everyday realities, interpreting and enacting the curriculum and yet wondering how to respond to the ever-shifting needs of their students. I speak to researchers engaging in fieldwork and yet grappling with the visceral and emotional moments that they feel are unable to be included in their writing.

I speak and yet do not know what speaks.

REFERENCES

Allison, A. (2013). *Precarious Japan*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Altbach, P. G. (1991). Textbooks: The international dimension. In M. Apple & L. Christian-Smith (Eds.), *Politics of the textbook* (pp. 242-258). New York, NY: Routledge.

Althusser, L. (1971). *Lenin and philosophy and other essays*. New York, NY: Monthly Review Press.

Alvarez, D. (2010). "I had to teach hard": Traumatic conditions and teachers in post-Katrina classrooms. *High School Journal, 94*(1), 28-39.

Anderson, J. D. (1988). *The education of Blacks in the South 1860-1935*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Anderson, M. B. (1999). *Do no harm: How aid can support peace-or war*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Anzaldúa, G. (1987). *Borderlands, la frontera: The new Mestiza*. San Francisco, CA: Aunt Lute Books.

Apple, M., & Christian-Smith, L. (1991). Politics of the textbook. In M. Apple & L. Christian-Smith (Eds.), *Politics of the textbook* (pp. 1-21). New York, NY: Routledge.

Asahi Shimbun Digital. (2018, March 3). Omoide, yatto torimodoseta. *Asahi Shimbun*. https://www.asahi.com/articles/DA3S13384996.html

Association of International Educators (NAFSA). (2017). *Issue brief: Immediate impact of terminating DACA*. Retrieved from http://www.nafsa.org/_/File/_/daca _phase_out_issue_brief.pdf

Bajaj, M. (2011). Human rights education: Ideology, location, and approaches. *Human Rights Quarterly, 33*(2), 481-508.

Baker, B. (1999). What is voice? Issues of identity and representation in the framing of Reviews. *Review of Educational Research, 69*(4), 365-383.

Bartlett, L. & Garcia, O. (2011). *Additive schooling in subtractive times: Bilingual Education and Dominican youth in the Heights*. Memphis, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.

Beabout, B. (2007). Stakeholder organizations: Hurricane Katrina and the New Orleans public schools. *Multicultural Education, 15*(2), 43-49.

Benjamin, W. (1968/2002). The task of the translator. In M. Bullock & M. W. Jennings (Eds.), *Walter Benjamin: Selected writings Volume 1 1913-1926* (pp. 253-263). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bjork, C. (2009). Local implementation of Japan's Integrated Studies reform: A preliminary analysis of efforts to decentralise the curriculum. *Comparative Education, 45*(1), 23-44.

Bjork, C., & Tsuneyoshi, R. (2005). Education reform in Japan: Competing visions for the future. *Phi Delta Kappan, 86*(8), 619-626.

Bogdan, R. & Biklen, S. (2007). *Qualitative research in education: An introduction to theory and practice* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Britzman, D. P. (1995). "The question of belief": Writing poststructural ethnography. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 8* (3), 229-238.

Britzman, D. P. (2003). *Practice makes practice*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Burde, D. (2010). Preventing violent attacks on education in Afghanistan: Considering the role of community-based schools. In *Protecting education from attack* (pp. 245-259). Paris, France: UNESCO.

Butler, J. (1995a). Contingent foundations. In S. Benhabib, J. Butler, D. Cornell, & N. Fraser (Eds.), *Feminist contentions: A philosophical exchange* (pp. 35-57). New York: NY: Routledge.

Butler, J. (1995b). For a careful reading. In S. Benhabib, J. Butler, D. Cornell, & N. Fraser (Eds.), *Feminist contentions: A philosophical exchange* (pp. 127-143). New York, NY: Routledge.

Butler, J. (2000). Restaging the universal: Hegemony and the limits of formalism. In J. Butler, E. Laclau, &S. Žižek (Eds.), *Contingency, hegemony, universality: Contemporary dialogues on the left* (pp. 11-43). New York, NY: Verso.

Butler, J. (2001). Transformative encounters. In E. Beck-Gernsheim, J. Butler, & L. Puigvert (Eds.), *Women and social transformation* (pp. 81-98). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Butler, J. (2004). *Precarious life: The power of mourning and violence*. New York, NY: Verso.

Butler, J. (2005). *Giving an account of oneself*. New York, NY: Fordham University Press.

Cable News Network. (2011, July 5). Japan graphic to save energy. *Cable News Network*. Retrieved from http://www.cnn.com/2011/WORLD/asiapcf/ 06/30/japan.energy. saving/index.html#

Carr-Chellman, A. A., Beabout, B., Alkandari, K. A., Almeida, L. C., Gursoy, H. T., Ma, Z., & Pastore, R. S. (2008). Change in chaos: Seven lessons learned from Katrina. *Educational Horizons, 87*(1), 26-39.

Casemore, B. (2008). *The Autobiographical demand of place: Curriculum inquiry in the American South*. New York, NY: Perter Lang.

Cave, P. (2010). Educational reform in Japan in the 1990s: Individuality and other uncertainties. *Comparative Education, 37*(2), 173-191.

Charland, P. C., & Cyr, S. C. (2013). The situations bank, a tool for curriculum design focused on daily realities: The case of the reform in Niger. *Prospects, 43*(4), 461-472.

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Chase, S. E. (2005). Narrative inquiry: Multiple lenses, approaches, voices. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.) (pp. 651-679). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Chase, S. E. (2011). Narrative inquiry: Still a field in the making. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (4th ed.) (pp. 421-434). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cherryholmes, C. H. (1988). *Power and criticism: Poststructural investigations in education*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Cho, J., & Trent, A. (2006). Validity in qualitative research revisited. *Qualitative Research, 6*(3), 319-340.

Clandinin, D. J. (2013). *Engaging in narrative inquiry*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Clandinin, D. J., & Rosiek, J. (2007). Mapping a landscape of narrative inquiry: Borderland spaces and tensions. In D. J. Clandinin (Ed.), *Handbook of narrative inquiry: Mapping a methodology* (pp. 35-75). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Clothey, R., Mills, M., & Baumgarten, J. (2010). A closer look at the impact of globalization on science education. *Cultural Studies of Science Education, 5*(2), 305-313.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Fries, K. (2004). Researching teacher education in changing times: Politics and paradigms. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education*. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Cole, E., & Barsalou, J. (2006). *Unite or divide? The challenges of teaching history in societies emerging from violent conflict. Special report*. Washington, DC: U.S. Institute of Peace.

Cook-Sather, A. (2007). Translating researchers: Re-imagining the work of investigating students' experiences in school. In D. Thiessen & A. Cook-Sather (Eds.), *International handbook of student experiences in elementary and secondary school* (pp. 829-871). New York, NY: Springer.

Davies, L., & Talbot, C. (2008). Learning in conflict and postconflict contexts. *Comparative Education Review, 52*(4), 509-518.

De Alba, A., Gonzalez-Gaudiano, E., Lankshear, C., & Peters, M. (2000). *Curriculum in the postmodern condition*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Delgado Bernal, D. (1998). Using a Chicana feminist epistemology in educational research. *Harvard Educational Review, 68*(4), 555-582.

De Man, P. (1986). *Resistance to theory*. Minnesota, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2000). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.).(pp. 1-28). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

DesRoches, D. (2018, February 21). Trauma bags and armed guards: Securing schools without creating a fortress. *National Public Radio*. Retrieved from https://www.npr.org/2018/02/21/587502662/school-safety-striking-a-balance-between-secure-but-not-a-fortress?sc=17&f=1003&utm_source=iosnewsapp &utm_medium=Email&utm_campaign=app

Diaz-Agero Roman, R. (2016). *Recovery and regeneration in Fukushima*. Retrieved from https://www.unisdr.org/archive/50743

Doll, W. E. (1993). *A post-modern perspective on curriculum*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Dryden-Peterson, S. (2011). *Refugee education: A global review*. Retrieved from http://www.unhcr.org/4fe317589.html

Ellsworth, E. (1989). Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through the repressive myth of critical pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review, 59*(3), 297-324.

Ellsworth, E., & Miller, J. L. (1996). Working difference in education. *Curriculum Inquiry, 26*(3), 245-263.

Endo, T. (2013). Towareru gakuryoku to seizon no kenri. In H. Sanuki, H. Satou, S. Miyashita, & Y. Nakata (Eds.), *3.11 to kyouiku kaikaku* (pp. 39-54). Kyoto, Japan: Kamogawa Shuppan. [Printed in Japanese]

Engelbrecht, A. (2008). The impact of role reversal in representational practices in history textbooks after Apartheid. *South African Journal of Education, 28*, 519-541.

Fine, M., & Weis, L. (1996). Writing the "wrongs" of fieldwork: Confronting our own research/writing dilemmas in urban ethnographies. *Qualitative Inquiry, 2*(3), 251-274.

Fontana, A., & Frey, J. H. (2005). The interview: From neutral stance to political involvement. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials* (3rd ed.) (pp. 115-160). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Foster, S., & Nicholls, J. (2005). America in World War II: An analysis of history textbooks from England, Japan, Sweden, and the United States. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 20*(3), 214-233.

Foucault, M. (1972). *Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977.* New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Freedman, S. W., Weinstein, H. M., Murphy, K., & Longman T. (2008). Teaching history after identity-based conflicts: The Rwanda experience. *Comparative Education Review, 52*(4), 663-690.

Frisoli, P. S. J., Frazier, J., & Hansen, H. (2013). Teacher motivation, well-being, and professional development: Teacher networks in Katanga Province, Democratic Republic of Congo. Paper submitted to UKFIET International Conference on Education and Development, September.

Fukushima Board of Education. (2013). *Dai 6ji Fukushima ken sougou kyouiku keikaku*. Retrieved from http://www.pref.fks.ed.jp/keikaku/6jikeikakukaitei/6jikeikakukaitei.pdf [Printed in Japanese]

Fukushima-Kencho. (2013). *Kin•Gendai*. Retrieved from https://www.pref.fukushima.lg.jp/site/ken-no-sugata/kingendai.html [Printed in Japanese] Fukushima Minpou. (2011, April 22). Souri, mou kaerunoka hinansha kibishii koe「genpatsu, ikkoku mo hayaku shuusoku o」*Fukushima Minpou*. Retrieved from http://www.minpo.jp/pub/topics/jishin2011/2011/04/post_686.html

Fukushima Ken Kikaku Chousei-Bu Toukei Chousa Ka Hen. (2012). *Fukushima-ken no suikei jinkyou*. Retrieved from http://www.pref.fukushima.lg.jp/uploaded/attachment/22314.pdf

Fukushima Minpou. (2012, March 2). Asu e no teigen Fukushima i dai kango gakubu sougouka gakubumon kyoujyu (shinrigaku) Shiga Noriaki shi kokoro no kea chuui haratte. *Fukushima Minpou*. Retrieved from http://www.minpo.jp/pub/topics/jishin2011/2012/03/post_3340.html

Fukushima Minyu. (2016, May 11). Hinanshichouson…Kawaru kyouiku kodomo genshou keikou「shou kibo no yosa dasu」. *Fukushima Minyu*. Retrieved from http://www.minyunet.com/news/sinsai/serial/0502/FM20160511-072757.php

Fukushima Minyu. (2018, March 3). Omoide mochidasu: Genpatsu jiko go hatsu. *Fukushima Minyu*. Retrieved from http://www.minyu-net.com/news/news/FM20180303-248937.php

Fukushima Prefectural Education Center. (2017). *Shochou aisatsu*. Retrieved from http://www.center.fks.ed.jp/

Fuller, B., & Clarke, P. (1994). Raising school effects while ignoring culture? Local conditions and the influence of classrooms, tools, rules and pedagogy. *Review of Educational Research, 64*(1), 119-157.

Gaspar, M. (2015). *IAEA releases Director General's report on Fukushima Daiichi accident*. Retrieved from https://www.iaea.org/newscenter/news/iaea-releases-director-generals-report-on-fukushima-daiichi-accident

Gay, G. (2010). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures: Selected Essays*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Gilmore, L. (2001). *The limits of autobiography: Trauma and testimony*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack. (2014). *Education under attack 2014*. Retrieved from http://protectingeducation.org/sites/default/files/documents/eua_2014_full_0.pdf

Goto, S. (2013). *Minna de manabu houshasenfukudokubon: Kagakuteki•ronri teki taido to ronri wo rikai suru*. Tokyo, Japan: Godo Shuppan Kabushiki Gaisha. [Printed in Japanese]

The Guardian. (2017, April 26). Japan minister quits after saying it was 'better' tsunami hit the north of country. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/apr/26/japan-reconstruction-minister-quits-after-inappropriate-comment-on-disaster-zone

Haraway, D. (1988). Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. *Feminist Studies, 14*(3), 575-599.

Hardy, L. (2007). Katrina exposes our schools' shameful inequality. *Democracy and Education, 17*(1), 64-66.

Henry, M. G. (2003). 'Where are you really from?": Representation, identity, and power in the fieldwork experiences of a South Asian diasporic. *Qualitative Research 3*(2), 229-242.

Hino, K. (2016, November 23). Ryoushin「Taiou subete ga osoi」 Gakkou gawa ni. *Mainichi Shinbun*. Retrieved from https://mainichi.jp/articles/20161124/k00/00m/040/070000c

Hochman, D. (2006). Hominid development: On being a social studies teacher during September 11th. In M. Grolnick (Ed.), *Forever after: New York City teachers on 9/11* (pp. 85-96). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Hodgkin, M. (2007). Negotiating change: Participatory curriculum design in emergencies. *Current Issues in Comparative Education, 9*(2), 33-44.

Hopmann, S. (2003). On the evaluation of curriculum reforms. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 35*(4), 459-478.

Hult, F. M. (2012). English as a transcultural language in Swedish policy and practice. *TESOL Quarterly, 46*(2), 230-257.

Hurn, C. J. (1993). *The limits and possibilities of schooling*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies. (2010a). *Guidance notes on teaching and learning*. New York, NY: INEE.

Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies. (2010b). *Minimum standards for education: Preparedness, response, recovery*. New York, NY: INEE.

Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies. (n.d.). *Multiple facets of education in conflict and fragile contexts*. Retrieved from http://www.ineesite.org/en/education-fragility/multiple-faces-of-education

International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC). (2012). *World disasters report 2012*. Retrieved from http://issuu.com/goldmercury/docs/1216800-wdr-2012-en-full

International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC). (2013). *Annual report 2012*. Retrieved from http://media.ifrc.org/ifrc/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2017/12/Annual-report-2012.pdf

International Rescue Committee (IRC). (2006). *Creating healing classrooms: Tools for teachers and teacher educators*. Retrieved from http://www.rescue.org/sites/default/files/migrated/resources/hci-tools.pdf

International Rescue Committee (IRC). (2016). *Annual report 2016*. Retrieved from https://www.rescue.org/sites/default/files/document/1568/internationalrescuecommitteeannualreport2016-rev.pdf

International Rescue Committee (IRC). (2018). *Disturbing new IRC stats: Refugee resettlement shattered under Trump*. Retrieved from https://www.rescue.org/article/disturbing-new-irc-stats-refugee-resettlement-shattered-under-trump

Izawa, T. (2017, April 11). Shinsai genpatsu ijime 13 ken…Fukushima hinansha kei 199 ken. *Mainichi Shinbun*. Retrieved from https://mainichi.jp/articles/20170411/k00/00e/040/206000c

Jackson, A. Y., & Mazzei, L. A. (2012). *Thinking with theory in qualitative research: Viewing data across multiple perspectives*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Kagawa, F. (2005). Emergency education: A critical review of the field. *Comparative Education, 41*(4), 487-503.

Kim, R., Ham, S., & Paine, L. W. (2011). Knowledge expectations in mathematics teacher preparation programs in South Korea and the United States: Towards international dialogue. *Journal of Teacher Education, 62*(1), 48-61.

Kincheloe, J. L., & Pinar, W. F. (1991). *Curriculum as social psychoanalysis: The significance of place*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Kincheloe, J. L., Pinar, W. F., & Slattery, P. (1994). A last dying chord? Toward cultural and educational renewal in the South. *Curriculum Inquiry, 24*(4), 407-436.

Kirk, J., & Winthrop, R. (2007). Promoting quality education in refugee contexts: Supporting teacher development in Northern Ethiopia. *International Review of Education, 53*(5/6), 715-723.

Kirk, J., & Winthrop, R. (2008). Home-based school teachers in Afghanistan: Teaching for Tarbia and student well-being. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*(4), 876-888.

Kliebard, H. M. (2004). *The struggle for the American curriculum* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Kos, A. M., & Zemljak, B. (2007). Psychosocial support for children, families and teachers in Iraq. *Intervention, 5*(2), 150-158.

Kvale, S., & Brinkmann. S. (2009). *InterViews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal, 32*(3), 465-491.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1997). I know why this doesn't feel empowering: A critical race analysis of critical pedagogy. In P. Freire (Ed.), *Mentoring the mentor: A critical dialogue with Paulo Freire* (pp. 127-142). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2001). *Crossing over to Canaan: The journey of new teachers crossing over into diverse classrooms*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2007). *The Dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children*. Retrieved from https://ebookcentral.proquest.com

Lagemann, E. C. (2000). *An elusive science: The troubling history of education research*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Lather, P. (2007). *Getting lost: Feminist efforts toward a Double(d) science*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Lather, P. (2013). Methodology-21: What do we do in the afterward? *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 26*(6), 634-645.

Lather, P., & Smithies, C. (1997). *Troubling the angels: Women living with HIV/AIDS*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Lather, P., & St. Pierre, E. A. (2013). Post-qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 26*(6), 629-633.

Law, W. (2014). Understanding China's curriculum reform for the 21st century. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 46*(3), 332-360.

Lies, E. (2017, April 25). Japan reconstruction minister quits after inappropriate comment on disaster zone. *Reuters*. Retrieved from https://www.reuters.com/article/us-japan-politics-resignation/japan-reconstruction-minister-quits-after-inappropriate-comment-on-disaster-zone-idUSKBN17S07R

Lortie, D. C. (1975). *School teacher: A sociological study.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Loveless, T. (2015). *How well are American students learning?* Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.

Low-Beer, A. (2001). Politics, school textbooks and cultural identity: The struggle in Bosnia and Herzegovina. *Paradigm, 2*(3), 1-6.

Lowenstein, E. (2006). Voices from the crossroads. In M. Grolnick (Ed.), *Forever after: New York City teachers on 9/11* (pp. 159-176). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Lyotard, J. F. (1984). *The post-modern condition: A report on knowledge* (G. Bennington & B. Massumi, Trans.). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press. (Original work published 1979)

Machel, G. (1996). *Impact of armed conflict on children*. Retrieved from http://www.unicef.org/graca/a51-306_en.pdf

Madriz, E. (1998). Using focus groups with lower socioeconomic status Latina women. *Qualitative Inquiry, 4*(1), 114-128.

Marcus, G. E., & Fischer, M. M. J. (1986). *Anthropology as cultural critique: An experimental moment in the human sciences*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2011). *Designing qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Masaki, M. (2012). *Daijiko to Setsuden No Natsu Wo Heta Genpatsu E No Taido*. Retrieved from https://www.nhk.or.jp/bunken/summary/research/report/2012_01/20120102.pdf

Maxwell, J. A. (2009). Validity: How might you be wrong. In W. Luttrell (Ed.), *Qualitative educational research: Readings in reflexive methodology and transformative practice* (pp. 279-287). New York, NY: Routledge.

Mazzei, L. A. (2013). A voice without organs: Interviewing in posthumanist research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 26*(6), 732-740.

McCurry, J. (2016, March 10). Five years on, cleanup of Fukushima's reactors remains a distant goal. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2016/mar/11/fukushima-daiichi-nuclear-reactors-decommission-cleanup-japan-tsunami-meltdown

Mercado, C. I. (1993). Caring as empowerment: School collaboration and community agency. *Urban Review, 25*(1), 79-104.

Miller, J. L. (1990). *Creating spaces and finding voices: Teachers collaborating for empowerment.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Miller, J. L. (2005). *Sounds of silence breaking: Women, autobiography, curriculum*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Miller, J. L. (2006) Curriculum studies and transnational flows and mobilities: Feminist autobiographical perspectives. *Transnational Curriculum Inquiry, 3*(2), 31-50.

Miller, J. L. (2010a). Curriculum and poststructuralist theory. *International Encyclopedia of Education, 1*, 499-504.

Miller, J. L. (2010b). Curriculum as a consciousness of possibilities. *Curriculum Inquiry, 40*(1), 125-141.

Minh-Ha, T. T. (2011). *Elsewhere within here immigration, refugeeism and the boundary event.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT). (1980). *Japan's modern educational system*. Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/hakusho/html/others/detail/1317220.htm

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT). (n.d.a). *Japanese school systems*. Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/english/introduction/1303952.htm

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT). (n.d.b). *Improvement of academic abilities (Course of study)*. Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/english/elsec/1303755.htm

Mishler, E. G. (1986). *Research interviewing: Context and narrative*. Retrieved from https://ebookcentral.proquest.com

Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., & Neff, D. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory Into Practice, 31*, 132-141.

Moon, R. (2013). Globalisation and citizenship education: Diversity in South Korean civics textbooks. *Comparative Education, 49*(4), 424-439.

Moore, A. L. (2007). Guess who's coming to dinner: The importance of multiculturalism in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina. *Multicultural Education, 15*(2), 24-30.

Motani, Y. (2005). Hopes and challenges for progressive educators in Japan: Assessment of the 'progressive turn' in the 2002 educational reform. *Comparative Education, 41*(3), 309-327.

Nancy, J. (2015). *After Fukushima: The equivalence of catastrophes*. New York, NY: Fordham University Press.

Nicolai, S., & Triplehorn, C. (2003). *The role of education in protecting children in conflict*. London, UK: Humanitarian Practice Network.

Nihon Keizai Shinbun. (2017, April 11). Fukushima hinan ijime 129 ken 16 nendo, monkashou ga hatsu chousha. *Nihon Keizai Shinbun*. Retrieved from https://www.nikkei.com/article/DGXLASDG11H2H_R10C17A4CC0000/

Noddings, N. (2008). Caring and peace education. In M. Bajaj (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of peace education* (pp. 87-91). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Noddings, N. (2013). Standardized curriculum and loss of creativity. *Theory Into Practice, 52*(3), 210-215.

Obura, A. (2003). *Educational reconstruction in Rwanda*. Paris, France: International Institute for Educational Planning.

O'Connor, P., & Takahashi, N. (2013). From caring about to caring for: Case studies of New Zealand and Japanese schools post disaster. *Pastoral Care in Education, 32*(1), 42-53.

Olson, G. A., & Worsham, L. (2000). Changing the subject: Judith Butler's politics of radical resignification. *Jac, 20*(4), 727-765.

Oxfam-Novib. (2009). *End-term evaluation report of post-tsunami reconstruction program in Aceh Province, Indonesia*. Retrieved from http://www.academia.edu/5092906/REBUILDING_ACEH_through_EDUCATION_FOR_ALL_End-term_Evaluation_Report_of_Post-Tsunami_Reconstruction_Program_in_Aceh_Province_Indonesia_carried_out_by_Education_International_co-financed_by_OXFAM_International_and_OXFAM-NOVIB_Evaluation_Team

Patai, D. (1994). (Response) When method becomes power. In A. Gitlen (Ed.), *Power and method: Political activism and educational research* (pp. 61-73). New York, NY: Routledge.

Pillow, W. S. (2003). Confession, catharsis, or cure? Rethinking the uses of reflexivity as methodological power in qualitative research. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 16*(2), 175-196.

Pinar, W. F. (1975). *Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Pinar, W. F. (2004). *What is curriculum theory?* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Pinar, W. F., & Grumet, M. R. (1976). *Toward a poor urriculum*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt.

Pinar, W., Reynolds, W., Slattery, P., & Taubman, P. (1995). *Understanding curriculum: An introduction to the study of historical and contemporary curriculum discourses*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Reconstruction Agency. (2017). *Zenkoku no hinanshasuu*. Retrieved from http://www.reconstruction.go.jp/topics/main-cat2/sub-cat2-1/20170829_hinansha.pdf

Richardson, L. (2000). Writing: A method of inquiry. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.) (pp. 923-948). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Riessman, C. K. (2008). *Narrative methods for the human sciences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Robertson, C. C., & King, J. E. (2007). Boŋ Feerey: A teaching and learning methodology for healing the wounds of distance, displacement, and loss caused by Hurricane Katrina. *Journal of Black Studies, 37*(4), 469-481.

Rutherford, J. (1990). The third space: Interview with Homi Bhaba. In J. Rutherford (Ed.), *Identity: Community, culture, difference. London* (pp. 207-221). London, UK: Lawrence and Wishart.

Saltz, C., & Grolnick, M. (2016). Preface. In M. Grolnick (Ed.), *Forever after: New York City teachers on 9/11.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Sankei News. (2016, May 24). Genpatsu jiko hinan kuiki roku cho son no jidou•seito suu shinsai mae no 6.6%, genshou tomaradu. *Sankei News*. Retrieved from http://www.sankei.com/region/print/160524/rgn1605240047-c.html

Sankei News. (2017, March 13). Zenchou hinan no Fukushima•Okumamachi, 「kakyuusei ni totte wa ikoku no hanashi」 hinansaki no Aizuwakmatsu deno seikatsu nagaku. *Sankei News*. Retrieved from http://www.sankei.com/affairs/news/170313/afr1703130033-n2.html

Sanuki, H. (2013). Hajimeni. In H. Sanuki, H. Satou, S. Miyashita, & Y. Nakata (Eds.), *3.11 to kyouiku kaikaku*. (pp. 10-22). Kyoto, Japan: Kamogawa Shuppan. [Printed in Japanese]

Save the Children. (2012). *Fukushima families*. Retrieved from http://www.savethechildren.org/atf/cf/%7B9def2ebe-10ae-432c-9bd0-df91d2eba74a%7D/JAPAN_FUKUSHIMA_FAMILIES_REPORT.PDF

Save the Children. (2013). *Two years on: Save the Children's response and recovery program*. Retrieved from http://www.savechildren.or.jp/jpnem/jpn/pdf/two_year_later/two_year_on.pdf

Scheurich, J. J. (1997). A postmodern critique of research interviewing. In J. J. Scheurich (Ed.), *Research method in the postmodern* (pp. 61-79). Philadelphia, PA: Routledge/Falmer.

Scott, J. W. (1991). The evidence of experience. *Critical Inquiry, 178*(3), 773-797.

Sealey-Ruiz, Y. (2007). Wrapping the curriculum around their lives: Using a culturally relevant curriculum with African American adult women. *Adult Education Quarterly, 58*(1), 44-60.

Selby, D., & Kagawa, F. (2012). *Disaster risk reduction in school curricula: Case studies from thirty countries*. Spain: United Nations Children Fund UNICEF and United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization UNESCO.

Sinclair, M. (2002). Planning education in and after emergencies. In J. Crisp, C. Talbot, & D. Cippollone (Eds.), *Learning for a future: Refugee education in developing countries*. Geneva, Switzerland: UNHCR.

Singh, N. (2011). Culturally appropriate education: Theoretical and practical implications. In J. Reyhner, W. S. Gilbert, & L. Lockard (Eds.), *Honoring our heritage: Culturally appropriate approaches for teaching Indigenous students*. Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona University Press.

Shriberg, J. (2007). *Teaching well? Educational reconstruction efforts and support to teachers in postwar Liberia*. New York, NY: International Rescue Committee.

Smith, M. (2010). School as Zones of Peace: Nepal case study in access to education during armed conflict and civil unrest. In *Protecting Education from Attack* (pp. 260-277). Paris, France: UNESCO.

Smith, S., & Watson J. (2010). *Reading autobiography: A guide for interpreting life narratives*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Soslau, E. G., & Yost, D. S. (2007). Urban service-learning: An authentic teaching strategy to deliver a standards-driven curriculum. *Journal of Experiential Education, 30*(1), 36-53.

Spencer, H. (2009). *Essays on education and kindred subjects*. Auckland, New Zealand: The Floating Press. Retrieved from http://www.ebrary.com

Squire, C., Andrews, M., & Tamboukou, M. (2013). Introduction: What is narrative research? In M. Andrews, C. Squire, & M. Tamboukou (Eds.), *Doing narrative research* (pp. 1-26). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

St. Pierre, E. A. (1997). Methodology in the fold and the irruption of transgressive data. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 10*(2), 175-189.

St. Pierre, E. A. (2000a). Nomadic inquiry in the smooth spaces of the field: A preface. In St. Pierre & W. Pillow (Eds.), *Working the ruins: Feminist poststructural theory and methods in education* (pp. 258-283). New York, NY: Routledge.

St. Pierre, E. A. (2000b). Poststructural feminism in education: An overview. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 13*(5), 477-515.

St. Pierre. E. A (2013). The posts continue: Becoming. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 26*(6), 646-657.

St. Pierre, E. A. (2014). A brief and personal history of post qualitative research. Toward "post inquiry*." Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 30*(2), 2-19.

St. Pierre, E. A., & Jackson, A. Y. (2014). Qualitative data analysis after coding. *Qualitative Inquiry, 20*(6), 715-719.

Swadener, B. B. (2005). Kenyan children speak through their art. In L. Diaz Soto & B. B. Swadener (Eds.), *Power and voice in research with young children* (pp. 137-152). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Taba, H. (1962). *Curriculum development: Theory and practice*. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace, World.

Takahashi, M., & Nonomiya, L. (2017, April 25). Abe Minister resigns following gaffe on Japan's 2011 earthquake. *Bloomberg*. Retrieved from https://www.bloomberg.com/politics/articles/2017-04-25/japan-s-reconstruction-minister-to-resign-for-quake-remark-nhk

Takayama, K. (2007). A nation at risk crosses the Pacific: Transnational borrowing of the U.S. crisis discourse in the debate on education reform in Japan. *Comparative Education Review, 51*(4), 423-446.

Takeda, S. (2017). *Shochou aisatsu*. Retrieved from http://www.center.fks.ed.jp/

Takeuchi, T. (2012). *Ookumamachi gakkousaisei e no chousen: Manabiau kyouiku ga tsunagu hito to chiiki*. Kyoto: Kamogawa Shuppan. [Printed in Japanese]

Tamboukou, M. (2013). A Foucauldian approach to narratives. In M. Andrews, C. Squire, & M. Tamboukou (Eds.), *Doing narrative research* (pp. 88-107). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Tani, M. (2013). Shinsai•Genpatsu to mukiau: Fukushima no mirai wo hiraku tameni. In H. Sanuki, H. Satou, S. Miyashita, & Y. Nakata (Eds.), *3.11 to kyouiku kaikaku* (pp. 10-22). Kyoto, Japan: Kamogawa Shuppan. [Printed in Japanese]

Tanner, D., & Tanner, L. (2007). *Curriculum development: Theory into practice*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Taubman, P. M. (2009). *Teaching by numbers*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Temple, B. (2008). Narrative analysis of written texts: Reflexivity in cross language research. *Qualitative Research, 8*(3), 355-365.

Temple, B., & Young, A. (2004). Qualitative research and translation dilemmas. *Qualitative Research, 4*(2), 161-178.

Tibbitts, F. (2002). Understanding what we do: Emerging models for Human Rights Education. *International Review of Education, 48*(3/4), 159-171.

Tilley, S. A. (2003). "Challenging" research practices: Turning a critical lens on the work of transcription. *Qualitative Inquiry, 9*(5), 750-773.

Tokyo Electric Power Company. (2012). *The Great East Japan Earthquake and current status of nuclear power stations*. Retrieved from http://www.tepco.co.jp/en/nu/fukushima-np/f1/images/f12np-gaiyou_e_1.pdf

Torsti, P. (2007). How to deal with a difficult past? History textbooks supporting enemy images in post-war Bosnia and Herzegovina. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 39*(1), 77-96.

The Tribune. (2017, April 26). Japan minister quits after inappropriate comment on disaster zone. *The Tribune*. Retrieved from http://www.tribuneindia.com/news/world/japan-minister-quits-after-inappropriate-comment-on-disaster-zone/397873.html

Truby, D., & Richards, E. (2005). After Katrina: Three teachers tell their stories. *Instructor, 115*(3), 24-25.

Tyack, D. B. (1974). *The one best system: A history of American urban education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Tyler, R. W. (1949). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Underwood, P. R. (2012). Teacher beliefs and intentions regarding the instruction of English grammar under national curriculum reforms: A theory of planned behaviour perspective. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 28*(6), 911-925.

United Nations. (2015). *Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.* Retrieved from http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/70/1&Lang=E

United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). (2007). *Training of teachers on how to give psychosocial support in emergencies*. Retrieved from http://www.unicef.org/media/media_41230.html

United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). (2008). *Post-crisis transition*. Retrieved from http://www.unicef.org/education/index_42706.html

United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). (2012). *East Japan earthquake and tsunami disaster. Japan committee for UNICEF emergency relief and reconstruction support one year report*. Retrieved from http://www.unicef.org.hk/upload/NewsMedia/publication/1year_report_en.pdf

United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). (2014). *Education in emergencies and post-crisis transition*. Retrieved from http://www.unicef.org/education/bege_61685.Html

United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2014a). *Education for all global monitoring report 2013/4: Teaching and learning: Achieving quality for all*. Paris, France: UNESCO.

United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2014b). *Stay safe and be prepared: A teacher's guide to disaster risk reduction.* Paris, France: UNESCO.

United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2015). *Education for all global monitoring report. Education For All 2000-2015: Achievements and challenges*. Retrieved from http://en.unesco.org/gem-report/report/2015/education-all-2000-2015-achievements-and-challenges #sthash.8ewTiUKN.XSP0Cjcb.dpbs

Van Maanen, J. (2011). *Tales of the field: On writing ethnography* (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Van Nuland, S. (2009). *Teacher codes: Learning from experience*. Paris, France: International Institute for Educational Planning. Retrieved from http://teacher codes.iiep.unesco.org/teachercodes/resources/Literature_review.pdf

Villenas, S. (1996). The colonizer/colonized Chicana ethnographer: Identity, marginalization, and co-optation in the field. *Harvard Educational Review, 66*(4), 711-731.

Wada, C. (2013, September 11). Shinsai kara 2nen han, hinansha to shimin no kyouzon mondai wo kakaeru「Iwaki shimin」. *The Huffington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.jp/2013/09/11/fukushima_iwaki_n_3905527.html

Wada, C. (2015, March 10). 「Hinansha, kaere」Rakugaki kara 2 nen Chernobyl wo sankou ni hajimatta Iwaki shimin ni yoru torikumi towa? *The Huffington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.jp/2015/03/09/iwaki-jc_n_ 6789370.html

Waller, W. (1965). *The sociology of teaching*. New York, NY: J. Wiley & Sons.

Weedon, C. (1987). *Feminist practice and poststructuralist theory*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Weedon, C. (2004). *Identity and culture: Narratives of difference and belonging*. London, UK: Open University Press.

Weis, L. & Fine, M. (2005). *Beyond silenced voices: Class, race and gender in United States schools*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Weis, L., Fine, M., Weseen, S. & Wong, M. (2000). Qualitative research, representations, and social responsibilities. In L. Weis & M. Fine (Eds.), *Speed bumps: A student friendly guide to qualitative research* (pp. 32-66). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Weldon, G. (2010). Post-conflict teacher development: Facing the past in South Africa. *Journal of Moral Education, 39*(3), 353-364.

Wermke, W., & Höstfält, G. (2014). Contextualizing teacher autonomy in time and space: A model for comparing various forms of governing the teaching profession. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 46*(1), 58-80.

Willis, D. B., Yamamura, S, & Rappleye, J. (2008). Frontiers of education: Japan as "global model" or "nation at risk"? *International Review of Education, 54*, 493-515.

Wolf, D. L. (Ed.). (1996). *Feminist dilemmas in fieldwork*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

World Health Organization (WHO). (2012). *The great East Japan earthquake: A story of a devastating natural disaster, a tale of human compassion*. Retrieved from http://www.wpro.who.int/publications/docs/japan_earthquake.pdf

Yomiuri Online. (2018, March 3). Touji no mama: Fukushima. *Yomiuri Shimbun Online*. Retrieved from http://www.yomiuri.co.jp/stream/?id=08220

Yano, H. (2013). A shift away from an egalitarian system: Where do the current reforms in Japan lead? *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 45*(1), 81-88.

Youdell, D. (2006). *Impossible bodies, impossible selves: Exclusions and student subjectivities*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Appendix A

Sample E-mail to Be Sent to Solicit Participant Suggestions

Dear ,

Greetings from New York. I hope this email finds you well.

I write to you today as I plan on returning to Japan during the summer month of August.

As you are already aware, I have been spending the past few years preparing for my doctoral dissertation research around curriculum studies. I am happy to share with you that I am finally embarking on my doctoral dissertation research and am seeking individuals who would be available and interested to participate in my research. As I plan my summer travels, I humbly seek your support if you would be able to introduce me to teachers whom you think would be interested to speak to me about their personal as well as teaching experiences around March 11, 2011.

I have also included below a brief summary of my research to give a glimpse of what I am exploring.

Please feel free to give them my contact information directly.

Thank you in advance for your support. I hope we can also find time to catch up should your schedule permit.

Name: Mito Takahashi, Teachers College, Columbia University
E Mail: pmg69@tc.columbia.edu
Study theme: While traditional notions of "curriculum" tend to be understood as something that needs to be developed and taught towards a learning objective, in exploring how teachers talk about their understandings of the "curriculum" and "experiences" in relation to 3.11, this inquiry aims to conceptualize "curriculum" and "experience" as anything but standardized and complete.
Seeking participation: The author of this research is seeking individuals who will be interested and available to participate in this research by engaging in 1-2 dialogue sessions to answer questions related to their educational background and teaching experiences. The first interview session will take place in August 2016 and the follow up interview will take place in the winter of 2016.

I will be happy to send you further information regarding this research.

研究者: 高橋美登、テイーチャーズカレッジ・コロンビア大学所属
Eメール: pmg69@tc.columbia.edu

研究テーマ：本来、教育計画や「カリキュラム」は授業の前に授業を想定した上で構成されるものとして考える傾向があります。事前に教育現場で「おこりうる」を想定して組まれたものが、現在私たちが主に関わりうる「カリキュラム」です。本研究は2011年3月11日を元に教員の体験談や経験をお聞きし、対話を通して私達が考える教育計画やそれに基づく経験というコンセプトを紐解いて行く事を目指しています。
研究参加のお願い：2回ほどのインタビューに参加出来る方を探しております。インタビューは参加者と研究者との対話と言った形式で行われます。最初のインタビューは2016年の夏に行われます。2回目のインタビューは2016年の年末に行う予定であります。教員としての体験談、ご自身の教育背景、教育現場での体験などについて話していただきます。

ご関心をお持ちいただけましたら、私の研究詳細を後日メール等で送らせていただきます。

Appendix B

Sample E-mail to Be Sent to Potential Participants

Dear ,

I hope this email finds you well. My name is Mito Takahashi (Patricia Gibson), a doctoral student from Teachers College, Columbia University. I was referred to you by Ms./Mr. (Name) whom I have been in communication with regarding my doctoral research.

I am currently engaging in my doctoral dissertation exploring how teachers understand and talk about the curriculum in relation to their daily experiences before, during, and after March 11, 2011. In discussing my research interests with Ms./Mr. (Name), s/he suggested I reach out to you as you may be interested to participate in my research exploration.

I will be in Fukushima between (dates) and would love to be able to connect with you and possibly interview you to hear your thoughts. The interview session will be between 60-90 minutes and I will be willing to meet you where it is most convenient for you. If you will be available and interested to participate, I will be more than happy to share further information regarding my research with you in later correspondences.

Thank you in advance for your time. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Mito Takahashi

拝啓

私はコロンビア大学院で教育を専攻しております、高橋美登と申します。以前より交流させていただいている （名前）にご紹介していただきメールを送らせていただいております。

私は現在３．１１を起点に教師の体験談、「経験」、そして「カリキュラム」についての研究に取り組んでおります。そこで、（名前）に私の研究に参加していただけるもしくは、興味をもっていただける先生としてご紹介していただきました。

私は8月に短期帰国する予定でおります。そこで、先生のご都合がよろしければ、ぜひ、お会いし、先生の教員体験や教育現場での体験談について聞かせていただければ幸いです。もし、参加可能であれば、インタビュー形式で60ー90分ほどのお時間をいただければと願っています。

教育委員会や研修会などで忙しい時期とは思いますが、先生が学校にいらしている間やご都合が宜しい時にお時間をいただければ幸いです。私の訪問可能な期間は(期間)です。

本来であれば、書面にて郵送すべきところではございますが、米国の郵便事情に鑑み、このようなメールでの略儀をどうぞご容赦ください。ご関心をお持ちいただけましたら、私の研究詳細を後日メール等で送らせていただきます。

（何々様）のお力添えをいただければ幸いです。

何卒宜しくお願い申し上げます。

高橋美登

Appendix C

Sample E-mail to Be Sent to Potential Participants Who Have Agreed to Participate

Dear ,

Thank you for agreeing to participate in my doctoral dissertation explorations. I thank you sincerely for your time.

As I will be in Japan during the below mentioned dates, I wanted to follow up with you to see which dates or times would work best for you.
Dates:
1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7. (etc)

I am most grateful for your time and anticipate a productive dialogue session with you. I will be able to share further information regarding the interview and my research when we meet in person.

Your expertise, experiences, and thoughts will significantly inform my explorations around curriculum and education.

Sincerely,

Mito Takahashi

拝啓

この度は私の博士論文研究にご参加していただき誠にありがとうございます。

今季は以下の日程で帰国予定しております。
日時:
1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.

先生のご都合のよい日時・場所を教えていただければ幸いです。

お会いした次第には60−90分ほどの対話形式でのインタビューを行わせていただきたいと思っておりますのでご了承頂ければ幸いです。研究内容等などはお会いした際に提供させていただきます。

先生の思考、経験、思想をお聞きするにあたり私の探求も影響される事を楽しみにしております。

敬具、

高橋美登

Appendix D

Informed Consent and Participant's Rights English Version

Protocol Title: Teacher "Narratives" from the Field? Confronting the (Im)Possibilities of Representing "Curriculum" and "Experience" Through Autobiography
Principal Investigator: Mito Takahashi (Patricia Mito Gibson), Teachers College, Columbia University, 917-280-2682 (US)

INTRODUCTION
You are being invited to participate in this research study called "Teacher "Narratives" from the Field? Confronting the (Im)Possibilities of Representing "Curriculum" and "Experience" Through Autobiography." This research study is a curriculum inquiry that explores teachers' narratives around their experiences of the Great East Japan Earthquake of March 11, 2011.

While traditional notions of "curriculum" tend to be understood as something that needs to be developed and taught towards a learning objective, in exploring how teachers talk about their experiences of March 11 and their understandings of "curriculum," this inquiry aims to complicate the ways in which we understand "curriculum" and "experience" as anything but standardized and complete. In this exploration, the researcher incorporates autobiography as a research method to complicate how the teachers' narratives will be represented in this inquiry.

This study invites 2-3 teacher participants to consider participating in 2 interview sessions, which will last approximately 60-90 minutes each. They will also be asked to share artifacts such as lesson plans, newsletters, photos, or blog content that they feel comfortable sharing with the principal researcher.

You will find below the informed consent outlining the content of this research as well as your participant rights.

WHY IS THIS STUDY BEING DONE?
This study is being done to explore narratives around the events following March 11, 2011 and the effects of such events on how teachers talk about their "experiences" as well as "the curriculum." Through autobiographical curriculum inquiry, the researcher aims to complicate traditional understandings of "experience" as well as "curriculum" as pre-determined content to be covered by the teacher towards other possibilities of understanding "curriculum."

The findings of this study may contribute to how educators approach curriculum related issues in regions affected by catastrophic events such as natural disasters.

WHAT WILL I BE ASKED TO DO IF I AGREE TO TAKE PART IN THIS STUDY?

If you decide to participate, you will be asked to take part in 2 interview sessions, which will be more like a dialogue or conversation between the participant and the researcher. Each session will last between 60-90 minutes. The first interview will take place in the Summer of 2016 and the second round of interviews will be scheduled to take place at the end of the year in 2016. You will be asked to discuss your own education experience and your experience as a classroom teacher. You will also be asked to share your experiences around the events that occurred on and after March 11, 2011 as it pertains to your teaching career.

As a participant, you will also be asked to share any artifacts (lesson plans, photos, newsletters sent to parents, blogs) that you feel comfortable sharing with the researcher.

This interview will be audio-recorded. If you do not wish to be audio-recorded, you will still be able to participate. The principal investigator will take notes during the interview. The interview will take approximately sixty to ninety minutes. You will be given a pseudonym or false name in order to keep your identity confidential.

To minimize any inconvenience this participation may cause you, all of interview sessions will be done at a location most convenient for you at a time that is convenient to you.

WHAT POSSIBLE RISKS OR DISCOMFORTS CAN I EXPECT FROM TAKING PART IN THIS STUDY?

This is a minimal risk study, which means the harms or discomforts that you may experience are the same amount of risk you will encounter during a conversation you may have with colleagues or neighbors. However, there are some risks to consider.

You might feel uncomfortable to recollect and share your experiences around March 11, 2011. You do not have to answer any questions or divulge anything you don't want to talk about. You may also have concerns sharing your thoughts regarding your daily activities as it pertains to your career. You can stop participating in the study at any time without penalty.

The principal investigator is taking precautions to keep your information confidential and prevent anyone from discovering or guessing your identity, such as using a pseudonym instead of your name and keeping all information on a password protected computer.

WHAT POSSIBLE BENEFITS CAN I EXPECT FROM TAKING PART IN THIS STUDY?

There is no direct benefit to you for participating in this study. Participation may benefit the field of curriculum studies as it pertains to contexts having experienced a natural disaster or catastrophic events that disrupts educational settings.

WILL I BE PAID FOR BEING IN THIS STUDY?

You will not be paid to participate. There are no costs to you for taking part in this study.

WHEN IS THE STUDY OVER? CAN I LEAVE THE STUDY BEFORE IT ENDS?
The study is over when you have completed the two interviews. However, you can leave the study at any time even if you haven't finished.

PROTECTION OF YOUR CONFIDENTIALITY
The investigator will scan all written materials into their password protected computer which will be kept in a secure location in their home. Once scanned, the written materials will be destroyed. What is on the audio-recording will be transcribed and the audio-recording will then be saved on a computer. There will be no record matching your real name with your pseudonym. Any electronic or digital information (including audio recordings) will be stored on a computer that is password protected.

HOW WILL THE RESULTS BE USED?
This study is being conducted as part of the dissertation of the principal investigator. The results of this study will be published and may be presented at academic conferences. Your name or any identifying information about you will not be published.

CONSENT FOR AUDIO
Audio recording is part of this research study. You can choose whether to give permission to be recorded. If you decide that you don't wish to be recorded, you will still be able to participate in this study.

______I give my consent to be recorded ____________________________________
Signature

______I do not consent to be recorded ______________________________________
Signature

WHO MAY VIEW MY PARTICIPATION IN THIS STUDY

___I consent to allow written, video and/or audio taped materials viewed at an educational
setting or at a conference outside of Teachers College _________________________
Signature

___I do not consent to allow written, video and/or audio taped materials viewed outside of Teachers College Columbia University _____________________________________
Signature

OPTIONAL CONSENT FOR FUTURE CONTACT
The investigator may wish to contact you in the future. Please initial the appropriate statements to indicate whether or not you give permission for future contact.

I give permission to be contacted in the future for research purposes:

Yes ________________________ No_______________________
Initial Initial

I give permission to be contacted in the future for information relating to this study:

Yes ________________________ No_______________________
Initial Initial

WHO CAN ANSWER MY QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS STUDY?
If you have any questions about taking part in this research study, you should contact the principal investigator, Patricia Gibson, at 917-280-2682 (US) or at pmg69@tc.columbia.edu.

If you have questions or concerns about your rights as a research subject, you should contact the Institutional Review Board (IRB) (the human research ethics committee) at 212-678-4105 or email IRB@tc.edu. Or you can write to the IRB at Teachers College, Columbia University, 525 W. 120th Street, New York, NY 10027. The IRB is the committee that oversees human research protection for Teachers College, Columbia University.

PARTICIPANT'S RIGHTS

- I have read and discussed the informed consent with the researcher. I have had ample opportunity to ask questions about the purposes, procedures, risks and benefits regarding this research study.
- I understand that my participation is voluntary. I may refuse to participate or withdraw participation at any time without penalty.
- The researcher may withdraw me from the research at his or her professional discretion.
- If, during the course of the study, significant new information that has been developed becomes available which may relate to my willingness to continue my participation, the investigator will provide this information to me.
- Any information derived from the research study that personally identifies me will not be voluntarily released or disclosed without my separate consent, except as specifically required by law.
- I should receive a copy of the Informed Consent document.

My signature means that I agree to participate in this study

Print name: ______________________________________ **Date**: _______________

Signature: ____

Appendix E

Informed Consent and Participant's Rights Translated Version

調査協力の承諾書

研究題目: Teacher "Narratives" from the Field? Confronting the (Im)Possibilities of Representing "Curriculum" and "Experience" Through Autobiography

研究代表者: 高橋美登 (パトリシア・ミト・ギブソン), テイーチャーズカレッジ・コロンビア大学, 917-280-2682 (アメリカ連絡)

<u>概要</u>
本調査の題名は、"Teacher "Narratives" from the Field? Confronting the (Im)Possibilities of Representing "Curriculum" and "Experience" Through Autobiography." 本来、教育計画や「カリキュラム」は授業の前に授業を想定した上で構成されるものとして考える傾向があります。事前に教育現場で「おこりうる」を想定して組まれたものが、現在私たちが主に関わりうる「カリキュラム」です。本研究は2011年3月11日を元に教員の体験談や経験をお聞きし、対話を通して私達が考える教育計画やそれに基づく経験というコンセプトを紐解いて行く事を目指しています。同時に、本研究は、自伝研究方法を取り入れながら、教員達の「経験」や「カリキュラム」について考えます。

同研究参加人数は2ー3名ほどを想定しています。参加同意なされた方は対話形式の60ー90分ほどのインタビューに二度参加していただき、教育計画、レッスンプラン、写真、ブログ等共有出来る範囲での参加をお願いする所存であります。

この承諾書はこの調査研究に関するものです。内容をご理解いただき、調査への協力、資料の公開についてご承諾をお願い致します。

<u>研究目的</u>
3．11を起点に教師の体験談、「経験」、そして「カリキュラム」についての研究です。対話を通して、私達が考える「カリキュラム」や「経験」に焦点を照らし、これらの標準化について考えて行く事を目指しています。自伝研究法を取り入れる事によって、従来考える事前に組み立てる形式の「カリキュラム」や予想範囲の「経験」から様々な「カリキュラム」のあり方や「標準化」に意義を持つ事を目的とした研究です。

本研究結果は将来自然災害など壊滅的な出来事によって影響を受けた地域での教育法やカリキュラム関連の対話に寄与出来ると考えます。

<u>研究参加同意した場合</u>

研究参加同意された場合、研究者によって少なくとも2回ほどのインタビューに参加される事を同意願います。インタビューは参加者と研究者との対話と言った形式で行われます。最初のインタビューは2016年の夏に行われ、2回目のインタビューは2016年の年末に行う予定であります。教員としての体験談や、ご自身の教育背景などについて話していただきます。その他にも、3．11後の教育現場についてお話ししていただく事もあります。

参加者はその他に、レッスンプラン、写真、学年ニュースレター、学校関連のブログなどご本人が提供出来る範囲での情報共有をお願いする事があります。

インタビューは録音され、研究者はインタビュー中にメモを取ります。インタビューを録音されたくない場合でも研究参加は可能です。約 60—90 分間のインタビューを予定しています。参加者の秘密保持を厳守の為、個人の名前を仮名で記名させていただきます。

参加者への不都合を最小限にする為、インタビューは全て参加者に最も利便な場所と時間に行う。インタビューの実施は、研究者と参加者が相互に受諾した場所で行われます（カフェ、図書館、社内スペースなど）。

リスク

調査に参加していただく場合のリスクは、同僚やご近所の方々との会話とほぼ同じです。但し、学校での体験や教員としての考えを提供する事によって個人情報流出についての不安等あるかもしれません。他に、3．11などの体験に触れ、調査の質問が原因で不快感が発生する可能性もあります。その際にはインタビューを終了することが可能です。研究者以外に本調査データを使用することはありません。参加者の個人情報などのデータは仮名を使い、パスワード保護されたコンピュータなどで保管されます。

利益

調査に参加することにあたり直接的な利益はありませんが、経験を共有することによって、自然災害など壊滅的な影響を受けた教育現場など、教育課程の編成・実施の問題について貴重な情報提供が可能となります。

報酬について

この調査に協力することによって協力者が費用を負担すること、また報酬として謝金を受けることはありません。

本研究参加期間について

調査協力はインタビュー終了と同時に終了となります。任意参加となりますので、参加の撤回はいつでも可能です。

データの機密性について

研究者が書き込んだノートなどのデータは全てスキャンされ、コンピュータ保管されます。後にノートなどの書類は廃棄されます。インタビューデータは Microsoft Word に書き写され、データ保管されます。

インタビューなどで得たデータやスキャンされたデータは調査データとしてパスワードで保護されたパソコンで保管されます。研究者以外に使用されることはありません。秘密保持の責任を厳守いたします。

調査結果について

この研究によって得た調査データは研究者の博士論文にて使用・発表されます。調査内容は博士論文として発刊されます。学会などで研究発表される事もある事をご了承願います。秘密保持の責任を厳守いたしますので参加者の名前等は使われません。

録音同意

この研究ではインタビューを録音いたします。録音について同意、拒否も可能です。インタビューの録音の拒否をなされてもインタビューに参加する事は可能です。

□同意します。 署名:
□同意しません。署名:

調査データの観覧

今回自分が参加し協力した調査データ(インタビュー等)を研究教育目的としたテイーチャーズ・カレッジ以外の場での公開を:

□同意します。署名:
□同意しません。署名:

以降接触許可について

研究者が以降接触を求める可能性があります。いずれか当てはまる項目に署名をお願いいたします。

以降、研究目的のために接触を許可する
□同意します。署名:
□同意しません。署名:

以降、本研究に関する情報提供に関して接触を許可する
□同意します。署名:
□同意しません。署名:

本研究についての質問等受付

研究や調査についてのご質問やご不明な点などは研究代表者までお問い合わせください。連絡先は下記のとおりです:
パトリシア・ミト・ギブソン
電話：011-1-917-280-2682（アメリカ）
E メール: pmg69@tc.columbia.edu

参加者としての権利や調査の進行手順についてのご質問・ご意見は Institutional Review Board /IRB Teachers College, Columbia University までお電話または文面（郵便）でお問い合わせください。
電話:(212) 678-4105
E メール:IRB@tc.edu
住所: 525 W. 120th Street, New York, NY, 10027
IRB は研究規制や研究参加者保護などを監督する委員会です。

調査参加者の権利について

- 研究代表者との話し合いの上、研究や調査について了解済みです。研究の目的や進行について質問をする機会は与えられました。
- 任意参加であることを承知しています。調査参加の撤回はいつでも可能です。
- 研究代表者の専門的判断による参加撤回が可能です。
- 調査の進行中に参加に影響を及ぼすような情報が発見された場合、研究代表者によってその情報は参加者に開示されます。
- 個人情報となるものは同意なしでは開示されません。法律による情報開示以外の場合にあたる。
- 承諾書の書類のコピーを一部ずつ受け取ります。
- 下記の署名によって調査への参加を承諾します。

名前: ____________________ 日付け:___/___/___

署名: ____________________

Appendix F

First Interview Protocol

Thank you for taking the time to participate in this conversation. In this conversation, I will be asking questions around your teaching background. I will also be asking questions around your understanding and experiences of particular concepts. This should last any where between 60-90 minutes. Before we begin, can I answer any questions or clarify anything for you?

この度はお忙しい中、お時間を取っていただきありがとうございます。色々質問させていただきますが、対話形式で行っていきたいと思います。この対話を通して、先生の教育背景など、先生の教育体験についてお聞きさせていただければうれしいです。1時間から1時間半の対話を見込んでおります。対話を始める前に質問等ありますか。

1	A. Can you tell me about your educational background? −先生の教育背景についてお話ください。 B. How did you decide to become a teacher? -教育者の道を選んだ課程についてお話してください。 C. What were some factors that influenced your decision to pursue a life as a teacher? −教育者の仕事に携わる要因になった体験などについてお話していただけますか。
2	A. If you have taught elsewhere, can you tell me about your experiences as a teacher prior to this current school? −他の教育機関・学校などでの教育体験がある場合、その経験についてお話していただけますか。 B. In what ways did you consider your role as a teacher? −以前の教育機関／学校での体験についてですが、教育者としての役割や役目についてお話いただけますか。 C. What did you consider the most important aspects of your curriculum? −以前の教育機関／学校での教育計画やカリキュラムについてですが、どのように関わっていましたか。教員として感じる教育計画の重要な点とはなんでしょうか。
3	A. In your earlier days of teaching, what expectations did you have about being a teacher? −教員に成り立ての頃、どの様な教師教員生活を期待・予想していましたか。

	B. How has that changed or not changed since you started teaching? −その期待や予想は変わりましたか。 C. How different or similar are your current experiences at the current school you teach? −以前働いていた教育機関／学校と今の学校での教員体験はどの部分が異なり、また、どの様な共通点がありますか。
4	A. How would you describe yourself as a "teacher?" −「先生」と言っても色々な「せんせい」がいると思いますが、自分はどの様な「せんせい」だと記述しますか。 B. What factors, in your opinion, make up a "teacher?" −どの様な要因が「先生」を確立/生み出すのでしょうか。
5	A. What do you think are the current needs of your students? −先生が思うに、今学生／生徒達が一番必要としているものやニーズは何でしょうか。 B. How do you address these needs as a teacher? -どのようにこのニーズに対応していますか。 C. How do you think your curriculum addresses or does not address these needs? −教育課程／カリキュラムはどの様にこのニーズに対応出来ていますか。
6	A. Can you tell me the factors that influence the content of your lesson plans? −日々の教育計画やレッスンプランはどの様な要因が影響して作成されますか。 B. What is your understanding of "curriculum?" −先生が思う／考える教育計画／カリキュラムとは何でしょうか。
7	A. Is there anything else you would like to re-visit before we conclude this conversation? −この対話を終える前に、再度話し合いたいテーマなどありますでしょうか。

Appendix G

Second Interview Protocol

I would like to express my sincere gratitude for continuing to stay in communication with me and agreeing to participate in this second round of conversation. In our last conversation, we spoke about your educational as well as teacher background. In this conversation, I would like to talk more about your daily experiences as well as interactions within the school as well as March 11, 2011 in particular. I have prepared questions based on our last conversation. Like our last session, I anticipate the conversation to last any where between 60-90 minutes. Can I answer any questions or clarify anything before we begin?

この数ヶ月の間お忙しい中、メールなどで連絡を取り続けていただき、二回目の対話にも承諾していただき、ありがとうございます。最初の対話では先生ご自身の教育背景や教育者としての意識などについて話させていただきましたが、今回は、先生の学校での日常や、学校との関わり、３．11についても話し合いたいと思っております。今回のテーマは以前の対話をベースに質問等を作成して来ました。以前同様、対話は1時間から1時間半を予想しております。始める前に何か質問等ありますでしょうか。

1	A. Can you walk me through your typical day at school? -先生の典型的な一日の様子についてお話しください。
2	A. How would you describe the curriculum for your grade level/school? -先生の学年／学校のカリキュラムについてお話しください。 B. How do you perceive your role as a teacher in relation to the curriculum? -学校のカリキュラムについて引き続き質問ですが、カリキュラムにおいて先生が考える自身との関係性や役割についてお話しください。
3	A. If you could describe 3.11 through kanji, what kanji would you choose and why? -３．１１を漢字で表すとしたらどの様な漢字で表しますか。 B. How would you describe the impact of 3.11 on your teaching career? -３．１１は先生の教員としてのキャリアにどの様な影響をもたらしましたか。
4	A. If you could teach anything in your class, what would you choose to teach? Why did you choose this topic/theme? -授業で教える内容をいとわないとしたら、どの様な授業を進行しますか。なぜそのテーマになさったのですか。
5	A. Can you tell me about a change that has occurred in your life recently that

	have impacted you? What was the change and how has it impacted you? -先生の私生活など最近起きた変化はありますか。どの様な変化なのでしょうか、そしてその変化は先生にとってどの様な影響がありましたか。
6	A. Is there anything else you would like to re-visit before we conclude this conversation?? -この対話を終える前に、再度話し合いたいテーマなどありますでしょうか。

Appendix H

List of Acronyms

City B .... City 100km west of Town A

City G .... A coastal city south of Tokyo

City H .... City located south of Town A

City J .... A city located in the central regions of Fukushima. One of the five largest cities in the northern regions of Japan

City W .... One of the largest cities after Tokyo facing the Gulf of Tokyo

Island S .... A small off shore island close to City G

Town A .... A town located in the eastern region in Fukushima

Town E .... A town N refers to as their hometown, located south of Town A

Town F .... A town located in the eastern regions of Fukushima

Innerway .... Referring to the central region in Fukushima

Pathway .... Referring to the eastern region in Fukushima

School Q .... One of the elementary schools located in Town A. Nao was teaching at this school at the time of the interview.

School T .... One of the elementary schools located in Town A. Both Hiro and Sora were teaching at this school at the time of the interview.

Hiro .... Research participant teaching at School T

Nao .... Research participant teaching at School Q

Sora .... Research participant teaching at School T