

The Multilayered Nature of "Democratic Aspects" Leading to Equity: Considerations from Collaborative Activities between Schools and Communities in Japan and the United States

Ayaka Nakano*

This paper examines how public education can ensure equity and diversity by clarifying the “democratic aspects” that can be captured through school-community collaborative activities in Japan and the U.S. As a result of comparison and analysis, it is indicated that in both Japan and the U.S., these activities are conducted in the context of streamlining educational administration. In addition, the participation in school management of diverse people such as local residents, parents, and children is promoted in order to grasp their needs and achieve deliberation on an equal footing. In contrast to Japan, however, these activities in the U.S. put importance on providing health and educational services to disadvantaged families and children. Furthermore, they aim to change not only schools but also communities. Therefore, this paper suggests that “democratic aspects” encompassed by collaborative activities have multiple layers: (1) “compensatory-type” (status-quo satisfaction -oriented democratic aspects), (2) “participatory-type” (deliberation-oriented democratic aspects), and (3) “transformative-type” (status-quo change-oriented democratic aspects). In order to guarantee equity of education that ensures fairness and inclusion to all children, this paper clarifies the importance of having both activities that distribute educational and welfare services on a curve to disadvantaged children and families (compensatory-type) and activities that involve children themselves in the practice, leading to the transformation and creation of the world (participatory and transformative type). The types of activities described above do not necessarily set the transformative-type as the ultimate goal. The three types interact together and pave the way toward a democratic and equitable education that is open to all and respects the voices of minorities.

Keywords: School-community collaboration, “democratic aspects,” compensation, participation, transformation

* Sophia University
Research Fellow of Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (PD)
e-mail: nakano-a@sophia.ac.jp

1. Introduction

To provide more equal and equitable education for all children, public education in each country must be “democratic” in a way that guarantees the fairness and quality of education. The term “democratic” here does not refer to the democratic political system. It is an emergent attitude in educational activities in which people, while connecting with others and with the world, perceive the social order and generate a more inclusive way for all people. This attitude does not refer to the adjustment of individual preferences through majority rule for the realization of a democratic system, or to the development of citizenship skills through citizenship education. It refers to the “fairness” that children can exert themselves regardless of their socioeconomic background, and to the “inclusion” that achieves a minimum necessary quality of education for all children (Parveva, et al., 2020), indicating democratic attitudes as the foundation for generating the concept of equity.

The essence of democracy is said to be the creation of a process that is fundamentally open and undecided (Biesta, 2011). While theoretical discussions of what “being democratic” is in the educational domain exist, there is little examination of how this “being democratic” is positioned in the actual educational system and practice. As a result, “democratic aspects” in the educational sphere exist with vague contours. This paper focuses on educational policies, especially collaborative activities between schools and communities, in Japan and the U.S. and considers the nature of public education that guarantees equity and diversity through a discussion of democratic attitudes. Here, “being democratic” is not regarded as fixed but as the “democracy with uncertainty” (Friedrich, et al., 2010) that continually arises with undecidability.

1.1 Collaboration with communities as “democratic aspects”

According to Biesta (2021), education can retain its connection to democracy as living together in plurality and difference. Here educational activities do not respond well to the demands for education from economic and social trends in subordinate ways: they examine things that are important to themselves and engage the world to generate alternatives (Ibid, p.3, pp.22-26). When we look at education from the perspective of being open to the world that embraces this plurality and difference, we can see not only the connection with others as individuals but also the “community” where children are located. Dewey (1975) holds that democracy is more than a form of politics, but also a cooperative way of life and a communal communicative experience. In other words, we find “democratic aspects” as momentary processes, generated in a dynamic relationship of connection and separation in a communal community. The generation of looser connections between these communities and schools produces opportunities for democratic and participatory approaches that can help support families and revitalize communities along with children and schools (Sanders, 2003). Communitarian norms, including a focus on community, are also said to hold mechanisms for generating flexible attempts to reconfigure existing public educational systems in the process of responding to local needs (Suetomi, 2012, p.164). These situations occur because school-community collaborative activities are positioned on the periphery of the schooling system and do not need to obey legally binding guidelines and curricula. Furthermore, the marginality and heterogeneity of the activity allow for the emergence of alternatives and a rethinking of the existing order in education (Nakano, 2023).

Although there are impressions that the policy movement to implement school education in collaboration with local communities has become more active only in recent years, these activities have a long history. Until the expansion of the role of government and administration post-World War II, school education was provided or supported mainly by local communities, including churches and volunteer organizations (Bray, 2003). In recent years, however, as the financial and functional limitations of government have been recognized, there has been a renewed focus on community participation in schooling to compensate for these limitations and to ensure the quality of education (ibid.). In terms of international trends, the Declaration of the World Conference on Education for All held by UNESCO in 1990 encourages partnerships at the regional level in terms of harmonization of activities and mobilization of financial and human resources. In other words, the agenda of collaboration with the community leads to discussions on guaranteeing inclusive and equitable educational quality, bringing perspectives of using outside human resources, operational efficiency, and deregulation and liberalization of education. Therefore, a collaboration between schools and communities, which is seen as a flexible, transformative, and open entity, can be positioned as democratic; it guarantees the quality of education in the context of the realization of marketization and efficiency in neoliberalism, not with government initiatives but with the participation of people.

1.2 Commonality of regimes/heterogeneity in policy borrowing

The existence of community and school-community collaboration is thus seen as a democratic concept that leads to openness and connection to the world. At the same time, it encompasses the neoliberal democratic concepts of “small governments” and “small schools.” This is why this paper focuses on the collaboration between schools and communities in Japan and the U.S. This collaborative activity resonates with the neoliberal ideology of transferring to the community some of the educational and welfare services that have been provided by schools or society through the withdrawal and downsizing of the “public.” In addition, it cannot be elucidated through philosophical inquiry alone but must be viewed in connection with the regime. Busemeyer (2014), drawing on Esping-Andersen’s welfare state regime theory, classified capitalist states into regime types and discussed education systems, discussing the relationship between decommodification and educational stratification in the education/training system. Moreover, Busemeyer concluded that Japan and the U.S. are positioned in liberal regimes, with a low degree of decommodification and educational stratification⁽¹⁾⁽²⁾. In other words, Japan and the U.S. can be categorized within the same educational regime. Similar backgrounds and ways of school-community collaboration can be captured between them.

During the postwar reform period, Japan adopted the concept of community schools, which had been revitalized in the U.S., with movements toward school education that positioned local residents and parents as parties (Shibata, 2020, p.131). Japan, therefore, is positioned as a policy borrower with the U.S. as a “reference society” (Steiner-Khamsi, 2014), while the U.S. is positioned as a policy lender. This is the difference between the two countries in the background of school-community collaboration.

By examining school-community collaboration in Japan and the U.S., this paper clarifies the multilayered and uncertain nature of “democratic aspects” in this collaboration, which are not limited to philosophical and regime resonance. Furthermore, it considers how education

can be directed toward providing a more equitable education for all children. In comparing educational policies in the two countries, the paper relies on the method of juxtaposition and comparison presented in Bereday (1964) and describes the criteria for comparability as mentioned above. After outlining the activities in Japan and the U.S., the study clarifies the similarities and differences between the two countries. Based on what is suggested by the descriptions of each country, it makes a simultaneous comparison of characteristics of the activities, which leads to the “democratic aspects.”

2. Approaching the “democratic aspects” through a comparison of Japan and the United States

As a prerequisite to discussing educational “democratic aspects” in Japan and the U.S., this section outlines the policy evolution of collaborative activities between schools and communities in the two countries.

2.1 Collaborative activities between schools and communities in Japan

First, let us look at school-community collaboration in Japan. In Japan, the local community had been an integral part of education. However, under the postwar centralized educational administration, the school-centered structure was created and the local community was overshadowed. The aspect of collaboration with local communities came back into focus around 1980, when reducing the financial burden on the government and streamlining public administration were on the agenda. The need for school-community collaboration was also expressed in the fourth report of the Provisional Council on Education (issued in 1987). The establishment of this council triggered discussions on the “liberalization of education” in Japan, amid deregulation of education and the principles of relaxed education and emphasis on individuality. The report noted that the educational capacity of local communities was declining due to the progress of urbanization and other factors. In addition, it clarified the roles and limitations of the family, school, and local community, focusing on the child’s position, and stated the importance of revitalizing their respective educational functions and promoting cooperation. The meritocratic society (*gakureki-shakai*) and falling educational ability were identified as factors contributing to the class disintegration and bullying problems that were becoming increasingly serious at the time. In order to restore this educational ability, the necessity of cooperation among schools, communities, and families was advocated, along with the introduction of private-sector vitality in education.

As a specific policy, the school council system was established to increase schools’ accountability and responsiveness to parents and local residents. This system also aimed at obtaining their cooperation, as well as understanding their intentions. However, it is pointed out that in the school council system, parents and residents are often placed in a passive position, expressing their opinions only in response to requests from the principals (Imai, 2001). This can be called an “accountability-type” (Iwanaga, 2011)⁽³⁾ collaboration between school and community, which tries to grasp the needs of local residents and others while their participation remains a formality.

In addition, there are school community support activities (*gakko chiiki shien katsudo*) in which volunteers from the local community provide practical support, such as flowerbed

maintenance, traffic safety on the way to and from school, sewing and calligraphy assistance in classes, and after-school study support based on volunteer organizations set up at the schools (Nakano, 2023). These activities are called “school-support-type” (Iwanaga, 2011) activities since local residents and other volunteers are responsible for providing support for schools and children.

However, in the “school-support-type” described above, local residents unilaterally support schools. Therefore, to generate more developed relationships, schools and communities must work together as partners on an equal footing. In community schools, the goal is to expand the discretionary authority of schools and further promote the participation of local residents and parents (Hidaka, 2006). Local residents, parents, and experts are expected to participate in discussions with school administrators and teachers. Here, the appointed committee members have the role of expressing their opinions on school management policies and the appointment of teachers and staff, as well as approving the policies. In addition, regional school collaboration activities (*chiiki gakko kyodo katsudo*) emphasize the complementary relationships among schools and communities, while creating a loose network and interaction among them for children’s growth. These collaborative activities can be described as “participation and co-determination-type” (Iwanaga, 2011) activities.

2.2 Collaborative activities between schools and communities in the United States

Next, we will discuss collaborative activities between schools and local communities in the U.S. Even in the United States, schools and local communities have traditionally been considered inseparable entities. Since progressivist thought flourished, educators have viewed schools as central institutions in the community and emphasized learning in connection with the community (Valli et al., 2016). In the 1980s and beyond, educational partnerships, which promoted cooperation between schools and businesses under the reform of educational administration aimed at streamlining government administration, expanded the scope of cooperation to include parents, local institutions, and the community. In addition, these partnerships became the driving force behind comprehensive educational reforms (Ohno, 1999). Along with this trend toward liberalization of education, collaboration between schools and communities was positioned as a clue to solving educational issues that were recognized as requiring policy responses in the 1980s and 1990s. In other words, school reform and community development have been linked so as to respond to children’s learning and education, influenced by community-wide inequities and issues such as poverty and so on (Green, 2018).

To consider measurement for these children and families’ difficulties, such as poverty, and to boost their health conditions and learning outcomes, the “Parent, Family, and Community Engagement (PFCE) Framework” was proposed by the Office of Head Start, Administration for Children and Families. School-community collaboration also aims to increase support for neighborhoods, families, and children in economic and other challenging situations (Anderson et al., 2019). A specific practice is Family and Interagency Collaboration, in which schools and related agencies attempt to extend the traditional school role model of teaching and learning. In this collaboration, schools and agencies aim to provide health, social, and educational services to families and children. There is also the format of Full-Service Schools as a framework that attempts to provide more comprehensive support services for families and children (Valli et al., 2016). Specifically, basic academic development, mental health counseling, family counseling, job development support, and personal skills development

would be provided in centers established within or near schools (Walker & Hackmann, 1999).

In addition, Full-Service Community Schools (FSCSs) are types of partnerships between schools and communities which focus on the importance of transforming the culture of the school. These systems not only consider families as customers and provide services such as medical care, food assistance, and learning support services, but also open the school to the community. The goal is to democratize schools by increasing the participation and decision-making power of parents and community members in school management and other matters (Valli et al., 2016). Specifically, community schools inside public school buildings are open to children, families, and community members before, during, and after school, with a full-time coordinator managing support services as part of the school management team (Dryfoos, 2002). In these FSCSs, community members, youth, parents, and school administrators attempt to transform the school into a child-centered institution (ibid.).

While the above collaborations focus on the provision of various services to children and families and their participation in school administration, the Community Development Model aims at transforming not only schools but also entire neighborhood communities (Valli et al., 2016). In particular, it focuses on economic growth, job creation, and leadership development for community members, parents, and children while increasing the social, economic, and physical capital of the community and the degree of decision-making by community members (Melaville, 1998, pp.14-15). The school setting then becomes an important contact point for local residents and others to address and reform urgent political, economic, and cultural issues (Valli et al., 2016).

2.3 Similarities and Differences

Based on the above outline, let us examine the similarities and differences between school-community collaboration in Japan and the U.S. As the first similarity, the need for collaboration between schools and communities has been advocated from the perspective of the streamlining and deregulating of educational administration. This is a phenomenon related to education policy and finance that arises due to the low degree of de commodification. In other words, under the decentralization of discretion and responsibility for education, it is expected that local communities can play roles in schooling as a way to distribute the financial burden of education and welfare services (Bray, 2003). As a new way to reform education, address serious “education problems,” and promote society toward the future while reducing education funding, the focus is on “communities” that can provide services and allocate resources based on “goodwill” and “free of charge” without assuming large financial outlays.

The second similarity is that the concept of community schools aims to encourage the participation of local residents and parents, and to collaborate with them in expressing their opinions from their standpoints. In other words, the concept of a community school is envisioned as an open and democratic place where diverse perspectives and opinions are included.

Elsewhere, the first difference is that in the U.S., the low degree of de commodification in the liberal cluster is reflected more strongly in the structure of collaborative activities. Family and Interagency Collaboration, Full-Service Schools, and FSCSs have in common that families and children are the recipients of health, social, and educational services provided by schools and other institutions⁽⁴⁾.

The second difference is also related to the first point of difference. School-community collaborative activities are positioned in the United States as agencies that provide direct support to families. In particular, the main objective of these activities is to support families and children in difficult circumstances where economic hardship is linked to medical care, food, and learning. In Japan, on the other hand, collaborative activities, which are implemented as part of public education, aim to contribute broadly to the development of children, rather than categorizing children by socioeconomic status, such as “poor families.” Here, we find support in the opposite direction of that in the U.S. This means that in Japan, local residents or family members support schools, and schools are not only the providers of resources but also the recipients of support.

The third difference is that in the U.S., collaborative activities aim not only at the transformation of schools but also at the transformation of communities as social and economic development. On the other hand, in Japan, since cooperation is promoted by focusing on the development of children’s abilities, social and economic issues are also directly connected to learning, and it is rare for cooperation to be oriented toward the fundamental improvement of the social and economic conditions of the region⁽⁵⁾.

3. Multi-layered “democratic aspects” as compensation, participation, and transformation

What, then, are “democratic aspects,” which include guaranteeing the quality of education and ensuring equity, as derived from the outline of school-community collaborative activities, and similarities and differences shown in the previous section?

3.1 The characteristics of collaborative activities derived from similarities and differences

In proceeding with the discussion, we will look at the nature of collaborative activities as revealed by the similarities and differences between Japan and the U.S. described above.

First, as a method of collaborative activities revealed by the first and second points of differences, we discussed the common perspectives of Family and Interagency Collaboration, Full-Service Schools, and FSCSs in the U.S., whose roles are to provide support for families and children. Here, activities are undertaken to compensate for the lack of learning, welfare, and social resources for families and children in difficult or disadvantaged situations. School community support activities in Japan also respond to the needs of families and children through learning support activities and so on. Therefore, when considered in terms of filling a deficient resource or existing needs, it is clear that these collaborative activities perform the function of “compensation.”

Next, as the second similarity, a role of collaborative activities common to both the community school system in Japan and FSCSs in the U.S. is that schools, local residents, parents, and various other people discuss and make decisions on school management policies from an equal standpoint. These activities aim to guarantee places where diverse people can participate in school management and educational activities. Thus, they have the function of promoting “participation.”

Finally, the third point of difference makes it clear that collaborative activities sometimes aim at not only the transformation of school organizations and cultures but also the transfor-

mation of communities, which is the perspective of the Community Development Model in the U.S. These activities are based on the participation of a wide variety of people. Therefore, even if a community school is categorized as a participatory-type of school mentioned above, it also has transformative characteristics when deliberations in the school lead to the transformation of the school organization, culture, and so on⁽⁶⁾. As a result, these collaborative activities have the function of promoting “transformation.”

The above shows that collaborative activities between schools and communities in Japan and the U.S. are rooted in the context of the streamlining and deregulation of educational administration, which is the first point of similarity, but also have the perspectives of compensation, participation, and transformation. Below, let us consider these three perspectives in relation to the “democratic aspects.”

First, we have compensation and participation. Howe (2004) shows the limitations of the formalistic interpretation of equality of educational opportunity as equal access to education for all. He also points out the existence of compensatory interpretation, which is a direct practical response to the disadvantages of children. Howe put importance on participatory interpretation, which encourages the participation of individuals and groups who have been excluded from the creation of educational order so as to incorporate their interests and needs. While Howe’s argument concerns equality of educational opportunity, the “democratic” realization of equity encompasses the above concept of equality. Therefore, compensation and participation are perspectives that are deeply related to the “democratic aspects.”

Next, regarding transformation, Rancière (2005 p.166) states that democracy is the name of the suspension of the order of distributing bodies within the community. In other words, Rancière considers that democracy arises at the moment when the existing order and body arrangement are suspended and displaced. Based thereupon, compensation for shortcomings made within the existing order and individual and collective participation alone are not sufficient for a democratic way of bringing about equity. As a result, transforming one’s environment is what brings about “democratic aspects.”

3.2 “Democratic aspects” in the compensatory-type

Based on the similarities and differences mentioned above, we will now discuss the “democratic aspects” of the collaborative activities between schools and communities. First, compensatory cooperative activities embody attitudes based on redistribution, which corresponds to the second principle of justice in Rawls (2010). This means providing services through collaborative activities on an inclined basis to children and families as “subalterns” (Spivak, 1999) without access to the full use of the system mainstreamed in the existing society or to the benefits therein. On the other hand, categorizing certain segments of the population as “oppressed” from the outside would embed them in the existing order. They become a surplus that does not belong to the situation and is not given a place in the commonality (Friedrich et al., 2010). In other words, even if substantial support is provided to children and families, they are always regarded as objects to be protected, making it difficult for them to be positioned as autonomous entities on the public ground of openness. Thus, even if all children enjoy the minimum necessary quality education (inclusion), children’s ability to fulfill themselves independent of their socioeconomic background (fairness) is restricted to a certain extent. This compensatory-type is the democratic attitude of status quo sufficiency thinking, which does not aim to transform the existing order in the sense of supplementing

those who do not meet the standards formed from the existing order.

3.3 “Democratic aspects” in the participatory-type

Second, from the perspective of participatory collaborative activities, the attitude of deliberative democracy can be assumed. Deliberation here does not mean that a completely free discussion among individuals will be allowed. The practice of deliberation is supposed to be an ongoing activity of mutual reason-giving, and a process of reaching mutually binding decisions based on legitimate reasons (Gutmann & Thompson, 2002).

Moreover, certain entry conditions must be met to participate in deliberative democracy. Biesta (2011) argues that although deliberative democracy presupposes a predefined image of “good citizens,” democratic citizens are not predefined identities that can be simply taught or learned. They emerge repeatedly in new forms as people participate in experiments in democratic politics. In thinking about the future of public education, we need a perspective that goes beyond the demands of parents to envision “the world of the future,” and we have to include in our scope heterogeneous others who cannot participate in the debate (Hirota, 2009, p.222). In other words, participatory collaborative activities must not only assume an “ideal dialogue situation” in which only “citizens” can participate but also shift the existing social conditions, the structure of the educational system, and the arrangement of people themselves.

3.4 “Democratic aspects” in the transformative-type

Third, transformative collaborative activities are synonymous with participatory activities in terms of the participation of local residents and parents. However, these are unique in being oriented toward promoting the transformation of schools and communities. In other words, while taking children’s education and schools as the starting point, these activities aim to ensure the quality and equity of children’s education over a long period not only by transforming school organizations and cultures but also by aiming for community creation and social transformation. Such transformations involve the politics of suspension and displacement of the existing order, as Rancière (2005) points out. It can be a combative transformation in which the connections between talents, occupations, and status within the existing inequal order are disrupted (Masschelein & Simon, 2010). Thus, pro-transformative activities are democratic attitudes oriented toward changing the status quo.

Even though room for people to be involved is guaranteed in the participatory model, if the redistribution of power, that is, the possibility of transforming the existing social order and structure, is not guaranteed, participation will be an empty process without power redistribution (Arnstein, 1969). Since pro-transformative collaborative activities do not end with the deliberative discussion, it is possible to overcome the existing structures and generate new ways of sustainable and inclusive schools in terms of people’s initiative.

4. General discussion

This paper captured the contours of the uncertain “democratic aspects” of collaborative activities between schools and communities in Japan and the United States. As a result, it became clear that these activities are conducted in the context of streamlining educational ad-

ministration in relation to neoliberalism. In addition, “democratic aspects” were generated in multiple layers as compensation, participation, and transformation, derived from similarities and differences between collaborative activities in Japan⁽⁷⁾ and the U.S.

Specifically, the following democratic aspects were identified: (1) status-quo satisfaction-oriented “democratic aspects” which emphasize meeting the needs of children and families within the current order, (2) deliberation-oriented “democratic aspects” which emphasize mutual understanding and dialogue through the participation of diverse agencies, including children, parents, local residents, and teachers, and (3) status-quo change-oriented “democratic aspects” which emphasize the creation of a world beyond the existing order by linking the participation of diverse people not only to the transformation of school culture and organization but also to the transformation of neighborhoods.

Democracy is more than a political form; it should be rooted in a culture that shapes the informal spheres of everyday life, such as family, community, workplace, school, and other public services (Skidmore & Bound, 2008, p.9). This paper is significant in clarifying the “democratic aspects” of collaborative activities between schools and communities, which occur in everyday life but have not been examined because of their vague contours.

In addition to clarifying the “democratic aspects,” the purpose of this paper was to examine ways to provide a more equitable education for all children. The vision of democracy is said to be sometimes contradictory, targeting not only the common good which is open to all but also the representation of minorities deprived of a voice (Friedrich, et al., 2010). However, this study demonstrated that the points that Friedrich et al. mentioned above should not be viewed as mutually exclusive but should be recognized as coexistent in order to guarantee equity of education that ensures fairness and inclusion to all children, including disadvantaged children. To this end, it is important to have both activities that distribute educational and welfare services on a curve to disadvantaged children and families (compensatory-type) and activities that lead to the transformation and generation of the world with children themselves participating in the practice (participatory and transformative type). For this reason, the types of activities described in the previous section do not necessarily set transformative-type as the ultimate goal: rather, the compensatory-type, the participatory-type, and the transformative-type influence and complement each other. As a result, this paper has clarified the multi-layered existence of the “democratic aspects” in collaborative activities, which enables us to consider how to provide equitable education for all children.

The “democratic aspects” are not fixed things, but have great plasticity that changes according to circumstances. In order to continue to search for more equitable education in constantly changing circumstances, it is important to generate alternatives that are capable of constantly accompanying changes in children from the variable “democratic aspects” through deliberations and practices in collaborative activities. These activities, which can combine the logic of marketization of education with democratic and equitable educational practices, will not be limited to the cycle of the three functions of compensation, participation, and transformation. They will further increase their presence as a flexible way to create new educational possibilities in the future.

Notes

- (1) Decommodification is defined as an increase in the degree to which people can sustain their lives independent of the market. Stratification captures the extent to which institutions in the welfare

- state create salient hierarchies, such as in Germany where the secondary education system is split and children are placed on different trajectories early in their educational process (Busemeyer, 2014). Some aspects of stratification in the liberal regime may be considered highly stratified depending on the nature of the discussion, which makes it easier to create disparities due to the market and private welfare (Esping-Andersen, 1990).
- (2) Busemeyer (2014) discusses the distribution of nations to each regime in the education and training system, with Japan and the U.S. classified in the same liberal regime. On the other hand, Esping-Andersen’s discussion of welfare state regimes places the U.S. in a liberal regime, but makes no specific mention of Japan.
 - (3) The “accountability-type,” “school-support-type,” and “participation and co-determination-type” presented in Iwanaga (2011) originally signify the characteristics of community schools. However, these types are connected to the characteristics of collaboration systems presented in this paper, so they are used as a typology to indicate the nature of collaborative activities between schools and communities here.
 - (4) However, families are not always positioned as demanders or recipients, but may be on the supply side as volunteers who participate in the school.
 - (5) In Japan, collaborative activities sometimes include problem-solving lessons that deal with research on environmental and social issues in the neighborhood, but community transformation is positioned as a method to achieve the goal of children’s learning.
 - (6) As indicated here, the participatory and transformative types are continuum typologies. However, there are some differences between these two types; the former sets goals as participation itself and the latter sets goals as shifting the current situation. In addition, for community schools classified as the “participatory-type,” the existence of “silent members” (Nakata, 2010) has also been pointed out. This indicates that there can be situations in which only some members speak up, making it difficult for all people to participate in deliberation on an equal footing.
 - (7) In 2.3, it was noted that collaborative activities in Japan do not include much of a transformative element. This implies that the phenomenon shown in this study, in which democratic aspects are generated in multiple layers from three types, is difficult to apply to Japan. However, this study attempts to comprehensively demonstrate the democratic aspects that collaborative activities can encompass through a comparison of Japan and the U.S., and the nonexistence of one typology signifies the direction that collaborative activities may take in the future. In other words, the lack of transformative elements in Japan suggests the possibility that Japan’s future activities could generate greater democratic aspects by being aware of the necessity of transformative elements.

Acknowledgment

This work was supported by JSPS Grant-in-Aid No. JP23KJ1929.

References

- Anderson, J. A., Chen, M.-E., Min, M., & Watkins, L. L. (2019). Successes, challenges, and future directions for an urban full service community schools initiative. *Education and Urban Society*, 51(7), 894-921.
- Arnstein, S. R. (1969). A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 35(4), 216-224.
- Biesta, G. (2011). The ignorant citizen: Mouffe, Rancière, and the subject of democratic education. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 30, 141-153.
- Biesta, G. (2021). *Kyoiku ni Kodawaru to Iukoto (Obstinate Education) (M. Ueno, Trans.)*. University of Tokyo Press (Japanese). (Original work published 2019)
- Bray, M. (2003). Community initiatives in education: Goals, dimensions and linkages with governments. *A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 33(1), 31-45.
- Bereday, G. (1964). *Comparative method in education*. Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Busemeyer, M. R. (2014). *Skills and inequality: Partisan politics and the political economy of education reforms in western welfare states*. Cambridge University Press.

- Dewey, J. (1975). *Minshu Shugi to Kyoiku Jo (Democracy and Education First Volume)* (Y. Matsuno, Trans.). Iwanami Shoten (Japanese). (Original work published 1916)
- Dryfoos, J. (2002). Full-service community schools: Creating new institutions. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 83, 393-399.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1990). *The three worlds of welfare capitalism*. Princeton University Press.
- Friedrich, D., Jaastad, B., & Popkewitz, T. S. (2010). Democratic education: An (im) possibility that yet remains to come. *Educational philosophy and theory*, 42(5-6), 571-587.
- Green, T. L. (2018). School as community, community as school: Examining principal leadership for urban school reform and community development. *Education and Urban Society*, 50(2), 111-135.
- Gutmann, A., & Thompson, D. (2002). Deliberative democracy beyond process. *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 10(2), 153-174.
- Hidaka, K. (2006). A study on the establishment of the school management committee system. *Journal of the Japan Society for Educational System and Organization*, 13, 163-175. (Japanese).
- Hirota, T. (2009). *Jiyu eno Toi 5 Kyoiku (The Question of Freedom 5 Education)*. Iwanami Shoten (Japanese).
- Howe, K. R. (2004). *Kyoiku no Byodo to Seigi (Understanding Equal Educational Opportunity)* (T. Omomo, M. Nakamura, T. Goto, Trans.). Toshindo (Japanese). (Original work published 1997)
- Imai, N. (2001). Some problems and prospects of the school councilor system. *Bulletin of Japanese Association of School Education*, 16, 39-54. (Japanese).
- Iwanaga, S. (2011). How the envisioned characteristics of the community school changed during the decentralization reform process. *Bulletin of the Japan Educational Administration Society*, 37, 38-54. (Japanese).
- Masschelein, J., & Simons, M. (2010). The hatred of public schooling: The school as the mark of democracy. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 42(5-6), 666-682.
- Melaville, A. (1998). *Learning together: The developing field of school-community initiatives*. Charles Stewart Mott Foundation.
- Nakano, A. (2023). *Gakko wo Chushin toshita Kyoiku no Togosei wo "Shuenbu" no Konzaisei kara Toraenaosu (Reconsidering the Integration of School and Centralized Education from the Mixed Nature of the "Periphery")* (Doctoral Dissertation, Graduate School of Education, University of Tokyo) (Japanese).
- Nakata, K. (2010). A Study on "silent members" in school management committee: How the micro-social relationships affect school governance? *Journal of JASEA*, 52, 96-110. (Japanese).
- Ohno, Y. (1999). A study on developing school-business partnerships in America: Special analysis on theory of systematization for partnerships. *Journal of the Japan Society for Educational System and Organization*, 6, pp.148-161. (Japanese).
- Parveva, T., Horváth, A., Krémó, A., & Sigalas, E. (2020). *Equity in school education in Europe: Structures, policies and student performance*. Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency, European Commission.
- Rancière, J. (2005). *Fuwa aruiha Ryokai naki Ryokai (Disagreement: Politics and Philosophy)* (S. Matsuba, H. Omori, S. Fujie, Trans.). Inscript (Japanese). (Original work published 1995)
- Rawls, J. (2010). *Seigiron (A Theory of Justice)* (T. Kawamoto, S. Fukuma, Y. Kamishima, Trans.), Kinokuniya Shoten (Japanese) (Original work published 1999).
- Sanders, M. G. (2003). Community involvement in schools: From concept to practice. *Education and Urban Society*, 35(2), 161-180.
- Shibata, S. (2020). Gakko Kyoiku no Ninaito toshiteno Hogosha, Jumin (Parents and Residents as Bearers of School Education), In Ohmomo, T., & Seto, H. (eds.), *Nihongata Kokyoiku no Saikento (Reexamination of Japanese-style Public Education)*. Iwanami Shoten (Japanese).
- Skidmore, P. & Bound, K. (2008). *The everyday democracy index*. Demos.
- Spivak, C., G. (1998). *Subaltern ha Katarukotoga dekiruka (Can the Subaltern Speak?)* (T. Uemura, Trans.). Misuzu Shobo (Japanese). (Original work published 1985)
- Steiner-Khamsi, G. (2014). Cross-national policy borrowing: understanding reception and translation. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 34(2), 153-167.

- Suetomi, K. (2012). The alternatives of education finance: As a basis of compulsory education. *The Japanese Journal of Educational Research*, 79(2), 156-169. (Japanese).
- Valli, L., Stefanski, A., & Jacobson, R. (2016). Typologizing school-community partnerships: A framework for analysis and action. *Urban Education*, 51, 7, 719-747.
- Walker, J. D., & Hackmann, D. G. (1999). Full-service schools: Forming alliances to meet the needs of students and families. *NASSP Bulletin*, 83(611), 28-37.