

論文

## How can practicality be treated in the teacher-training course “Development and Learning”?

教職課程科目「発達と学習」において実践性はどのように扱うことができるか

Keiichi KODAMA

児玉 佳一

Key words: Development and learning, Teacher-training course, Practicality, Theory in practice, Reflection

教育心理学的研究において「実践性」は研究活動の中核としてここ30年ほど強調されてきた。教職課程科目「発達と学習」の講義においても、こうした「実践性」を捨象しない講義のあり方を模索する必要がある。本論文では、教育心理学において扱われてきた「実践性」を確認した後、「発達と学習」における「実践性」を担保しようとする実践例を概観した。これらを踏まえて、「発達と学習」の講義における「実践性」を担保した講義の要件として、「theory into practice から theory in practice へ転換すること」、「一人称の視点を持ち込むこと」、そして「省察的实践であること」を提案した。

It has long been recognized that “practicality” is a hot topic in Japanese educational psychology and that it is at the core of research activities. Previously, educational psychology, as a field of psychology, was centered on laboratory research and the application of the theories obtained through that research to practical situations. However, there is a limit to what can be explained by a single theory in complex situations, and educational psychology that is forcibly “imposed” on these theories has often been described as a study of futility. In order for educational psychology to contribute to practical situations, it is necessary to move beyond the application of theories to the construction of theories in practical situations.

On the other hand, “the process of physical and mental development and learning of infants, pupils, and students,” as the subject for teacher training courses, is specified in The Core Curriculum for Teacher Training Course (MEXT, 2017) established by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) as a subject to be studied based on various theories of educational and developmental psychology. Many universities have made this subject a compulsory part of their curriculum. “The process of physical and mental development and learning of infants, pupils and students” is the name of the subject in the teachers’ licensing law and its enforcement regulations, and many universities offer classes with titles such as “Introduction to Educational

Psychology,” “Development and Learning,” and so on. In this article, this class will be consistently referred to as “Development and Learning.”

“Development and Learning” is defined in The Core Curriculum of Teacher Training Course as covering the items shown in Table 1. It broadly specifies the processes of development and learning. On the developmental side, the goals are to understand the significance of understanding development and the developmental processes of physical, language, cognitive, and social skills. On the learning side, the goals are to understand the concept and form of learning, motivation, peer relationships, evaluation and assessment, and instruction to support learning activities.

A variety of teaching methods are used in university courses to help students learn the material. For example, the research behind each theory is explained, and practical issues are discussed in groups. What is important here is not only consolidating the knowledge of each theory, but also learning with an awareness of “practicality” in the form of actual practical situations.

In this article, I examine how a course on “Development and Learning” incorporating “practicality” in educational psychology can be put into practice. In order to do so, I will first review the discussions on the “practicality” of educational psychology in Japan. Next, a case study on “Development and Learning” in Japan will be taken up, and

Table 1

*The position of “the process of physical and mental development and learning of infants, pupils, and students” in The Core Curriculum for Teacher Training Course*

---

**Overall goal**

Acquire basic knowledge of the mental and physical development of infants, pupils, and students, and the process of learning, and understand the basic concepts of guidance to support learning activities based on the psychological characteristics of each developmental stage.

(1) The process of mental and physical development of infants, pupils, and students

**General goal**

To understand the process and characteristics of the mental and physical development of infants, pupils, and students.

**Attainment goals**

- (a) Understand the significance of understanding development in education, based on the concept of the physical and mental development of infants, pupils, and students, and the related factors.
- (b) Understand the characteristics of movement, language, cognition, and social skills at each stage of development from infancy to adolescence.

---

(2) The process of learning in infants, pupils, and students.

**General goal**

Acquire basic knowledge of infants, pupils, and students learning and understand the basic concepts of development-based learning support.

**Attainment goals**

- (a) Understand the concept and form of learning.
  - (b) Understand the motivation, peer relationships, and evaluation and assessment of learning that support independent learning in relation to the characteristics of development.
  - (c) Understand the concepts underlying instruction that support independent learning activities based on the physical and mental development of infants, pupils, and students.
- 

*Note.* Translated by the author from MEXT (2017).

an overview of the perspectives from which it is practiced will be provided. Based on the above, some suggestions on what kind of learning activities are required in “Development and Learning” will be proposed.

### Discussions about “practicality” in educational psychology in Japan

Kage (2005, 2017) summarized the genealogy of the debate over “practicality” in educational psychology in Japan. In line with this summary, I will review the discussion so far.

#### The First Generation

From the birth of educational psychology to the postwar period, educational psychology was a kind of applied psychology that added the spice of education to psychology. Therefore, its content was a hodge-podge of psychology (Yoshida, 1990). Because of this, the perspective of applying psychological theory to educational situations was emphasized, and educational psychologists were regarded as enlightening “educational technology” based on psychology.

On the other hand, the application of psychological theory by educational psychologists has often generated unnecessary confusion in educational fields. Although the theories

enlightened by educational psychologists were akin to educational techniques, they did not have educational values and goals; therefore, they often diverged from the awareness of issues and goals in the field of practice. Cries about the “barrenness of educational psychology” in the field of practice grew louder and louder.

#### The Second Generation

In order to break out of its barrenness, educational psychologists aimed to make educational psychology independent of applied psychology as the “psychology of educational problems.” Azuma (1982) stated that consciousness of educational problems would give educational psychology the following characteristics:

- (1) Educational psychology would be specific.
- (2) Educational psychology would be developmental.
- (3) Educational psychology would be clear and unambiguous.
- (4) Educational psychology would be critical and creative.

This perspective led educational psychologists to explore the problems and theoretical aspects of education-specific problems and their applied solutions. However, the balance was not appropriate. Educational psychology became more focused on theoretical rather than applied research, and it

became increasingly difficult to distinguish between basic research on human cognition, development, and learning and the research of educational psychology. There was not only an increased theoretical orientation, but also a problem of a "lack of philosophy and historicity" with respect to education and human beings, and a "lack of sociality and responsibility" with respect to practice in terms of applied solutions. There were some easy applications where only the words "educational" and "practical" were used.

As a result, educational psychology moved away from its nature as a form of psychology that contributes to educational issues.

### **The Third Generation**

This shift was triggered by the increased interest and attention of psychologists in qualitative research, such as fieldwork, which led to a flurry of discussion. *Japanese Journal of Educational Psychology*, which deals with educational psychological research in Japan, also began to include a new category of "practical research" in 2000, and a new qualification called "school psychologist" was established. "Armchair educational psychology" (Tsuzuki, 1973), which attempted to maintain a certain distance from the field of education as a science, was transformed into a discipline that aimed to understand related phenomena through a new methodology and in a new field, with "practice" as its keyword.

Kage (2005) summarized four perspectives on the attitudes of researchers studying practice:

- (1) Trying to understand practice from the inside out.
- (2) Trying to cooperate with the field of practice.
- (3) Trying to face educational values.
- (4) Trying to be self-reflected.

Based on these four perspectives, educational psychologists are both "researchers" and "practitioners," and they are involved in practice in the following three ways (Kage, 2005):

- (1) Being the subject of practice: Researchers are involved in the field of educational practice as teachers and counselors, or they create the field themselves so that they can carry out their own research and practice.
- (2) Creating practices together: The researcher will engage in "practice to support the practitioners" through consultation and other roles.

- (3) Exploring practice: The researchers use methods such as action research to conduct theoretical research while putting themselves in practice.

### **Debates about "practicality" in pedagogy**

Here, I will leave educational psychology for a moment and give a brief overview of how the debate about "practicality" has been discussed from the slightly wider academic standpoint of pedagogy.

#### **Relationship between theory and practice**

Around the same time as the rise of the third generation, Manabu Sato published an article on the relationship between theory and practice (Sato, 1996; 1998). In this article, he argued that there are three relationships between theory and practice.

The first relationship is the "theory into practice" position, which recognizes educational practice as the application of scientific principles and techniques. This position can be said to apply to the first generation of educational psychology.

The second relationship is that of "theory through practice," which assumes that certain principles and regularities are embedded in "excellent teaching" and extracts these principles and laws through the process of "typicalizing" classroom practices. Although this position aims to theorize from educational practices, it is criticized because (a) the effectiveness of the typicalized theory is questionable in relation to diversification of educational values; (b) in reality, the theory typicalized in "excellent teaching" generates "theory into practice"; and (c) privileging "excellent teaching" and deprive the diversity and character of their practice.

The third relationship is the position that regards educational practice as an externalized theory that is internalized by the teacher, and researches theory in practice which functions intrinsically in the activities of teachers and children who create educational practice ("theory in practice"). In this position, theory and practice are not separate domains, but all practices are objectified as "theoretical practices" (Sato, 1998). It can be said that the third generation of educational psychology is attempting to develop research practices from this standpoint of theory in practice.

### **The reflective practitioner**

Another debate over theory and practice concerns the concept of the “reflective practitioner” by Donald A. Schön (1983), which is also important. The idea of “theory in practice,” as noted by Sato (1996, 1998) above, is based on Schön’s discussion.

Schön analyzed the practices of various professionals and considered the relationship between professional action and reflection. In the past, the prevailing image of professionals, such as doctors and lawyers, was people who possessed a wealth of knowledge and skills, and whose practice was based on “technical rationality” in applying them. As a result, interpersonal professions that constantly require complex and improvisational responses, such as teachers, were neglected as professionals due to their lack of established knowledge and skills. In analyzing the practices of these so-called interpersonal professionals, Schön found that they confronted uncertainty in their educational practices by not practicing on the basis of “technical rationality” but on the basis of “reflection in action,” in which they interacted with the situation, questioned the framework of the problem, and made decisions about what to do. He called such professionals “reflective practitioners.”

There are two main frameworks for this reflection (Schön, 1983). The first is “reflection in action,” which is the ability to think in and interact with ever-changing situations in the field of practice. The other is “reflection on action,” which is the ability to relativize one’s own practice from multiple perspectives. In these two forms of reflection, teachers construct ways of acting out uncertain practice by self-identifying the theoretical frameworks inherent in them and continually developing and improving their professional competence.

Since this was raised by Schön, further discussions on reflection have been promoted. For example, Max van Manen (1991) proposed a framework of “recollective reflection,” in which teachers gain fresh and deep insights by interpreting their own experiences, and “anticipatory reflection,” in which they deepen their thinking about the possibilities for subsequent practice. In other words, reflection is developed an aspect as thought that takes place in a form embedded in the act, an aspect that targets the act after the practice, and an aspect that identifies the possibilities for the next practice.

### **What is “practicality” in educational psychology?**

Based on the discussion and genealogy, I would like to summarize the aspects of “practicality” in educational psychology at the present stage, referring to examples of research that has been conducted so far. I would like to confirm the “practicality” from the aspects of development and learning, referring to each case study.

#### **Dealing with “theory in practice”**

The first feature is the discovery and construction of “theory in practice.” Kage (2005) argues that researchers in educational psychology are also “practitioners” and that they should (1) be the subject of practice, (2) create practice together, and (3) explore practice in the field of practice. It is important to note that simply being involved in practice does not guarantee “practicality.” Even if they are involved in practice, the “theory into practice” (Sato, 1996, 1998) way of engaging with the field of practice does not allow them to deal with practical theories on issues specific to educational practice. It is important to grasp the “theory in practice” that teachers have or that functions intrinsically in educational practice, to construct a new “theory in practice” in collaboration with the field of practice, and to develop and reconstruct the “theory in practice” as a practitioner.

#### **Capturing the individuality of practice**

The second feature is capturing the individuality of practice. “Theory in practice” is a position that extracts local theories from the field of practice. In other words, it requires research that scoops up the individuality of practice without discarding it. This is tackled through qualitative research, including fieldwork.

The third generation of educational psychology research is increasingly emphasizing this “individuality.” For example, developmental psychological research has been conducted on case studies of children with disabilities (including developmental disabilities). Specifically, fieldwork that depicts the actuality of environmental engagement and support approaches for children with disabilities (e.g., Kusumi, 2019; Shijo, 2013) and studies that seek to identify the difficulties teachers experience in supporting children with developmental disabilities (e.g., Sunami, 2018).

In instruction and learning research, Shin'ichi Ichikawa and members of his laboratory have examined educational practices from a cognitive psychological perspective through their own educational practices. Their practices have been systematized in the form of “cognitive-counseling” and the “thinking after instruction approach” (e.g., Ichikawa, 2019). These studies do not apply findings from cognitive psychology in the field (not “theory into practice”), but rather approach learners’ difficulties from a cognitive psychological perspective and work together to solve them, and the solution process is often examined in a case study.

On the other hand, many studies have examined the meaning of actions exhibited by teachers and children in their interactions with others in educational practice through participation in practice sites and long-term fieldwork (e.g., Ichiyangi, 2009; Yamaji, 2017). These studies are characterized by an awareness of the individual nature of learning and fidelity to the individual nature of “learning methods and learning outcomes of the people involved” (i.e., they do not judge good or bad learning based on knowledge retention as a subject matter in general).

Both studies were conducted in such a way that they did not discard the individual characteristics of each student. In other words, the “practicality” of the research was summed up in the individuality that captured aspects of individual development and learning. Also, it may also be characterized by the act of research that seeks to find local theories that are primarily about the “knowing in action” (Schön, 1983) of supporters of development and learning.

### **Being a reflective practice**

The third feature is the study of “reflective practice,” in which the researcher is also a practitioner. Lee S. Shulman stated in a private communication that “even if you have been teaching for 30 years, if you do not reflect on your own teaching, you are only repeating the first year 30 times” (Asada, 1998). Reflection has three functions: supporting improvisational thinking during practice, building competence as a teacher after practice, and applying it to the next practice. This approach to reflection leads to externalizing the “theory in practice” that was embedded in the teacher and teaching practice.

### **Practical examples in the teacher training course “Development and Learning”**

In light of the above “practicality,” I would like to provide an overview of the current state of practice of the teaching subject “Development and Learning.” However, in searching for case reports, although there are several discussions on how “Development and Learning” should be assigned in the teacher training curriculum (e.g., Kojima, 2017; Nakanishi, Hosoya, Naito, Harano, and Takee, 1991), there are few reported cases. In addition, many of the case reports tend to come from the subject of “the methods and techniques of teaching and learning” (MEXT, 2017) that deals with teaching and learning theories, rather than “Development and Learning.” Therefore, I extracted practical cases in “the methods and techniques of teaching and learning” related to teaching and learning.

### **Proposals at the Japanese Association for Educational Psychology (JAEP) 2019 Symposium**

In 2019, at the 61st Annual Meeting of the JAEP, the symposium “How The Core Curriculum for Teaching Training Course will change the nature of ‘educational psychology’” was held (Fujie, Nonaka, Kajii, Nozaki, and Mori, 2019). In keeping with the main purpose of this article, let me begin with an overview of the discussions at this symposium.

The issues addressed at this symposium were “how to create a learner-centered learning environment in the context of the introduction of the teaching core curriculum” and “how to consider the relationship between teaching subjects and the academic knowledge of educational psychology.” The former focused on the challenges that arise from the concern that the core curriculum, which prescribes a certain type of content, may lead to lecture that is centered on the teaching of theory. The latter focused on the challenge of developing a sense of how to understand educational activities from a psychological approach and solve problems, rather than just as knowledge of educational psychology as an academic discipline.

The three speakers reported on their practices at the symposium, as follows: The classification of learner types, learning tasks in and out of class, and innovations in small-group learning (Nonaka); a cross-curricular approach that combined the examination of actual cases in “Development and Learning” with classroom observations

and mock lessons (Kajii); and a practice aimed at cultivating psychological thinking skills that can be used in later educational practice, rather than the memorization of theories (Nozaki). Kajii and Nozaki's approaches were based on a clear sense of purpose—that is, they wanted students to acquire “competence embedded in practice” through “Development and Learning.”

An important suggestion made at this symposium was that, since most of the learners in the teacher training course have no experience in the field, it is important for them to acquire psychological thinking skills that will be useful in their later educational practice, such as the view of education and students through educational psychology, rather than considering the applicability of the theory to the school environment. Kajii and Nozaki's practices were developed with an emphasis on how the educational psychological theories discussed in “Development and Learning” are embedded in cases of practice and how the individuality of those cases can be read.

#### **Examples of practices in “the methods and techniques of teaching and learning”**

Two practical examples are presented here. Both are cases of practices that attempted to acquire empirical psychological thinking skills and theories embedded in practical situations.

The first is a case study by Fukaya and Uesaka (2017) that used the “cognitive-counseling” technique as the theme of the class. The focus of “cognitive-counseling” is using cognitive psychology to solve the difficulties that arise in learners' learning. The technique begins with the assessment of learning difficulties. On the other hand, teacher training students may only teach solutions without assessing the difficulties. As a teacher, pedagogical content knowledge (Shulman, 1986) is needed to accurately determine learners' difficulties and provide tailored explanations. In this practice, they provided learning support to actual elementary and junior-high school students as an extracurricular activity and incorporated reflective discussions of that support into the class. As a result, the teacher training students acquired a better understanding of learners' difficulties than at the beginning of the class, and it was shown that there was an increase in the amount of instruction that made the students aware of the learning strategy while checking their comprehension, rather than simply teaching.

With regard to the management of group learning, Kodama (2017) incorporated the experience of supporting learning as a teacher during group learning into the class. This practice was designed to cultivate not only their experience as participants in group learning, but also their (simulated) experience as teachers managing group learning. Specifically, during the group learning time, the students who acted as teachers did not participate in the group activity; they moved between groups and observed what was happening during group learning. In some cases, they could advise the group as a teacher. In addition, they had received a lecture on the theory of collaborative learning prior to the study. As a result, the students who perceived the teacher's role during collaborative learning to be “intervention” were made aware of the need for “evaluation” and “situational assessment.” It also showed that the students came to the realization that there are indirect ways of supporting students, such as through the group structure and task setting, as well as direct interventions by the teachers themselves.

Both practices share a commonality of the simulated experience of acting as a teacher. Even if it is not a mock lesson, simply experiencing how to think in practice while building on educational psychological findings may have a certain effect on teaching students with little experience.

#### **The reflective practice of teachers of “Development and Learning”**

Sakamoto (2013, 2015) provides a unique report on university teachers who taught “Development and Learning” in their practice. He reports on his own reflections and the process of his lesson study. Sakamoto (2013) conducted a lesson study in which he attempted to transform the students' concepts of the class through a lecture on “Development and Learning.” Lesson study and reflection are conducted with his colleague. Through a class that focused on assignments and discussion activities to reflect on students' own experiences, a classroom examples, and thoughts on education, the students' concepts of the class changed from (a) “individual enjoyment” to “classroom-wide enjoyment”; (b) “concretization of class participation and the formation of collaborative perspectives”; and (c) “fun through jokes” to “the joy of learning together.” Sakamoto's own reflections also led him to an increased awareness of his habits of listening to what they had to say and the improvisational way in which he reconstructed the class.

In addition, Sakamoto (2015) reported on his reflection. The lecture was recorded on video to create an ex-post class transcript (this is also the case in Sakamoto, 2013). In addition, he focused his reflections on the failures and difficulties he felt during the creation of the class record. Through these reflections, Sakamoto changed into thinking about presenting alternatives from the teacher’s point of view to the student’s it, and that he began to reflect on his psychological state as well as the actions and events in the class.

While many reports focus on methodological proposals in practice, it is interesting that Sakamoto (2013, 2015) describes the process of clarifying his own “theory in practice” through his reflection and connecting it to the next stage of practice. This report depicts the researcher as a practitioner exploring “practicality,” and the students are also exposed to one educational practice experience through their participation in “Development and Learning.”

### **Proposals: For “practicality” in “Development and Learning”**

Based on the discussion so far and the reported cases, I will suggest what perspectives are needed to ensure practicality in the teaching course “Development and Learning.”

#### **Proposal 1: Shifting from “theory into practice” to “theory in practice”**

First, it is necessary to prevent “theory into practice.” In “Development and Learning,” for example, students are often required to understand academic theories and knowledge, such as those presented in textbooks, based on the teacher’s explanations. This is because the Japanese teacher employment examinations include the field of “educational psychology.” However, this can easily lead to the occurrence of “theory into practice” if the teacher just explains the theory.

Earlier, I mentioned the importance of “practicality” in educational psychological research as being “theory in practice.” While the theories that have been developed in educational psychological research are important, it is also necessary to pay attention to the “theory in practice” that is found in local settings.

There are two main meanings of “theory in practice.” The first is a “theory in practice” embedded in the context of actual cases of practice. For example, Kajii and Nozaki reported on the practice of discovering psychological theories,

values, and thinking processes embedded in the context of practice, using real-life examples. The theories, values, and thinking processes discovered here are not generalized theories found in textbooks, but local theories that emerged in different contexts. The same theories and thinking processes cannot be applied to different situations, and learners must always improvise in different contexts.

On the other hand, since most participants in teacher training courses are inexperienced in educational practice, it is unlikely that they will be able to think psychologically from the outset if they have only seen examples of actual practice. Often, the focus is on value judgments and impressions based on good and bad, like and dislike. In order to overcome this problem, it is important to provide a framework in advance of looking at practical examples. For example, Buzzelli (1996) proposed four dimensions for analyzing teacher–children interactions in learning activities (Table 2). It is also important to provide a framework for capturing these instances so that inexperienced learners can be better supported in their learning.

The other meaning is “theory in practice,” which is embedded in the practice of “Development and Learning.” For example, Sakamoto (2013, 2015) externalized the “theory in practice” that was embedded in practice through reflecting on his own practice to improve his teaching. It is also important to show the teacher training students how teachers themselves become practitioners and share the process of discovering “theory in practice.”

However, “theory in practice” here tends to be biased toward “theory in practice” about how to teach and be a teacher. In fact, Sakamoto (2013, 2015) also tended to do so. An important point is that, as Vygotsky (1934/2001) points out, “schools deal with two different processes: the developmental process and the teaching process. The problem is the relationship between these two processes.” It is important to capture the relationship between development and learning, not to separate or equate them. In light of this, Akita (2005) reported an example of a study that captured the relationship between developmental and learning processes over time through a discourse analysis that focused on one classroom group, one teacher group, and one school system so that individual names could be identified. The important point is to find “theory in practice” as a “Development and Learning.”

Table 2  
*Four dimensions for analyzing teacher-children interactions in learning activities*

Dimension	Content
Mastery	What knowledge and means of mediation do children acquire as a result of participating in classroom activities? What do they mean for future learning and development?
Voice	How do children's voices show up in their interactions? Are we listening to our children's interests, questions, and concerns, which are expressed and acknowledged in our interactions?
Authority	Who is considered to have authority over knowledge and classroom learning? Are children given authority over their own learning?
Positionality	What is the teacher's position toward children as learners and toward the content being learned? Do teachers strive to position children as learner together and teachers together?

*Note.* Based on Buzzelli (1996) and translated by the author with reference to Ichiyanagi (2016).

**Proposition 2: Bringing in the “first-person” perspective**

Second, as mentioned above by Akita (2005), is to bring a “first-person” perspective to the study of theory. The educational psychology theories dealt with in textbooks are essentially theories according to the generalized “third-person” perspective. This is important in terms of knowing the so-called “average” psychological mechanisms. However, psychological theories are often easily understood as individualistic psychology, which is often attributed to the “mind-set” of the individual. The essence of psychological mechanisms should be considered as arising in the interaction with the individual situation. Therefore, in examining cases, it is necessary to read the theory embedded in the cases and situations from a “first-person” perspective.

To bring in a “first-person” perspective, it will be important to emphasize narratives in cases. For example, this means being aware of the narratives of teachers in the field and the “addressing” of classroom discourse. When the perspective of “for whom” is incorporated into the case, and is also important in the understanding of theory, the theory as understood there will function as “theory in practice.”

**Proposition 3: Being reflective practice**

Third, the emphasis should be on reflective practice. Each case study should be used not only as a teaching material, but also as a mechanism for reflecting on one’s own psychological thinking and perceptions of the value of educational issues from the context embedded in the case study.

Sakamoto (2013, 2015) was aware of a lesson design that emphasized student–student and student–teacher dialogue with the aim of transforming the students’ concept of the class. Reflection is both an individual thinking process and an activity that is mediated within a community. In fact, Sakamoto (2013, 2015) also engaged in reflection in

collaboration with a colleague teacher. It will be important to work on initiatives that allow students to experience reflection as a dialogic practice, where they can reflect on their own thinking processes while being exposed to the thinking processes of others.

The “first-person” perspective described above is essential for these reflections. For example, through understanding a case as a character in it (e.g., a teacher or student) rather than as a third party to it, it is believed that one can discover the “theory in practice” embedded in the case and expand one’s own perspective on the theory found.

**Toward becoming a teacher as a psychological practitioner**

To summarize the above proposals, in order to ensure “practicality” in “Development and Learning,” it is important to understand cases from a “first-person” perspective and develop reflections based on psychological thinking, with the aim of understanding them as “theory in practice” rather than just memorizing theory.

Such a proposal may be criticized for neglecting theories that could be found in textbooks. In this article, I do not take the position that such generalized theories are unnecessary. Rather, generalized theories are necessary to discover “theory in practice” through psychological thinking. This is because the construction of a theory without a generalized theory often leads to disintegration. In particular, students’ naive and sensitive “theory in practice” may be prone to this.

In addition, given the amount of time available for lectures, you may find it difficult to combine generalized theory with case studies. One methodological suggestion in this case would be flipped learning. Students prepare general theory with flipped learning and confirm it within the class. Further it would be necessary to change the structure of the class



without making it lecture style only, such as using the remaining time to case study.

The meaning of educational psychology research in teacher training has been questioned ever since it was stated that “educational psychology is a barrenness discipline in educational practice.” One of the solutions to that question was to focus on “practicality.” The ultimate goal of “Development and Learning” is to foster teachers who are capable of psychological practice. Through “Development and Learning,” I would like to foster teachers who do not merely know generalized theories, but who are able to discover the state of psychological theories embedded in practice, and who are able to approach those practices from a psychological perspective. In addition, it is necessary to pursue the development of such teachers not only in the “Development and Learning” context but also in the context of the curriculum as a whole.

### Reference

- Akita, K. (2005). School/classroom culture generation and learning: Analysis of School Functioning. Kage, M. (Ed.). *New Forms of Educational Psychology* (pp.111–131.) Tokyo: Seishin Shobo. (In Japanese, translated by the author of this book.)
- Asada, T. (1998). Reflecting my lesson: Using the teaching diary method. Asada, T., Ikuta, K., & Fujioka, K. (Eds.). *The growing teacher: An invitation to educator for human development* (pp.147–160). Tokyo: Kaneko Shobo. (In Japanese, translated by the author of this book.)
- Azuma, H. (1982). The nature of educational psychology. Azuma, H. (Ed.). *Psychological Foundations of Education*. Tokyo: Asakura Syoten. (In Japanese, translated by the author of this book.)
- Buzzelli, C. A. (1996). The moral implications of teacher-child discourse in early childhood classrooms. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *11*, 515–534.
- Fujie, Y., Nonaka, Y., Kajii, Y., Nozaki, H., and Mori, T. (2019). How the core curriculum for teacher training will change the nature of “educational psychology”: Interrogating the relationship between teaching subjects and academics in the new course. *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Japanese Association of Educational Psychology*, 140–141.
- Fukaya, T., & Uesaka, Y. (2017). Educational practice to enhance teacher trainees’ practical abilities for learning support through the experience of cognitive-counseling. *Japan Journal of Educational Technology*, *41*, 157–168. (In Japanese with English abstract.)
- Ichikawa, S. (Ed.). (2019). *A practicing-based approach in educational psychology*. Tokyo: The University of Tokyo Press. (In Japanese, translated by the author of this book.)
- Ichiyangi, T. (2009). How do teachers’ revoicings affect students’ listening and learning? *Japanese Journal of Educational Psychology*, *57*, 373–384. (In Japanese with English abstract.)
- Ichiyangi, T. (2016). Introduction to lesson study (part 2): Analyzing classroom discourse. *Journal of Classroom UD Research*, *2*, 54–61. (In Japanese, translated by the author of this article.)
- Kage, M. (2005). New Forms of Educational Psychology: Practice as Research. Kage, M. (Ed.). *New Forms of Educational Psychology* (pp.3–33.) Tokyo: Seishin Shobo. (In Japanese, translated by the author of this book.)
- Kage, M. (2017). Reconsideration of the role of psychology in education: From the perspective of practicality. *Japanese Psychological Review*, *60*, 391–403. (In Japanese with English abstract.)
- Kodama, K. (2017). A practice of “Teaching Methodology” to encourage students to comprehend collaborative learning as teachers’ perspectives. *Journal of Center for Teacher Development and Educational Research, Daito Bunka University*, *2*, 281–290. (In Japanese with English abstract.)
- Kojima, I. (2017). Developmental research on teacher specialization “student understanding and response ability” in teacher training course: Integrated curriculum study by “clinical teacher training”: psychology education “educational psychology” “education consultation” “career education” collaboration curriculum development proposal. *Bulletin of Tokyo Denki University, Arts and Sciences*, *15*, 3–12. (In Japanese with English abstract.)
- Kusumi, Y. (2019). Learning processes of a student with moderate intellectual disability and teacher feedback in lessons with a money management task: A socio-cultural approach. *The Japanese Journal of Development Psychology*, *30*, 101–112. (In Japanese with English abstract.)

- abstract.)
- MEXT (2017). Core curriculum for teacher-training Retrieved from [https://www.mext.go.jp/component/b\\_menu/shingi/toushin/\\_icsFiles/afieldfile/2017/11/27/1398442\\_1\\_3.pdf](https://www.mext.go.jp/component/b_menu/shingi/toushin/_icsFiles/afieldfile/2017/11/27/1398442_1_3.pdf) (August 26, 2020)
- Nakanishi, N., Hosoya, J., Naito, Y., Harano, K., & Takee, T. (1991). What should educational psychology be as a teaching curriculum? *The Annual Report of Educational Psychology in Japan*, 30, 9–11. (In Japanese, translated by the author of this article.)
- Sakamoto, A. (2013). A practical study of lesson to promote changes in the concepts of teaching: Through a lesson study of “Educational Psychology”. *Bulletin of the Nagoya Ishida Gakuen Secondary Education Research Department*, 5, 9–36. (In Japanese, translated by the author of this article.)
- Sakamoto, A. (2015). Self-reflection of researcher teachers in university teaching programs: An empirical investigation using lesson records of “Educational Psychology”. *Bulletin of the Nagoya Ishida Gakuen Secondary Education Research Department*, 7, 7–22. (In Japanese, translated by the author of this article.)
- Sato, M. (1996). Pedagogy as practical inquiry: Traditions of the paradigm shift beyond technical rationality. *The Japanese Journal of Educational Research*, 63, 278–285. (In Japanese, translated by the author of this article.)
- Sato, M. (1998). Psychology in the practical thinking of teachers. Saeki, Y., Miyazaki, K., Sato, M., & Ishiguro, H. *Between psychology and educational practice* (pp.9–56). Tokyo: The University of Tokyo Press. (In Japanese, translated by the author of this book.)
- Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books Inc.
- Shijo, K. (2012). Interactions between a child with special needs and the other children in a mainstream classroom: Analysis based on Vygotsky’s theory of defectology. *The Japanese Journal of Special Education*, 50, 171–180. (In Japanese with English abstract.)
- Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 15(2), 4–14.
- Sunami, N. (2018). Process and characteristics of difficulties experienced by teachers of children with ADHD tendencies: Qualitative research based on teacher narratives. *The Japanese Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 29, 228–242. (In Japanese with English abstract.)
- Tsuzuki, A. *Exploring Educational Psychology*. Tokyo: Kaneko Shobo. (In Japanese, translated by the author of this book.)
- Van Manen, M. (1991). Reflectivity and the pedagogical moment: The normativity of pedagogical thinking and acting. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 23, 507–536.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (2001). *Thought and Language*. (Y. Shibata, Trans.). Tokyo: Shindokusyosya (Original work published 1934)
- Yamaji, A. (2017). Qualitative research on observations of a middle school student’s conceptual understanding of algebraic expressions: Listening and help-seeking. *Japanese Journal of Educational Psychology*, 65, 401–413. (In Japanese with English abstract.)
- Yoshida, A. (1990). A far-future vision of what to expect from “educational psychology”. *The Annual Report of Educational Psychology in Japan*, 29, 142–153. (In Japanese, translated by the author of this article.)

### Acknowledgement

I would like to thank Editage (www.editage.com) for English language editing.