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Abstract
Since around 2000, we have had some cases of School Social Work (SSW) in Japan. However, we have not discussed why we need SSW. This paper investigated the origin of SSW and the relationship between Social Work, Counseling and School by reviewing the history of SSW after the World War II, and made it clear that “School” and “Social Work” in 1990’s were related each other only by administrative procedure. Based on this analysis, we suggest that we should develop SSW as “Collaborative relations” from now on.
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I. Introduction
Problems occurring in schools today are difficult to resolve using conventional methods. Examples include, first, the problem of new poverty resulting from social stratification, as well as the problems that emerge against that backdrop: child abuse, refusal to go school, classroom collapse, delinquency, and crime, etc. Thus, the necessity of a School Social Work (below, “SSW”) approach has been argued. The need for SSW has been indicated for “children with disabilities” (Kadota 2002), “poor families” (Iwata 2003), “refusal to go school” (Uchida 2005), “child abuse” (Kanazawa 2004), “classroom collapse” (Otsuka 2006), etc., and proposal has been made of SSW practice models (Kadota 2000) and other responses. Further, as shown in Table 1, since around the year 2000, some local authorities have made trial placement of School Social Workers (below, “SSWr”) to implement SSW. It is expected that, in a broad sense, the activities of these SSWr can be linked to novel activities that join together schools and communities with children.

According to Yamashita (1998), SSW is “an assistance system implemented by social workers to enable children who directly confront a variety of difficulties in the midst of their school activities to sufficiently develop their capabilities.” Hanba (1999), after presenting the same definition, explained the necessity of “the provision of support that increases the quality of life of children, with the ample inclusion of a social work-perspective in school-based activities.” Meanwhile, Kadota (2002), upon urging “social work-specialty support activities with their purpose the guaranteeing of rights and opportunities of child students to receive an equal education,” added that SSW entails, “when a child student is in a situation where his/her right to equal opportunities of education has been infringed, engagements towards revising and improving that situation.”

However, SSW “is not a field that has been fully established in Japan” (Yamashita 2006). The concept itself is new, and the discussion thereof has not had a sufficiently practical and real nature. Therefore, when
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considering what type of activities are desired of SSWs into the future, it is first necessary to make a summary review of engagements that can be called “pioneering practices” in SSW, even before discussion can be made regarding the concept itself of SSW.

Nakamura (1989) has stated that for school social work, “inasmuch as, in solving problems of school-age children, adjustments must be made according to each family environment, caseworkers are indispensable who have their focus on the social environment, centered on the family.” Examples from this perspective include the work in the 1960s of caseworkers hired by the Education Committee of Osaka’s Airin District, who performed support activities for children not attending school and long-term absentee children, and the activities of the Public Welfare Office employees of Yokohama City’s Kotobuki district (Table 2). Prior to the 1960s, work related to today’s SSW was carried out by Child Welfare Officers of Child Guidance Offices and Welfare Offices of Welfare Offices. Therefore, in the present paper, the term “social work” is used such that “social work” practice includes those activities performed by Child Welfare Officers and Welfare Officers even before the concept of “social work” became firmly established in Japan. Thus, the history of issues in SSW will be traced in an attempt to understand the issues of today.

Table 2 SSW Pioneering Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Period</th>
<th>Osaka City, Airin District</th>
<th>Yokohama City, Kotobuki District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Name, etc.</td>
<td>February 1962-1984</td>
<td>1964-1970s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer</td>
<td>No record</td>
<td>Engagement by “Kotobuki Daily Life Center” (the precursor of the “Kotobuki School”) employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Type</td>
<td>Osaka City Education Committee</td>
<td>Yokohama City (Kotobuki Daily Life Center)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Persons</td>
<td>Non-full time consigned workers (designated as “office workers”)</td>
<td>Yokohama City Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of Assignment</td>
<td>1 person</td>
<td>No record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of Employees</td>
<td>To perform consultation, survey, assistance, etc., regarding the entrance into school, school transfer, and school commuting of non-school attending children</td>
<td>Purpose of establishment of the “Kotobuki School”: To reintroduce into schools non-school attending and long-term absentee children of the Kotobuki District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications</td>
<td>Caseworker</td>
<td>No record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>No record</td>
<td>Employees of the “Kotobuki School” served as teachers seconded by the City Education Committee. Employees of the “Kotobuki Center” were employees of the City Public Welfare Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles Required of SSWs</td>
<td>Work concerning special education (since the Airin Elementary and Middle Schools had been designated as special school classrooms)</td>
<td>Employees of the “Kotobuki School”: To reintroduce into elementary and middle schools non-school attending and long-term absentee children of the Kotobuki District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target District</td>
<td>Non-school attending and long-term absentee children and students of the Airin district Children and students of the Branch Schools of the Hagi nochaya Elementary School and the Imamiya Middle School</td>
<td>Yokohama City, Kotobuki district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details of Main Actual Work Performed</td>
<td>Non-school attending and long-term absentee children and students of the Airin district Children and students of the Branch Schools of the Hagi nochaya Elementary School and the Imamiya Middle School</td>
<td>Procedures for children who had no family registration or residence records. Discovery of non-school attending children and performance of procedures for attending school. All other general welfare services-related work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision System</td>
<td>Procedures for children who had no family registration or residence records. Discovery of non-school attending children and performance of procedures for attending school</td>
<td>No record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>From 1975, work related to facilities-based education Desired was the performance of work related to non-school attending children, and consultations, etc., for students attending schools, within the Airin district</td>
<td>Although closed in the fourth year of the “Kotobuki School,” thereafter, Kotobuki Daily Life Center employee continued to support the school attending of non-school attending children)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of current SSW practice, it is necessary to investigate and summarize its "relationship with the school counselor system, which toady has been developed nationwide" (Yamashita 2006). Although School Counselors (below, "SCr") first appeared in the 1990s, even prior to that time, a deep relationship had existed between schools and counselors. In the period when delinquency and refusal to attend school had become major issues, there was a growing expectation that counseling could serve as a means to resolve these problems. The result was the introduction of the SCr; such are the historical circumstances that led to this new position. It has been pointed out (Noda 1998) that after the introduction of SCr, the SCr has been performing, in actuality, SSW-like functions.

When considering these facts, one must ask the following: How did schools engage with social work before SCr and SSWr made their appearance? How was counseling involved at schools? What was the relationship, if any, between social work and counseling? One cannot argue about future directions for SSW without first answering these questions. Thus, in the present paper, summary review is made of the relationships among "schools," "social work," and "counseling," and the changes that occurred in that relationship, in the postwar period; thereafter, presentation is made of future issues for SSW.

II. Changes Seen in Postwar Japan in the Relationships Among Schools, and Counseling and Social Work

Counseling (client-centered therapy) within school sites in Japan started in the 1950s. The introduction of counseling "took a unique structure, inasmuch as school teachers would diligently learn counseling, clinical psychologists would diligently communicate such to teachers, and counseling would be introduced into the schools" (Kondo 1997).

Kondo (1997), in reviewing the history of the relationship in Japan between education and counseling, including the period after counseling was introduced, made a division into four periods: "The period of introducing counseling into the educational world (1950s)," "the first peak period of school counseling (1960s)," "the stagnation period (1970s and 1980s)," and "the second peak period of school counseling (1990s)." In this section of the present report, two periods will be added to Kondo's four periods: the period prior to the introduction of counseling at school sites (from the end of World War II to the 1950s), and the 2000s decade, when SSW was introduced. For each of these periods, summary is made of the relationship between schools and counseling, and of that between schools and social work.

1. From Immediate Postwar Period to the 1950s: The Period of Responses to Postwar Problems and Issues

There were two major problems of Japanese children in Japan immediately after World War II ended in August 1945: problems concerning "measures to protect war orphans and runaway/homeless children" and "the problem of infant and child malnutrition" (Tanno 1977). These two issues had a major impact on the passage of the Fundamental Law on Education and the Child Welfare Law. In regards to this point, Sano has stated that within the process of passing the Child Welfare Law, "the fundamental idea at first was an emphasis on 'bright aspects,' with children being seen as 'the hope of history'; while this view of children was being praised, in the end, welfare services as the 'bright aspects' for 'ordinary children' ended up being homes for infants only, although there was debate about uniform child care and protection" (Sano 1977). The reasons therefore are explained as follows:

This was due to the pressing need faced directly in the contemporary nationwide crises of runaway, homeless, and war-orphaned children, and the need for practical resolution of crises such as the increased death rates of infants and the rationing of (powdered) milk. Basically, however, there was a thoroughgoing logic such that for 'positive' children, 'education' (the Ministry of Education) was needed, and for 'negative' children, 'welfare' (the Ministry of Health and Welfare) was needed. This
is clear proof that the prewar image of children, with child-directed measures based on economic principles, was continued (carried on) without a halt (change) (Sano 1977: 19).

The 'negative' children of that time, as Sano calls them, were the runaway, homeless, and war-orphaned children. The major school-related problem of such children was the "non-attendance at school" issue. As for the "non-attendance problem," not only orphans, but also even children who had a parent/parents or protector, often ran away from home due to the poverty of their families.

Child Welfare Officers of Child Guidance Offices mainly carried out the responses on behalf of these children, and runaway/homeless and orphaned children were protected as children who required protection; these children were placed in facilities or with foster parents, etc. The Child Guidance Offices would perform procedures required for school attendance, and, as a response for those children who, due to poverty, were unable to continue attending school after they started, via tie-ups with Welfare Offices of Welfare Offices, the Centers would perform the procedures required for education assistance, etc. In this way, the relationship between "schools" and "social work" ended with assistance for non-attending children. The persons responsible for what is here called "social work practice" were Child Welfare Officers and Welfare Officers.

As for counseling in this period, there was almost no debate concerning the relationship of such with "schools." It was in the 1950s that counseling made its appearance at school sites. However, as for psychology-related work, it is a fact that intelligence tests were also performed at Child Guidance Offices.

2. The 1950s: The Convergence Period of Postwar Child-Related Problems

At the beginning of the 1950s, the problem of "residences" for homeless children and war orphans was largely being resolved by assignment to facilities. The postwar process of assignment to facilities and the details of treatment have been the subjects of various criticisms, and this developed into a "dispute about 'hospitalism,'" which further developed into a debate regarding the problem of educating children living in facilities. Nevertheless, the relationship between social work and schools never went beyond the performance of procedures for changing schools that accompanied assignment to facilities, and other assistance with procedures up to daily life assistance payments.

As for school sites, in the passage of over 10 years since postwar, there was a decline in the initial long-term absentee rates with such things as the economic recovery, an improvement of medical care levels, and the improved hygienic environment, etc. Yet parallel with this, a change was seen from the problem of long-term absentee children to the problem of "school phobia" (Takigawa 1998).

Absenceism at Japanese elementary schools never fell below 3% in the prewar period, and it was only the short period around 1975 when nearly 100% of children attended [elementary] school (Takigawa 1998: 164).

It was in the urban areas where the "school phobias" of long-term absentee children first made their appearance. "Despite the fact that there were absolutely none of the conventional factors that might hinder a child from attending school," "it was thought that a state where a child would not (could not) attend school was very strange and irrational, and solutions were sought for in clinical psychology and psychiatry" (Takigawa 1998: 166-167). In this way, the reasons for the phenomenon of not going (not being able to go) to school were not readily understandable-in other words, this phenomenon stemmed from "individual pathology," and these children emerged as the targets of therapy via psychiatry and clinical psychology.

It was in this postwar recovery period when counseling was introduced into the world of education. In 1951, the first Japanese-language translation was made of a work by Carl Rogers, and this spurred, in the 1950s, "the initial introduction of counseling theory and methods by a portion of researchers, and some teachers began to have an interest in such" (Hayashi 2000: 88).
3. The 1960s Period of High-Level Economic Growth: A Period of Response to "Outside-School" Needs

As many persons have pointed out, the 1960s era of high economic growth was a time when major transformations occurred to the fundamental orientations of educational perspectives and in how children were perceived. And, as a matter of course, there were also changes in the roles and responsibilities of "schools."

A major pillar was the Ministry of Education's implementation in 1961 of a Nationwide Academic Aptitude Survey (academic aptitude tests). Nomoto (1999) has pointed out that "academic aptitude tests enabled clarification not only of the nationwide standing of individual students, but also of entire classes and schools; thus the abilities of teachers and school principals became the subjects of comparisons"; in this way, children "were pushed into a state of being under evaluation."

Although thereafter, the Ministry of Education terminated the Nationwide Academic Aptitude Survey for middle-school students in 1967, this was a time when the wave of "an overemphasis on one's academic record" accelerated more and more. Around 1965, the nationwide average of students who went on to attend high school exceeded 70%.

In the 1960s, the first counseling peak was reached. According to Hayashi (2000), this was an era where, "Against the backdrop of the postwar high economic growth, the effects of the mass media on children and the 'school entrance examination wars' became seen as problematic, and this was a period when postwar delinquency reached its second peak." Hayashi adds: "The Ministry of Education sought budgetary funding for the establishment of a counselor system, and in the 'Handbook for Student Guidance,' terms such as 'unconditional respect' and 'an empathetic understanding,' etc., began to be included." "This was an era when Rogers'-type counseling widely penetrated the educational world." In other words, at school sites, a focus was placed on counseling methods, and there was investigation of an introduction of counseling by specialist professionals (in the end, such counseling was actually not introduced). Rather, there appeared "teachers" who, as education specialists, actively utilized client-centered counseling techniques within the context of educational consultation and student guidance.

Also, compulsory-education level school attendance rates in Japan were maintained at 99%, and there was a rise in the rate of advancement to high school. Meanwhile, there were districts where children were not even receiving their compulsory education in such districts, there was a pressing need to respond to the problem of so-called "non-school attending children." These were towns with boarding houses ("simple residences") where day laborers lived. These included the Airin district of Osaka, the Kotobuki district of Yokohama, and the Yamatani district of Tokyo.

In the Airin district of Osaka City, the "Airin Gakuen" was established in 1962 as a school for non-school attending children in the form of a "Branch School of the Haginochaya Elementary School and Branch School of the Imamiya Middle School." Employees of the Osaka City Educational Committee were commissioned as "caseworkers" to provide assistance for non-school attending children, and these persons performed consultation, surveys, assistance, etc., for children with no family registration or citizen registration records and for long-term non-school attending children regarding such things as entrance into school, changing schools, and matters concerning attending and commuting to schools (Koyanagi 1978; Sakakura 2002).

Policies for non-school attending children in Yokohama City's Kotobuki district began in 1964 with the "Kotobuki Gakkyu." The purpose of the establishment of the "Kotobuki Class" was to reintroduce into elementary schools local Kotobuki district children who were long-term absentee from school or not attending school; in its fourth year, the class was closed, having, it was said, fulfilled its role. After the closing of the "Kotobuki Class," the site was then used as a "school-age children care center." In fact, however, even thereafter, there remained numerous non-school attending children. Thus, the employees of the "Kotobuki Seikatsu-kan," which served as the Kotobuki Labor Comprehensive Welfare Center, took over and continued the work of providing attending-school assis-
tance to long-term absentees and non-school attending children (Nomoto 1974).

The 1960s were also an era of expanding needs for childcare, due to such things as the social advancement (employment) of women and the "nuclearization" of families. As responses, a variety of laws were established in the 1960s, and there was an increase in this period in the number of homes for infants. However, homes for infants had no provisions for, and no track record for, taking care of "children who were attending elementary school yet 'lacked child care'"—thus, the problem emerged of a need for after-school care for elementary school children (Mochizuki 2004: 121). Thus, a few school-age children care center did emerge. Thereafter, school-age children care center became an essential pillar in the raising of healthy children, and a debate was carried on regarding the functions and purposes of such facilities, just as that regarding preschool childcare. In this way, social work practice in the child welfare area was chiefly for children "outside of school." Yet in "certain special districts," such as the Airin and Kotobuki districts, there was the existence of "special" social work practice performed by postwar Child Welfare Officers for non-school attending children.

4. The 1970s and 1980s: The Period of the Call for "Education Outside of Schools"

Into the 1970s, there were ever-growing increases in entrance-examination competition and on the overemphasis on academic records. In 1974, the rate of progression to high school exceeded 90%, and a period began when virtually all advanced to high school. Parallel to this, there were increasing problems, too, such as delinquency that included in-school violence and further non-school attendance issues.

Phenomena such as "school rage" that began in the 1970s can be said to be the "expression of the first signs of alienation" (Yamashita 1998) from schools, which consider children as subjects of education. From this standpoint, it was self-evident that the viewpoint would be reached that analysis was required as to whether there were problems in the environments that children were placed in, problems that evoked such phenomena in children.

Schools, however, did not make analysis of the background of such phenomena; instead, they determined to take a strong stance that would silence such emerging problem behavior via the introduction of police powers under the rubric of "reinforced student guidance." The result was that "the objections" of children (Sasaki 2003: 148) were dismissed.

This issue of "rage" at school sites became a focus of social concern, while at the same time, criticisms were beginning to be heard regarding the attitudes of "client-centered" counseling that had been introduced at school sites in the 1960s. It was suggested that with teachers focused on students as "clients," and involved in "non-instructional type" counseling, "guidance" could not be provided to "students," thereby leading to an educational situation whereby "rage" could not be "controlled." Even clinical psychologists made no active demand for the introduction of counselors at school sites, since such "'specialists of the mind,' whose forte was communication using words among parties" (Ozawa 2002: 116), were not apt at handling problems such as internal-school violence.

The result was that in-school violence, such as violence against teachers and destruction of property, etc., declined as the result of police intervention. Meanwhile, the numbers of cases of "bullying" and "non-school attendance" were on the increase. In 1975, the number of non-school attending children exceeded 10,000 persons, and that number rose rapidly: in 1982, the number was 20,000 persons, and in 1984, 30,000 persons. In 1984, the number of dropouts from public and private high schools reached 110,000 persons. In addition, there were cases of suicide due to "bullying."

Having reached this stage, clinical psychologists began to actively argue for the reintroduction of counseling. This is because non-school attendance and bullying were seen as "desired target for treatment by 'specialists of the mind,' as individual interviews were easy to perform", and a counseling style based on individual treatment made it "easy to construct a relationship based on language" (Ozawa 2002: 116).

Meanwhile, in the child welfare field, while this was said to be an era of "everyone advancing to high school," due to the fact that children resident within
children's shelters (child-rearing facilities) had only a 30% high school-advancement rate, etc., discussion arose regarding the education of children within children's shelters. There was also an increase in other school-related problems, including the issue regarding leeway for school attendance in the education of children residing in intellectually disabled children's facilities, and issues regarding the implementation of compulsory education within home for juvenile delinquents, etc. The need for "outside-school education" was also indicated as a means to resolve various problems occurring within schools. Here was seen "a trend such that the daily life and development of children within communities were viewed from the perspective of a unity between welfare and education, with the desire to provide systematic protection" (Mochizuki 2004: 161).

As an "internal school" response, argument was made of the need for counseling, both on the school side and in the psychology field. Meanwhile, in the child welfare field, it was argued that from a social work perspective, needed were "outside-school" responses. The result was that "inside schools" became an area less-and-less involved with social work.

In this era that marked the third peak of postwar delinquency, Yamashita was the first in Japan to use the name "SSWr," and SSW activities were started from 1986 in Tokorozawa City, Saitama Prefecture. The activities there of SSWr were performed on the basis of a consultation request made by a school principal. Assistance details were centered on direct assistance, such that "for persons who had a behavioral problem, and for persons who were not attending school," "the SSWr would visit individual homes" (Yamashita 1998). Yamashita's activities were ended in 1998, and, unfortunately, these types of activities did not spread to other localities. It was in this period when other social problems occurred, including the discovery of a dead infant in a coin-operated locker. Thus, there was a gradual move in the child welfare field toward the initial responses for child abuse.

5. The 1990s: A Period of Investigating a "Cooperative Working Relationship" with School Sites

Entering the 1990s, there was an increase in the numbers of non-school attendees, reaching 70,000 persons in 1992 and 128,000 persons in 1999. There was also a rise in the number of suicides stemming from bullying. To respond to these problems, from fiscal year 1995, the Ministry of Education began to introduce SCr; this was made a formal system in 2001, and continues to this day. The direct trigger was the 1994 suicide of a second year middle-school student in Aichi Prefecture, Kiyotero Okouchi, who had been the target of bullying. The Ministry of Education placed its hopes in the SCr, whose specialist activities included "counseling, etc." techniques required for solving problems such as "bullying" and "non-attendance at schools."

Yet once the SCr started to work at school actually, "the SCr work duties are including large number of social-worker-type jobs, while 'counseling' work as narrowly defined constituted only around 30% of all of the work duties of SCr" (Kurosawa & Mori 1999). Thus, the importance of social work among SCr duties was indicated, and there were some SCr who themselves took the initiative and introduced social-work perspectives within their own activities. Noda (1998) noted that "in the assistance of children undergoing adolescence, a time when counseling is difficult, the performance of counseling in its narrow definition-repeated one-on-one interviews with students under the working conditions as established for SCr work-was certainly not beneficial." This is because the problems at schools today of non-attendance, classroom collapse, bullying, etc., themselves involve a complex, intertwined mixture of child abuse, delinquency, crime, etc., all arising against the backdrop of novel problems related to poverty, itself the result of social stratification. Such school problems have themselves thus generated the need for social work perspectives. Still, there were limitations to the type of social work activities that SCr could perform, with their training as counseling specialists, and thus a debate started regarding the necessity of introducing actual SSWr into school sites.

The 1990s, when SSW began to become a focus of interest, was a period where the problem of child abuse
began to be viewed with close scrutiny. In the child welfare area, too, there was a broadening awareness that child abuse required higher levels of social work techniques, and that this was a problem that could only be resolved via tie-ups with “schools.” In tandem with this, investigation began as to how to best make tie-ups with schools within the domain of social work practice.


From the end of the 1990s, incidents have occurred of death and injury caused by elementary school- and middle school-aged children. Numerous mass reports have stated how “an ordinary child” had “lost control.” Although not a factor in such cases, much has been made of the fact that such children had experience of “non-attendance at school,” or how they suffered from a “developmental disorder” or “symptoms of psychiatric disorder.”

Yet what we need to know when such an incident occurred is not whether the perpetrator has been “absent from school” or has a “developmental disorder,” etc., but “what was acting in the background” of such an incident (Hamada 2005: 3). Without trying to unravel that background, no clue can be found as to how to resolve such problems—and this can be said not only for “heinous crimes.”

This perspective that a problem can be resolved only by focusing on “what was acting in the background” is a perspective of social work, which focuses on the relationship between an individual and his/her unique background environment. School problems all occur in the midst of interpersonal relations. Yet, despite this, no attempt had been made hitherto of viewing school problems from a social work perspective. This fact itself was a problem, and only as the 2000s began did an awareness arise of the importance of a social work perspective. Localities have now emerged where the educational administration has actually set in place SSWr (Table 1).

While the Ministry of Education (2006) considers that, in regards to policies undertaken hitherto regarding non-attendance at school, problematic behavior, special support for education, etc., “Truly, a variety of policies have been prepared in response to problems that have occurred within the school system,” still, “each respective policy is expected to engage itself with its focus on one particular problem; these are not comprehensive interventions in any specific field.” Especially in regards to the problem of child abuse, “there has still been no formulation of an internal-school stance; currently, the search for response policies is underway.”

In other words, the Ministry recognizes that policies for school-related problems have hitherto involved specific responses for each problem phenomenon; this is an indication of the importance of SSW, with its approach being a comprehensive perspective. Said differently, schools are now in the midst of a social situation whereby they cannot reform themselves without the active use of social work networks. The Ministry of Education has performed a survey of SSW practice in Japan and abroad, and has made report of its results as follows.

Hitherto, no particular attention has been paid to SSW. Yet the isolation of individuals has penetrated, making it difficult to build mutual relationships. It is a fact that, due to this, numerous problems have occurred, beginning with abuse, making it difficult for teachers and other education workers to become engaged within school sites. (Portion omitted.)

In localities where SSW has already been introduced, considering the positive evaluations that have occurred, such as a desire to increase personnel numbers, it is thought that it would be regrettable if such activities were halted to only a portion of regions. Making SSW available as one choice is an issue that is, at the least, worthy of debate (Ministry of Education 2006).

III. Considerations

1. The “Procedural Relationship” Between “Schools” and “Social Work”

As described above, assistance for non-school attending children who were postwar runaways, homeless, or orphans, etc., consisted of policies for “children
requiring protection,” and were chiefly handled by Child Guidance Offices. As eras changed, the problems faced by children become more diversified, and responses for such persons as juvenile delinquents and abused children became necessary. In was only natural that, in tandem with these changes over time, the role of social work also changed. Yet in the period from just after the war to the 1990s, in the relationship between social work and schools, what was required was environmental coordination to guarantee the minimum of daily life of children in their attendance at school, as exemplified by support up to entrance and attendance at school, and the performance of procedures required for educational assistance after school attendance was achieved, etc. When this type of relationship between schools and social work is considered as a “procedural relationship,” then one can say that the school-social work relationship never went beyond a thoroughly “procedural relationship.”

This fact becomes clear when one considers the work of caseworkers in the Airin district that began in the 1960s—although this was a necessary attempt to support people in their daily lives, such work never expanded into other districts or regions. As shown in Table 2, in exceptional districts, the minimum procedures required to guarantee the daily lives of children had great significance. In this sense, there existed regions where caseworkers were necessary to perform pioneering activities similar to those of today’s SSWr. According to Koyanagi and Nomoto, although such activities were performed while building what we would now call a “partnership” relationship with local citizens, considering the relationship specifically with schools, actual activities undertaken never exceeded the boundaries of procedural-type activities. Koyanagi (1978: 49), who was a caseworker in Airin, himself has stated in regards to activities that, “as for me, so long as I performed the procedures, I was finished.” Thus, when viewed from the social work side, it was thought that schools were, in a certain sense, “holy ground,” a sanctuary into which one could not really enter.

Based upon these facts, it is essential that the relationship into the future between “schools” and “social work” should go beyond a merely "procedural relationship."

2. The Ground That Sustained the “Procedural Relationship”

The relationship between “schools” and “counseling” was not irrelevant to the fact that the relationship between schools and social work was held to the “procedural relationship” level. As stated above, the impact of the high-level economic growth that so rapidly occurred in the 1960s meant that social workers were involved in the performance of social work regarding problems of children that occurred “outside of schools,” such as responding to care-related needs, etc. Meanwhile, as for problems that were occurring “inside schools,” the major trend was to seek for resolutions via counseling. In other words, this meant that, within school sites, a method was used that focused on the source of the problem being the “individual” himself/herself. Thus, at that time, with the exception of special localities such as the Airin district, the problem of non-attendance was not, at school sites, the subject of social work, but was rather determined to be the object of counseling. The result was that the relationship between social work and schools never exceeded the procedural boundaries.

In the 1980s, when an even greater expectation was placed in counseling, the fact that activities within Tokorozawa City, which straddled the concept of SSW, remained single-region activities and never spread to other areas, is not without its reasons. Despite the fact that the practice of Yamashita, which involved activities with the conscious design of rebuilding interpersonal relationships, included important viewpoints, such were never diffused within school sites. One factor for this is thought to be that this period was one of a major trend toward counseling within the educational world.

With the coming of the 1990s, however, when the attempt was made to introduce SCr into schools, it was clear that “Among those activities that the SCr performed after introduction at school sites that were highly evaluated by the school side, many were those that did not stem from ‘counseling’ or ‘psychological therapy;’” rather, these were social work-type activities (Kanazawa 2002). Among work actually performed by
the SCr, who engaged themselves at schools using a message that saw the “individual” as the focal source of problems, pioneering SSW activities were included that linked the children and the school with the local community (Kanazawa 2002).

3. From a "Procedural Relationship" to a "Cooperative Working Relationship"

SSW is based on the perspective that the causes of problems facing children are the result of a variety of intertwining complex factors in the daily-life environment in which such children live. The focal point of social work, namely, “mutual interactions of an individual and his/her environment,” has an important significance in that assessments are performed from a spectrum of multiple viewpoints. To perform such multivariated assessments, it is necessary to consider the perspectives from persons in a variety of specialist fields, including social workers, education workers/teachers, counselors, physicans, and so on. Here, an individual facing his/her problem alone has no meaning-instead, a team approach is essential. One result of performing team-based assessments will be a linkage to cases outside of the school. In other words, the problem itself will be “opened to outside of the school.” In such a case, other institutions can also assign members to the team.

When, however, attempt is made to first analyze a problem from the perspective of counseling, of necessity, the “individual” becomes the focal point of the problem, with the result being that there is no need to focus on what has occurred, or is occurring, on the environmental side.

In this sense, the ways problems are viewed in counseling and in social work, respectively, are polar opposites: this is the major reason why social work is needed at school sites. This does not mean, however, that there is no need for counseling. In fact, there are large numbers of children and parents who require psychological help. What is problematic is the naming of the phenomenon in the statement of the problem: saying that so-and-so is a victim of “non-school attendance” or of “bullying,” for example. What is needed instead is to determine how an individual’s daily life situation is linked with the school problem, or how it is not linked, and then, on the basis of such understanding, to provide assistance to individuals requiring psychological help. In such a determination, the social work perspective is indispensable.

In such a movement, SSW cannot be limited to merely a procedural relationship. The emergence in the 2000s decade of SSW signifies the transformation of “schools” from “separate sanctuaries” to “sites of cooperative working.” Kadota (2006) has also indicated the need for such “cooperative working” relationships, and, in order to make considerations regarding the future structure of such “cooperative working” relationships, a survey is underway to determine the actual state of current engagements at school sites. It is a fact that a large number of problems have accumulated that cannot be resolved without forging such “cooperative working relationships” between teachers (including educational workers) and SCr, such that school problems and social work are effectively integrated, while also taking into account the history of “student guidance” and “educational consultation” that have been performed hitherto by such teachers.

IV. Future Issues

The above presented a summary of the changes made in the relationship between three areas in Japan in the postwar period, namely, “schools,” “social work,” and “counseling.” The following items were made clear: that until the 1990s, the relationship between schools and social work never went beyond the procedural area, that the current time, when there is a vigorous and engaged debate regarding SSW, marks the beginning of a “cooperative working relationship,” and that, into the future, after fully clarifying the differing specialties of SSWr and SCr, teachers and related institutions must all together to build “appropriate and effective methods of cooperative work.” Upon these bases, below are stated in conclusion some perspectives for dealing with future SSW-related issues.

First, there is the issue of how a team-based system with teachers can be constructed with the SSWr serving as the axis. The “cooperative working relationship”
has only just begun, and it will be necessary to perform further investigation from now on. School problems, from bullying to corporal punishment inflicted by teachers, are problems that occur within schools. When the SSWr are directly faced with such problems, from time to time they will have to fight against the school system itself. For such times, methods will have to be considered that will enable SSWr to continue to maintain their advocacy functions within their activities. This is a debate that has many overlapping layers of major issues, including appropriate hiring practices, supervision systems, etc.

Further, in order to consider how best to engage Japan SSW within schools, it will be necessary to review and summarize what school-provided “student guidance” and “educational consultation” has actually given to students. Then it will be necessary to perform even further investigation, from a social work perspective, of the merits and demerits of “student guidance” and “educational consultation.”

A second issue will be responding to the problem of expanding poverty. Up until now, social work has mainly been engaging in such problems outside of schools. Yet these are not problems that are merely external to schools. With the ever-increasing stratification of society, what is in all actuality the neglect that occurs due to the impoverished status of a family means that there are more than few cases where the school-provided lunch is the sole nutritional source of children (Iwata 2003). Yamano (2006), too, who has argued regarding the proper place of SSW from the perspective of the child consultation systems of municipalities (cities, towns, and villages), has stated that “What can be clearly stated is that the weakness of the daily-life infrastructure is remarkable, and the fact that a situation exists whereby there are many children in a so-called state of neglect.”

Third is the necessity of a community development perspective. Community development is, “with local residents serving as the leaders and driving force, the improvement by residents of that local-area society’s various economic, social, and cultural problems” (Kawamura 2005). The background for the stated need today of SSWr is the fact that within local communi-
ties where human relationships have become divided and separated, it has been indicated that required are engagements led by the local residents themselves to remake person-to-person relationships, and to, eventually, work themselves toward the discovery and resolution of the problems of daily life faced by those community residents, and in the midst of such, to rethink and revise the role played by schools. In other words, this entails the forging of a cooperative working relationship between community residents and schools. When that perspective has been reached, then practical research awaits regarding what types of activities the SSWr can do as a person responsible for community development.

Fourth is the necessity of revising the perspective on “development.” At school sites today, there exist numerous problems related to “development.” Nevertheless, so long as a state continues where there is no discussion on how best to understand “development,” investigation will be limited to merely finding frameworks for special educational assistance and methodology and the like, and the confusion at schools will continue. Wallon (=1952), who had a major impact on the formation of development theory, stated that “The ‘I’ emerges from the relationship between an individual and the environment, and the development of an individual must be thought of as linked with the means and methods of daily life of that individual;” he thus emphasizes the environment. This kind of thinking of Wallon overlaps with a fundamental concept of social work, namely, the importance of “mutual interactions of an individual and his/her environment.” The nature of SSW will vary according to what types of perspective social workers have regarding development. Social workers must seriously acknowledge that fact that, in social work overall, there has been little discussion regarding the best ways of viewing development, and engage themselves directly with this issue.
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