MATURATION AND PERSONHOOD

IN

WELLINGTON, NEW ZEALAND

AND

SHIZUOKA, JAPAN

By

Judith Helen Theng

A thesis
submitted to the Victoria University of Wellington
in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in Anthropology

Victoria University of Wellington
2008

ABSTRACT

This thesis is a comparative study of maturation and personhood in two modern societies: Wellington, New Zealand and Shizuoka, Japan. It examines the interrelations between cultural and ideological constraints and pragmatic choice in the maturation of young people. It explores how concepts of personhood and 'becoming a person' affect the decisions and choices made by young people of senior high school age and upward as they negotiate transitions toward fuller social personhood. It demonstrates how modernity carries different implications for young people in Wellington and Shizuoka despite large areas of commonality. In terms of the current debate concerning the nature of modernity, it is supportive of multiple modernities.

The thesis argues that 'becoming adult' is central to young people's maturation in Wellington whereas in Shizuoka maturation involves sequential transitions through time. The different perceptions of 'adulthood' in Wellington and of transitional change in Shizuoka are analysed in relation to a number of themes. These themes include ideas of the self/person, the significance of gender, concepts of independence, and relations between self and others; the importance of school, part-time work, tertiary education, employment and careers; and orientations toward the family, leaving home, marriage and the future.

The thesis argues that the distinctiveness of each society may be found at the interface between sociocultural knowledge of what makes a person and the construction of self. It suggests that the direction of transformations in each society results from choices and decisions that attempt to reconcile socoiocultural ideals and personal desires. This approach is one that leads to a better appreciation of fundamental differences between modern societies.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 3

QUALITIES ASSOCIATED WITH MATURATION

AND PERSONHOOD   76

CHAPTER 6
CONCLUSIONS

TABLES

APPENDICES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This thesis is based on research among young people and their parents of European (mainly British) descent in the greater Wellington region of New Zealand, and on young people and their parents in the city and prefecture of Shizuoka, Japan.

The thesis examines the sociocultural frameworks of personhood within which young people in Wellington and Shizuoka construct their lives. It explores interrelations between cultural constraints and pragmatic choice in the maturation of young people. It considers how concepts of personhood and 'becoming a person' affect decisions and choices made by parents and young people of senior high school age and upward as they negotiate transitions toward fuller social personhood. And it demonstrates how modernity carries different implications for young people in Wellington and Shizuoka despite large areas of commonality.

The focus and design of the thesis and the choice of sample groups from Wellington and Shizuoka for a comparative study had their own evolution (see also Methodology). Initially I planned to study concepts of self and transitions to adulthood among young people in Wellington. The proposed study included my analysing and extending a body of research interviews with high school students and parents already assembled by a team of anthropologists at Victoria University of Wellington in connection with the FRST-funded Youth and Family Project (YFP).[1] As I began work on the thesis, however, my husband was awarded a ten-month science fellowship at the Prefectural University of Shizuoka, Japan. The opportunity therefore opened for me to extend my research to include fieldwork in Shizuoka toward a comparative perspective.

Since the YFP research suggested a firm relationship between concepts of 'adulthood', 'maturity', 'responsibility' and 'independence', I intended researching these themes in Shizuoka. At the outset of my work in Shizuoka, however, and in contrast to the situation in Wellington, I was told that young people and their parents were unconcerned with and

---

[1] The Foundation for Research in Science and Technology (FRST) is a New Zealand government organisation that funded research conducted by the Youth and Family Project in the Anthropology Department at Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand between 1994 and 1998. This project was designed to consider growing up and intergenerational relations in four ethnic communities in Wellington. See Appendix 2.

uninterested in 'adulthood'. I went on to discover that these attitudes prevailed despite the existence of an 'Adult Day' for those turning twenty, and even though young people appeared to exhibit similar traits of maturity and responsibility associated in Wellington with being adult. My interest shifted to a new set of questions. How did young people and their parents in Wellington perceive adulthood, and what did it imply about being a person? What did personhood imply in Shizuoka? Did structural attributes of industrial society in Shizuoka and Wellington create similar social boundaries? Did young people in each society anticipate similar lives? An attempt to answer these and related questions changed the focus of my research from adulthood to broader issues of maturation and personhood in modern society.

In his book 'Modernity and Self Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age' Anthony Giddens (1991:52-54; 88) proposes that the self in modern society is a 'reflexive project' whereby the individual self-consciously and routinely creates his or her self-identity. This activity is said to involve the continuous re-ordering of self-narratives as biography across time and space. Giddens (1991 passim; see also Beck 1992; Bauman 2000) argues that, in the late modern age, the nature or form of the self reflects a situation wherein social attributes once relevant to a person's identity such as those associated with lineage, gender and social status are free-floating rather than fixed. Accordingly, a self is no longer anchored in relatively stable external social criteria but contends with day-to-day activities through internally self-referenced criteria. The result is an independent and autonomous forging of self-identity during which daily decisions weighing up opportunity and risk become decisions about how to act and who to be. In linking self and identity to 'the capacity *to keep a particular [biographical] narrative going'* (original italics), Giddens (1991:54; 83-84; 87-88; 225-226) further proposes that an authentic self is socially integrated with other people through 'pure' (socially unanchored) relationships in a socially and economically mobile world wherein events are mediated on a global scale. Significantly, however, Giddens notes that the construction of self requires a 'cognitive component of personhood':

> To be a person is not just to be a reflexive actor, but to have a concept of a person (as applied both to self and others). What a 'person' is understood to be certainly varies across cultures, although there are elements of such a notion that are common to all cultures. (Giddens 1991:53)

The necessary link argued for by Giddens between the construction of self and a 'cognitive component of personhood' is central to the theme of this thesis since, rather than offering an analysis of personhood *per se*, the thesis explores the relationship between concepts of personhood and ways in which young people in two modern societies structure their lives. Further, as links between sociocultural concepts of personhood and the choices and decisions people make reveal the distinctiveness of each society, the thesis ultimately provides an understanding of how the lives of young people in each society differ, and of how, through their choices, people differently reconstruct their societies.

On three counts, however, Giddens' analysis of self-identity in the modern age does not fit easily with my research. Taken together, these areas indicate conceptual inadequacies regarding Giddens' notion of modernity. Firstly, in his discussion of self and personhood Giddens (1991:80) constructs an existential universe which he equates with modern life, contrasting it with 'traditional' societies where lineage and gender attributes resulted in a relatively fixed nature of personhood, limiting choices that determined who a person might become. The 'modern versus traditional' element of Giddens' paradigm immediately and erroneously renders as 'non-modern' significant gender and status differentials associated with concepts of personhood in modern Japan. Although the 'existential' nature of society outlined by Giddens does not accord with Shizuokan society, it does accord with aspects of society familiar to young people and their parents of British/European descent in Wellington. In cross-cultural terms, therefore, the self-identity Giddens describes in relation to an existential universe might be more accurately and more usefully labelled 'modern Western', allowing for the possibility that other characterizations of self and identity exist in the modern world.

Secondly, and on the other hand, theoretical depictions of self-narratives that Giddens outlines with reference to an 'existential terrain' convey the idea that constructions of self and personhood in modern society lack definitional or constraining (directional) purpose. In both Wellington and Shizuoka, however, self-narratives are constructed with reference to socioculturally recognised frameworks that constrain and partially direct young people's maturation into full personhood.

Thirdly, Giddens (1991:74-75) equates the aspect of choice in day-to-day modern life with the 'free-floating' nature of modern existence. He argues that, since in all cultures individuality and the individual have been cultivated to some degree, the link between

choice and an individual's search for self-identity is less relevant in characterising the modern (Western) self. As Lukes (1985:298-299) rightly points out, however, an individualist mode of thought is distinctive of modern Western cultures, enabling the individual to choose or invent conceptions of the good and to distance himself from roles and actions over which he may consequently exercise choice as an autonomous agent. Lukes associates this mode of thought with men only, yet, as will be seen, the individualist mode of thought is fundamental to the self-identity of young men and women and their parents in Wellington. Lukes contrasts the individualist mode of thought with that of individuals who are culturally identified largely through roles and social positions which carry associations of virtue and the good, arguing that, as these associations are internalised, they operate within an accepted social framework. In such societies, according to Lukes, ends and means are arrived at more through 'knowledge and discovery' than through choice. In terms of my own research, the contrast Lukes draws here is too absolute. While my research illustrates that an individualist mode of thought is characteristic of Wellington society, and that individualism[2] is not a salient value in Shizuoka, and while certain values in Shizuokan society are clearly mediated through roles and social position, my research also shows that agency and choice are significant aspects of the lives of young people and their parents in modern Shizuoka.

'Modern' and 'modernity' have no fixed meaning but, in terms of their ideological content, meanings of modern/modernity derive from the Western world and imply a consumerist and civil society identified with forward movement, progress and improvement, especially through science and technology. Since disparate sociocultural elements between Wellington and Shizuoka societies do not negate the modernity of either society, my research supports concepts of alternative renderings (Hubinger 1997) and constructions of modernity (e.g. Dore 1973,1987; Yang 1994; Weller 1999; Eisenstadt 2000). That is, I take Giddens' and other similar representations as being only one possible model of modernity. Recently, Kahn (2001) has challenged the idea of multiple modernities which, he argues, occur when non-Western societies are measured against Western precepts of modernity and found wanting. Kahn (2001:657) names the classical Western narrative and yardstick of modernisation as 'a universal trajectory of individual emancipation and constantly evolving rational mastery', yet he disputes that these components of

---

[2] As Béteille (1986:122) writes: 'When we say that individualism is a value in a given society we mean that its people hold the individual to be as important as, or more important than, clan, caste, estate, race or nation, and that they act in ways which enable us to infer that they assign him such significance.'

modernisation were ever a single movement among Europeans. He suggests that autonomy and rational mastery were ever in conflict, that this conflict defines modernity, and is everywhere represented today as globalisation (rationalisation) versus expressive meaning (cultural autonomy). Kahn therefore offers a universalising principle of modernity which however lacks ethnographic grounding and, in that Kahn fails to distinguish between individual and cultural autonomy, retains a Western bias toward individual emancipation/autonomy as a marker of modernity.

In this thesis, by contextualising personhood in two modern societies, concepts of autonomy and alternative perceptions of self/person and choice are thrown into relief. These and other related issues are illustrative of alternate forms of modernity and their impact on and significance for young people and their parents. I argue that, in Wellington, personhood can be usefully explored through ideas of 'becoming an adult', which provide a framework within which sociocultural values and constraints are articulated. Adulthood is considered achievable by the early twenties and is understood to involve the acquisition of maturity, life-experience, self-responsibility and autonomous independence. On the other hand, I argue that 'adulthood' is not elaborated in Shizuoka as in Wellington. To be 'adult' at twenty in Shizuoka signifies little more than having attained a legal age. The evolution of personhood in Shizuoka involves sequential transitions, which include marriage and having children, and the acquisition of knowledge and practice of social values toward becoming a full part of a social whole in middle life. Growth of the self toward full personhood implies outward development from a family-based identity, and practical acknowledgement of social roles that are hierarchised according to attributes of gender, position and seniority.

Throughout the thesis, I refer to the Wellington sample group as representative of 'Wellington' for comparative purposes. New Zealanders of British/European descent do not, however, reflect the whole of Wellington society, which includes immigrants and their descendents from other ethnic backgrounds, and Maori. Although the YFP project included interviews with a wider population,[3] an analysis of the entire body of available

---

[3] YFP schedules devised for students and parents of British/European descent were built out of earlier YFP research that focussed on immigrant Greek and immigrant Indian New Zealand populations, and Maori. Maori are descendents of the first settlers to New Zealand who arrived from Polynesia between 700 and 1,000 years ago. According to the 2001 New Zealand Census, 80% of New Zealand's population were European, 14.7% Maori, 6.5% Pacific peoples, 6.6 Asian, and 0.7% other (*New Zealand Official Year Book* 2006:102).

research material was beyond the scope of this thesis. The decision to focus on British/European interviews reflects the fact that, although New Zealand is officially a bi-cultural nation, the dominant cultural orientation is British/European in origin. Also in New Zealand, as in Britain, associations made between increased industrial wealth, nationhood and egalitarian democracy are seen as mutually affirming and desirable progressions. Bi/multi-cultural dimensions of life in New Zealand nevertheless challenge notions of a modernity perceived solely in terms of British/European cultural experiences. Similarly, this Wellington/Shizuoka comparison is indicative of the strength of cultural variation in the creation of alternative modernities.

1.1. DEFINING 'CULTURE'

Underlying this thesis is the anthropological view that, since there is no universal language, cultural distinctions reflect different elaborations of aspects of human-ness. Knowledge of other cultures and comparisons of cultures can therefore expand an appreciation of human possibilities and reveal local biases.

When discussing the concept of culture Clifford Geertz (1975:49) writes:

> There is no such thing as a human nature independent of culture… We are… incomplete or unfinished animals who complete or finish ourselves through culture—and not through culture in general but through highly particular forms of it.

By 'culture' Geertz refers to the symbolic systems required for people to function in any one society. These systems concern people's ideas, values, acts, and emotions. Most anthropologists would accept that 'culture' implies the knowledge necessary for a person to be a competent member of society, and that these cultural aspects are learned and change through time (see e.g. Keesing and Strathern 1998:16; McCurdy, Spradley and Shandy 2005:5). In recent years, postmodernist thought has undermined any easy equation between 'a shared culture' and 'the way of life of a people'. Ideas of the homogeneity of 'a people' are problematised by phenomena such as global influences crossing cultural boundaries, and by internal diversity arising from variations in ethnicity or religious beliefs and differences of power, class and status etc.. As Rosaldo (1993:217) says: '[T]he notion of an authentic culture as an autonomous internally coherent universe no longer seems tenable…'. There are nevertheless a number of factors within any one modern society that create a deep sense of unity. These are, fundamentally, a common language, a shared outlook achieved through state-controlled education, and shared orientations and attitudes that mediate social relations, roles and organisations. Within a modern nation state, the

imagined community (Anderson 1991; Hobsbawm and Ranger eds. 1983) is also held together through common law and notions of citizenship, as discussed further below (Chapter 1.4). These cultural factors are implicit in references to the societies of Wellington and Shizuoka.

My focus on the perceptions, attitudes, values and future anticipations surrounding personhood in Wellington and Shizuoka builds on Goodenough's (1961, quoted in Keesing and Keesing 1971:21) idea that 'culture' implies 'standards for deciding what is, …for deciding what can be, …for deciding how one feels about it, …for deciding what to do about it, and… for deciding how to go about doing it'. While this position postulates 'conceptual designs' and 'standards' as a base for the way people live and make decisions, it does not preclude diversity or change within any one society.

1.2. CONCEPTS OF 'SELF' AND 'PERSON'

Any attempt to comprehend maturation toward personhood among young people in Wellington and Shizuoka requires an appreciation of concepts of 'self' and 'person' in both societies. There is, however, little anthropological literature on personhood in New Zealand (a lack that this thesis will help to redress). As European New Zealand is a Western society, however, it is appropriate to annotate anthropological contributions across time to establish points of difference in concepts and attitudes in the West and Japan as a background reference for ethnographic material presented in subsequent chapters. Anthropologists such as Sökefeld (1999:427-428; also La Fontaine 1985:124-126) indicate how the terms 'self', 'person' and 'individual', which derive from Western discourse, are poorly distinguished even in Western usage, as distinctions between these terms are difficult to maintain. It is in a general sense, therefore, that I attempt to locate and clarify cross-cultural differences in perceptions and understandings of the self/person.

1.2.1. Western perceptions of 'self'/'person'

In his influential 1938 essay on the concept of the person, Marcel Mauss (1979:59, 74) argues that 'the idea of the 'person', the idea of the 'self' (*moi*)' are very recent concepts with a particular and traceable historical evolution. In speaking of the concept of a 'self', Mauss (1979:61) refers not to the 'sense of the 'self'' (a person's sense of his/her body and mental and physical individuality), which he believes human beings have been aware of

for all time, but to the 'idea of the "person" as a category' of the human mind,[4] for which he distinguishes three successive forms.

Using ethnographic data from studies of Indian tribes in North and Central America and of Australian aboriginal tribes, Mauss develops the first concept of the person, the *personnage*, or the notion of the role (see translator's note in Mauss 1979:viii). According to this concept, persons are classified in terms of relationships through designated roles depicting relative age and rank that symbolise, each as a part and in its relative position, the totality of a clan or tribe (Mauss 1979:65). With this notion of the person (the *personnage*) a person is fused with the clan but detached by named roles, where rights attached to the roles are inherited (Mauss 1979:66). A *personnage* is likened to an actor who plays out allotted parts in a social drama (Mauss 1979:73).

Mauss describes the evolution of a second concept of the person (the *persona*) as a development in Latin civilisation that eventually led to the modern individual person. The chief significance of the *persona* is the designation in a person of a 'self', the 'I-construction' of individual consciousness (Mauss 1979:75-76), that Mauss claims had also been separately invented, but subsequently lost, in Brahmanic and Buddhist India and in ancient China. The Latin *persona* was a legal development when, through revolution, all free men of Rome became Roman citizens and acquired a civil *persona* (Mauss 1979:80). That is, the personal character of law emerged, and personhood as *persona* became synonymous with the 'true nature' of an individual (Mauss 1979:81).

Finally, Mauss arrives at the contemporary concept of the 'person' (*personne*), which evolved through a number of transformations and accretions to the *persona* through time. As elaborated by Mauss, these include moral enrichment via the Greeks during the Graeco-Roman period that implanted 'a sense of a conscious, independent, autonomous, free, responsible being' into the *persona* (Mauss 1979:84). Further, a metaphysical and moral evolution occurred via Christianity when Jews, Greeks, slaves, freemen, males and females were all deemed 'one in Christ'. This precept established the idea of oneness in relation to God, but also in the human person in terms of 'substance and mode, body and soul, consciousness and action' (Mauss 1979:85-86). A rational element followed through Renaissance theologians and philosophers who established the idea of

---

[4] Mauss defines his subject as social history and distinguishes it from linguistics and psychology.

consciousness/conscience as a category (Mauss 1979:87). And a psychological transformation came via Kant and Fichte who established the indivisible '"self" or ego' as the basic category of individual freedom and conscience (Mauss 1979:89). The point Mauss is keen to establish is that whereas today, through modern (Western) notions of 'person' and 'self', it might appear natural (to Westerners) to assume that the 'heart' of a person's consciousness and morality lies within the individual person, such assumptions represent 'a naïve view of history' (Mauss 1979:59). It can be added that, given the historical development of the modern Western notion of the person, it would be naïve to suppose that the same sense of an individual self would develop in other cultural areas.

I note here that some anthropologists have disagreed with the way Mauss has characterised the person. Among them, Carrithers (1985:249) argues that the self and person are separate entities which are nevertheless in dialogue one with the other and able to influence one another. According to Carrithers (1985:235-236), 'self' (*moi*) concerns the individual as a moral agent of a natural or spiritual cosmos, while 'person' (*personne*) concerns the individual as a member of a collectivity, or of society as a whole. Each concept is argued to have its separate history and relative autonomy and hence, according to Carrithers (1985:237), the ascendence of 'person' over 'self', as Mauss describes, is not historically guaranteed, even in the West.

Wellington informants conceive of personhood in connection with an individual autonomous self which, by virtue of being a citizen of a state, is also endowed with egalitarian rights and responsibilities. Notionally, theirs is the position described by Dumont (1980:263):

> In the modern Western world not only are citizens free and equal before the law, but a transition develops, at least in popular mentality, from the moral principle of equality to the belief in the basic identity of all men, because they are no longer taken as samples of culture, a society or a social group, but as individuals existing in and for themselves.

Dumont (1977;1986) expanded on ideas presented by Mauss in terms of politics and economics. He presented the Western self as transforming 'in a philosophical shift from other-worldly metaphysics to this-worldly immanence, from holism to individualism' (Celtel 2005:179). Dumont's characterization of the Western self by 'individualism' ('the individual is a paramount value') developed in contradistinction to his representation of social organization in India as 'holism' ('the paramount value lies in society as a whole')

(Dumont 1980:4). In like fashion, and also in contradistinction to orientations in non-Western societies, Geertz depicted the Western concept of the self as autonomous individualism:

> The Western conception of the person… [is that of] a bounded, unique, more or less integrated motivational and cognitive universe, a dynamic centre of awareness, emotion, judgement and action organised into a distinctive whole and set contrastively against such wholes and against its social and natural background (Geertz 1983:59).

As Spiro (1993:115-116) notes, from these and other subsequent studies, a patterned representation of the Western self has emerged:

> [T]hese authors are not unanimous in their formulations; nevertheless, they do seem to agree that whereas the Western self and/or its cultural conception is characterised by self-other differentiation, personal individuation, and autonomy, the non-Western self and/or its cultural conception is not differentiated, individuated, or autonomous, or not, at any rate, like anything approaching the same degree. Rather, the key characteristics of the non-Western self are interdependence, dependence, and fluid boundaries. (Spiro 1993:116)

Spiro is one of a number of anthropologists (see Sökefeld 1999:418 fn.3; Kusserow 1999:210) who have recently questioned some unexamined assumptions in representations of an autonomous, individualistic Western self. While maintaining that differences between Western and non-Western characterisations of self certainly do exist, Spiro (1993:117,114-115) argues that the prevailing bipolar typology of the self is too limiting and, since some characteristics of each type are to be found in the other, that differences perceived as being exclusive to one or other type are 'wildly overdrawn'. Spiro (1993:117,136) further names, as one recurring problem in some analyses, a conflation of cultural conceptions of the person with the actors' conceptions of self, and/or the actors' mental representations of the self, or the self itself which, Spiro (1993:110, 136-141) argues, always differentiates its own self from other selves but is also always social. At the same time, Spiro (1993:141) concedes that the Western folk model of the self (as opposed to psychoanalytic or philosophical models) conceives of the self as autonomous and non-relational.

In identifying one problem associated with the individualism:centricism representation of a Western versus non-Western self, Sökefeld (1999:418-419) points to how 'others' in non-Western societies are too often given descriptive identities which lack selves:

> Anthropological characterisations of 'the other' are often inversions of European self-images…
> [B]y being denied a Western self, anthropologists' others [are] denied a self at all. (Sökefeld 1999:419)

Sökefeld conceives of the self as an individual self-consciousness or self-awareness, distinguishing this aspect of self from the identity of 'an individual'. When stripped of the voluntarism associated with the Western self, argues Sökefeld (1999:429-430), the individual self-consciousness is recognisable as that definitional aspect of human-ness able to reflexively monitor 'the conditions, course and outcome of action'. This self-conscious aspect of self is locatable in a person's motivations, aims and struggles and is arguably (Fuchs, in Comments on Sökefeld's article 1999:433) thought by Sökefeld to be detached from cultural concepts of the self. The self-conscious aspect of self is considered able to manage the self's identity/ies and restructure the meaning of the self's distinction from others yet, since in its agency social and cultural constraints need to be taken into account, the self-conscious aspect of self is not autonomous (Sökefeld 1999:424,426). When anthropologists overlook this aspect of self, the identities they ascribe to 'others' are reduced to mere products of their culture. Sökefeld (1999:429) proposes that in societies where identities are multiple or 'floating', the self-conscious reflexive self is also a relatively stable point from which to observe the flux. Like Spiro, Sökefeld (1999:431) accepts that the selves of all people of the world are not essentially the same or similar yet argues that an individualism:centricism dichotomy between Western and 'other' selves makes people appear more dissimilar than they really are.

Lindholm (1997:405), whose ideas of the self partly resemble those of Sökefeld, takes issue with an independent American: interdependent Asian dichotomy by which Western selves resemble Geertz's concept of the self while Japanese 'have selves that are merged into a shared communal identity'. Such views, according to Lindholm (1997:405-409), are derived from ethnographic representations highlighting an opposition between independence in the West and the cultural significance of conformity and social obligation in Japan. These representations have led to *a priori* assertions that 'unlike the Western self, the Japanese self… is public, shaped by others, fluid, and flexibly adaptive to the requirements of the community', thus blurring distinctions between the self as a concept and self as an agent. Lindholm (1997:415) concludes that both American and Asian selves are more complex and more alike than a simple independent:interdependent distinction allows, and that in both American and Asian selves an agentic relation exists between an

'inner autonomy' and the indigenous social structure and values associated with cultural patterns of authority and subordination.

In addition to concerns with the nature of the self, the representation of a Western self as autonomous and individualistic is deemed inadequate by a number of scholars who debate its validity from different perspectives. Gilligan (1982), for example, proposes that, in the United States, autonomous independence is a masculine ideal derived from a man's need for competition in a hierarchised world of work. She contrasts the masculine ideal with an alternative ideal based on women's empathetic, nurturing and caring relations with others. In analysing the theories of Gilligan and other well-known feminists (Ortner, Chodorow and Daly), Morris (1994:169-191) points out that many feminist critiques of classical concepts of 'person' or 'psyche' have argued that, by treating 'reason' and 'person' as essentially gender neutral concepts, many male philosophers and social scientists have conflated 'reason' and 'person' with the gendered interests and perspectives of men. Much social theory on 'person' and 'self' is therefore said by feminists to ignore central concerns of human life, such as childbearing, that are associated with women. Morris suggests, however, that having criticised the Cartesian dualistic paradigm for gender bias, in their advocacy of the 'person' as gender specific, some feminists propose alternative theories that also conflate the concept of person or psyche with a specific (female) gender.

Criticism of representations of a Western self as autonomous and individualistic have also focussed on the multi-layered and often contradictory modes of individualism that a self is assumed to encompass (e.g. Bellah et al.1985; Kusserow 1999). Other criticisms have highlighted the inter-personal commitments associated with holistic perceptions of the human person that have accompanied a move from emancipatory politics (Marxism, liberalism, conservatism) to 'life politics' and which oppose the ideal of independence (Riches 2000).

1.2.2. The partible and dividual person

In a number of anthropological studies (e.g. Marriott 1976; Marriott and Inden 1977; Strathern 1988) Mauss's notion of the relational world of *personnage* is further developed and referred to by the terms 'partible person' and 'dividual person' (as opposed to 'individual'). These terms denote a person who is conceived of as a part of a whole social world, but whose identity is divided into parts that are in relational correspondence with 'dividual' parts of others. That is, such persons are not singularised and conceived of as

individuals who take on roles in relation to others. In India, for instance, a person is thought to be composed of morally encoded substances that determine not only who a person is but also the way s/he acts. These substances carry the rights, duties and obligations associated with social roles, and in social transactions these substances are constantly exchanged (Marriott and Inden 1977:232). Similarly, in Melanesia, persons are born with encoded rights and obligations and, as Strathern (1988:321) points out: 'Children are not born as natural asocial beings… [S]ocial relations are not constructed after the event, so to speak, through posterior socialization.' For this reason, Strathern (1988:268-271) argues that the individual Melanesian subject, who is present in all relationships, takes a shape that differs from one created by the twentieth century Western imagination, where the self is placed at the centre of relationships as 'an agent, a subject, the author of thought and action'. In the Melanesian case, the person is always imagined as one of a pair of several contrasting modes—male and female, same-sex and cross-sex. Moreover, as the object of regard by others, persons objectify their relationships. The outcomes of a person's acts are always thought to originate in and thus belong to (are indebted to) these relationships. Further, a person's acts should reveal as their cause the demands of others. Thus a person's acts appear to be circumscribed yet, as no one else can act for a person, at the point of taking action, an agent exercises his or her subjectivity (Strathern 1988:338-339).

Concepts of the dividual or partible person were developed when the concept of *personnage* proved inadequate to an understanding of the person in India or Melanesia. Strathern (1988:269-271), for instance, shows that when assuming that all persons conceive of a centre for the self, and when assuming that the Melanesian person is a role-playing ego, the Western imagination falsely concludes that at the centre of a Melanesian person is an empty space, and that Melanesians are unaware of themselves. Concepts of the dividual and partible person also arose in an attempt to clarify that, in India and Melanesia, Western notions of 'society' and the 'individual' do not exist. In Western terms the 'social' (which is reified to 'society') is a collective involving communication between separate autonomous persons as individuals.

1.2.3. Concepts of 'self'/'person' in Japan

In discourse concerning a Japanese concept of 'self' and 'person' there are references to a 'relational self' which evokes certain aspects of the *personnage* and of the partible person,

although the relational self cannot be directly equated with either. Debates over the nature of Japanese personhood discuss roles as well as relational identities. Also at issue is the problem that the notion of an autonomous individual is peculiar to the West. It is nevertheless understood that in Japan, as in the West, there are complex concepts of personhood with a long, accumulative history. In Japan the historical assimilation and syntheses of Confucian and Buddhist thought, and Western influences through the past century, all play their part. In debates over the concept of the person in Japan, however, there have been undercurrents of a view that has occurred more generally in anthropological literature that Ortner (1995:369-370) has described as 'too simple' and 'dangerous'. Ortner refers to the way the relationalism/individualism opposition has been 'embedded in the powerful modernization narrative: traditional people are relational, modern people are individualistic', pointing out that such a narrative denies a position of equality in a discourse of Otherness. As Ortner goes on to say, theoretical arguments have recently begun to examine individualism as an ideological rather than an ontological formation, a position I take in this thesis.

Concepts of the person in Japan have been developed subsequent to Ruth Benedict's (1989 [1946]: 43, 195-198, 219-220) depiction of social relations in Japan. Benedict portrays patterns of social hierarchy and the respect gained from maintaining one's 'proper place'. Life in Japan is presented as the fulfilment of duties in separate spheres of obligation according to which, in the light of whether these duties have or have not been met, a person is judged. The system described is that of an 'ethics of indebtedness' (Benedict 1989:103). Benedict concludes, however, that the Japanese have no integrated personality or character, and that their morality has no 'foundation' or 'soul' in the sense of a person's being able to think and act according to his or her inner perceptions of truth or conscience. Rather, the Japanese are said to be concerned with observing proprieties and living according to the expectation of others. Benedict's conclusions of the Japanese person and psyche are thus imbued with Western assumptions and misconceptions similar to those noted by Strathern in Melanesian analyses, which ascribe an empty space and lack of awareness to a person's 'centre'.

One challenge to Benedict's concepts follows a psychosocial approach propounded by Takeo Doi. Doi (1981; 1988) sets out the familiar and named dualities (inside:outside

etc.)[5] through which people in Japan relate to each other in formal and less formal ways and presents the achievement of an absence of self as a recognised virtue. However, Doi argues that people in Japan seek dependence in relationships. He develops a theory wherein the psychological foundation of a person's character is based on the concept of *amae* (the seeking of indulgence in relationships), associating this concept with the social obligations in relationships (*giri*) that follow from human feeling (*ninjo*), and also with verticality in social structures. For Doi, *amae* is linked to *ninjo*. He (1981:20) further hypothesises that the feeling of *amae* first manifests itself in the mother-child relationship and is universal, but whereas *amae* has been retained in relationships in Japan, in Western society it has been replaced by a respect for mutual independence. This aspect of his approach has been criticised by some Westerners (e.g. Dale 1986:123; Morris-Suzuki 1998:130) as presenting a Japanese ego that remains undeveloped, a tendency Doi (1981:119) himself has argued is a potential danger in *amae* based relationships.

Another line of debate picks up on the idea that in Japan a sense of personhood is located in relationships (dyadic and group) in contrast to being centrally located in the independent person as in the West. Where anthropologists (e.g. Befu 1989:39-66; Kondo 1992) have disputed that individuality or a sense of subjectivity is absent from the Japanese sense of personhood, they address the same problem of subjectivity dealt with by Strathern who maintains that, although a Melanesian person's acts originate in his or her relationships with others and need to reveal the demands of others as causal, at the point of taking action a person acts subjectively.

The issue of Japanese subjectivity has been approached from different perspectives by other anthropologists including Rohlen (1976) and Plath (1980, 1989). Writing in the 1970s, Rohlen (1976:125-143) argues that 'adulthood' (a term for which he says there is no easy Japanese equivalent) is primarily viewed by Japanese as 'a time of becoming, not being'. My research reveals a similar position arrived at through a different route. When compared with American attitudes, Rohlen suggests that, rather than conceiving of an adult life with a plateaued existence, a person in Japan considers him/herself situated within the flow of time that takes him/her through a process of socialisation to which is attached a spiritual dimension.[6] By following a 'way' or 'path' that requires empathy,

---

[5] See Chapter 2.2.3.

humility and receptivity to others, a person seeks self-improvement through roles and the fulfilment of duty and obligations with the aim of achieving in middle life the recognition of 'being human' and, in later life, of reaching a spiritual freedom 'based on the atrophy of the self'. In Rohlen's view, the focus at a personal level on the Japanese spiritual heritage is partially a reaction against industrial change and unattractive foreign values. Yet a psychological focus on self-discipline toward an internal fullness of spirit that denies a centred self suggests that, at the heart of Benedict's empty centre, lies a psychology of human perfectibility.

Plath's (1980, 1989) view on subjectivity derives from an analysis of Japanese concepts of personal maturity, based on a life-course study of twenty-three people. Plath (1980:219) commends Benedict's recognition that in Japan people need to practise self-discipline and self-respect in attending to claims of different circles of human attachment. Naming these pursuits 'the drama of sociability', Plath proposes that a person's character is shaped by developing a strong character that through time becomes more individuated. According to Plath (1989:70), individual life courses in Japan are based on 'a person steering himself along a path (arc), his actions shaped by those around him (circle), as he strives to realize an ideal of wholeness (sphere)'. 'Arcs' imply a loose attachment to roles, and a self-centering where goals and a long-range view organise career activity and personal directions. The 'circle' represents fellow travellers and is group-oriented yet also person-centred in that each person cultivates his or her capacities for relatedness with others. Since a person must also care for family members who have physically died but remain spiritually present, Plath notes that the self is measured against a long span of time. The 'sphere' implies a centering that comes from cultivation in, for instance, aesthetic or martial arts, or in religious, spiritual or psychological states of being. Plath essentially distinguishes a relational or field model of development from the West's entity or particle model. A personal subjectivity connected to goal orientations is introduced into what is otherwise Rohlen's long-range view where maturity is ascribed to a distant horizon. On this point it should be noted that Plath's concept of roles differs from both that of the *personnage* and the partible person in that career activity associated with industrial society allows for a role detachment not possible in small-scale agrarian society.

---

[6] Rohlen describes *ki* ('breath', 'spirit') and *kokoro* ('heart', 'sentiment', 'spirit') as terms derived from Confucian, Taoist and Buddhist thought that saturate daily life with implications about human perfectibility. See also Frager and Rohlen (1976). R.J. Smith (1985:56-57, 99, 103-104) makes a similar argument for *seishin* ('spirit', 'inner strength').

In other research concerning the notion of a self that lacks a Western-type essentialised centred self, the point at issue is not the group model *per se* but the nature of the 'self'. Ohnuki-Tierney (1993:100-101; 1987:22-25) suggests a self that is interdependent and relational with no independent abstract entity. In other words, what is proposed is the concept of a self with no solid 'self' and the concept of a person with no concrete sense of personhood. This concept arises from the necessity in Japan to alter the presentation of self according to oppositional dualities, such as inside:outside, informal:formal, and back:front. Terms for these oppositions are known to and recognised by all, and represent the different possible modes for each and every relationship according to who is present, and to factors of gender, age, status, and context.[7] Thus Rosenberger (1992:14-16) presents the relational Japanese self as being unanchored in a person but as existing in relationship with others, moving between formal and informal modes of expression where gender, age and status constantly alter the respective positions taken in interactive social exchange. People's interactions fuse more closely in the inside, informal modes and are distanced through the outside, formal modes, and none remains fixed. That is, at one moment one person might be addressed by a second person in an informal mode but, with a sudden change in context, will immediately be addressed by that same person in a distancing mode, with the expectation of similar instantaneous mode switches by the first person. The ability to register these switches and shifts and to respond accordingly is called *kejime*.[8] Subtle variation in the positioning of self is further modulated through selective use of grammatical structures in the language (Hendry 1993:52-58) where, moreover, terminology emphasising gender, age and status does not include the direct 'I-thou' idiom that mediates relationships in English.[9] This type of relational self is argued to have a number of consequences that contradict conclusions arrived at through Western modes of thought. Tobin (1992:24), for instance, elaborates how creative elements of formal, ceremonial and ritualistic aspects of life are valued as a source of pleasure rather than being negatively borne as unwanted constraints. Thus Japanese are said to be 'less likely than Americans' to perceive social conformity and group identification as weakness

---

[7] These dualities were detailed by Doi (1981; 1988) to redress non-Japanese perceptions of the nature of relationships in Japan. See thesis Chapter 2.2.3.

[8] *Kejime* is further discussed in Chapter 2.2.3.

[9] In an instructive paper on 'individual' and 'self' in Vietnam, Marr (2000:790) writes that the 1945 August revolution 'gave millions of ordinary Vietnamese a sense of personal empowerment in hundreds [of ways]', including the abandonment of traditional honorifics which, in the past, had prevented the formation of more egalitarian relationships.

or the betrayal of individuality. In another study, Kondo (1992:40-66) examines the multiple and particular contexts in which a confectioner pursues what appears to be a fragile and self-contradictory construction of self-identity, noting all the while that relations of formal hierarchy are matched by a sense of an informal equality ('us' as equals).

As one among scholars who regard the sociocentric:individualist comparative framework in Japanese-American studies conceptually inadequate, Shimizu (2000:195-211) argues that both individualist and sociocentric elements were present in the experiences of three Japanese adolescents. Shimizu distinguishes the ontological self, or self-awareness, from concepts of individual or sociocentric selves, arguing that ontological self-awareness transcends culturally constructed selves.

Concepts of self and individual identity also inform Mathews' (2000:12-16; see also Mathews 1996) delineation of a Japanese self which is argued to operate at three levels. A deepest 'taken for granted' level is said to function below the level of consciousness and includes language and social practices (Bourdieu's *habitus*). A middle 'it can't be helped' level includes legalised and customary practices beyond one's control, such as having to work and pay taxes. At a shallow level, however, selective choice might involve a person's selection of elements from global (foreign) sources that contribute to the surface shaping of the person. As examples, Mathews describes artists who have either assimilated foreign or rejected local musical, art or dance forms as part of their individual conscious identity. Adaptations at a shallow level are thought to have little overall effect on how people interrelate.

Cultural support for a 'relational self' includes an understanding in Japan that a person is always considered as being a part of the whole. The Japanese word for 'self' (*jibun*) literally means 'self part', implying that a person is 'a part of the larger whole that consists of groups and relationships' (Rosenberger 1992:4). It might therefore appear that a self that attains value as a part in multiple relationships which often, but by no means always, rest on principles of debt, obligation and expectation could perhaps be an equivalent to the notion of a partible or dividual person. Yet, while the Japanese model of a relational self might carry overtones at a surface level of the partible or dividual person, there is no real equivalence. Relationships in Japan exist in different contexts, at different levels, and in different intensities according to different precepts from those precepts that are responsible

for the idea of dividual and partible selves. For one thing, Hindu concepts of relational transacted substances and of transactionable impurities and pollution through marriage or food exchange (Dumont 1980:130-51) that are responsible for Marriott's (1976:111) concept of 'dividual' persons are not relevant to notions of relatedness in Japan.[10] Again, the particular Melanesian system of a gift exchange of inalienable things that defines interdependency in relationships (Strathern 1988:161-167)—for which the notion of a partible self was developed—is likewise not relevant in Japan. Furthermore, whereas in Hindu India or in small scale Melanesian societies a child is born with pre-existing and encoded substances that predetermine partibility in relationships, in Japan a child is born as though from the sphere of the divine world as a *tabula rasa*, unsullied by sin or pollution, and in need of being socially and ritually 'created' as a social human being (Lebra 1984:173; Hendry 1986:16-17). Concepts of birth from a divine world are of Japanese Buddhist origin. They were well established in mediaeval Japan and are culturally present in attitudes and social practices today (LaFleur 1992:33-43). There is no concept in Japan, therefore, of a self that is 'divisible'. That is, the concept of a person is not one of a self that has been or can be divided into parts, nor one that consists of transactionable parts. Rather, the concept in Japan of a 'relational self' belongs to a notion that, through participation in multiple relations, a person continuously creates and recreates his or her own sense of being through actions that are in accordance with sociocultural values and ideals.

1.3. NOTIONS OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

Doi's concepts (outlined above) of *amae* based, dependent relationships in Japan have led to ideas that Japan is a 'maternal' as opposed to a 'paternal' society (as in the West), endorsing the view that, in Japan, child development is mother focussed. Views of the maternal in the Japanese psyche are still debated. Aoki (1997:26-31), for instance, promotes equality in human relations yet acknowledges that Doi's identification of 'maternal desire' reveals and pinpoints 'the deep psychological layers of desire of the modern Japanese' (Aoki 1997:29). Aoki traces this tendency to Meiji imperial systems of social relationships. In another case, Ueno (1997: 281-288) argues that the influence of Confucianism and a different process of modernisation have, in Japan, resulted in and

---

[10] The idea of substance transaction noted by Marriott is connected to a caste society. In Tokugawa Japan caste-like classes were created but, with the exception of the outcaste *Eta* group who carried hereditary pollution, notions of pure:impure distinctions between classes did not exist. The Tokugawa class system began to disintegrate from the early eighteenth century with the emergence of capitalist mercantilism (Storry 1960:73-77; Thomas 1996:73).

perpetuated social patterns promoting a strong mother-son bond and the idea of the feminine as maternal. Ueno further connects these orientations to political and socioeconomic factors that radically polarise male and female roles in Japan, a situation that she would like to see change, arguing that while mothering is very important it is neither the necessary nor the only worthwhile function for all women.

In developmental studies comparing practices in Japan and the United States of America, Azuma (1986:7-8) attributes a strong mother-child bond in Japan to the historical tradition of a woman's move at marriage from her natal family to full membership in her husband's family, where the husband's role was peripheral as 'high status guest' (Vogel, in Befu 1986:14). Azuma further suggests that, in Japan, a child's relations of interdependence with the mother is a pattern that transfers to peers and later to the community whereas, in the United States, parents encourage a child's independence from an early age. Befu's (1986:14-15) view is that in Japan a father's structural isolation from his children arises from his position of authority. According to Befu, family structural alignments affect child development such that, in Japan, the mother and children are emotionally aligned whereas, in the United States, where ideally the conjugal relationship is defined by romantic love, the ideology encourages equal responsibility for the child in both mother and father. Yamamura (1986:34) notes, however, that where married couples in Japan have chosen their marriage partner and planned a family, children tend to identify more with both parents.

The contrast between a relational self in Japan and an autonomous individual self in the United States is further elaborated in developmental studies. Befu (1986:22-23), for instance, points to Japanese values of trust, obligation and social interconnectedness, differentiating them from highly individualised skills and qualities that are prioritised in the United States, such as independence, self-reliance, freedom, and free will. In Japan, where valued qualities carry moral weight, children are believed to be inherently good (Yamamura 1986:36). According to M.White and LeVine (1986:55-62), patience and *amae*-based indulgence are believed key to imparting desirable qualities, making a child '"human-like"… that is, able to maintain harmony in human relationships', while child socialisation aims to develop performance qualities that indicate the deeper ability to be a good (social) person. Being compliant, cooperative, spirited and energetic foster social abilities, while persistence and endurance foster personal and social development. These

qualities are contrasted with individualised skills in the United States that are described as 'more superficial, or as *means* rather than *ends*'. DeVos and Suarez-Orozco (1986:296-297) contrast a Japanese mother's empathetic appeal to her child with the American parent's assertion of will and authority, suggesting that the American mother and child often relate through a battle of wills. Yet ultimately, as Befu (1986:25-26) notes: 'How… conceptions of personhood are related to child development remains unclear. Somewhere along the road from childhood to maturity, the child acquires them… [and is] rewarded by accepting, internalising, and acting in accordance with them.'

An emphasis in Japan on the feminine as maternal and its social implications have bearing on the Shizuoka-Wellington comparative study in that they suggest a deep attitudinal divide between parents in Japan and those in Wellington. The implication that, in Japan, the mother's parenting role is essential and foremost contrasts with general perceptions in Wellington that both parents should have input in parenting their children. And, as will be seen, parents in Wellington generally accept, and indeed encourage, their children's becoming individuals through separating themselves from others in the construction of an independent adult self. Some scholars (e.g. Drewery and Bird 2004:11-20) link this pattern of development to (Western) psychological (biological and cognitive) 'stage' theories of adolescent development in which a young person's separation and independent maturity are thought to peak at adulthood.

1.4. PERSONHOOD, NATIONAL IDENTITY AND CITIZENSHIP

Approaches to national identity and citizenship, which in New Zealand and Japan differ considerably, also affect concepts of the person. It is appropriate in this introduction to background these distinctions as a reference for ethnographic data in the thesis.

1.4.1. Personhood, National Identity and Citizenship in New Zealand

In New Zealand there were no standardised or publicly disseminated notions of national identity as in Japan although two annual remembrance days celebrated events of national significance. Anzac Day honoured New Zealand and Australian armed forces' participation in World War I in support of Britain yet effectively marked New Zealand's spirit of independence from Britain. Waitangi Day celebrated the 1840 signing of a treaty for partnership between the English Crown (representing non-Maori in New Zealand) and Maori. Popular characterisations of ordinary New Zealanders were, however, reinforced

through the media. These included notions of rugged individualism, 'kiwi' innovation, 'can do' attitudes and an egalitarian ethic, all of which influenced young people's ideas of themselves as New Zealanders. Most of these concepts stemmed from an historically recent, pioneering colonial period where such traits aided survival yet they remained important indicators of how people should be.

Concepts of personhood in New Zealand were affected by and changed in relation to the politico-socio-economic consciousness of the times. European colonisation of New Zealand from the nineteenth century laid the foundations for a democratically elected parliamentary industrial state that remained economically and politically part of the British Empire, whose values and traditions reflected and built upon those of Britain. By the Constitution Act of 1852 the newly established New Zealand government, voted into office by male European franchise, assumed sovereignty for most internal decisions affecting the colony. In 1897 the franchise was extended to European women. New Zealand has been a self-governing British dominion since 1907 with ultimate sovereignty vested in the British Crown. Pertinent to this thesis, however, is a complex series of events from the late 1960s that abruptly, in the 1980s, transformed the nature of New Zealand society from a postwar social democratic welfare state system to a de-regulated libertarian minimalist state in which market forces reigned supreme (Jesson 1987; Kelsey 1995).

In New Zealand, a postwar social democratic consensus had reconciled collectivist principles of democracy with individualist principles of the market economy. This consensus was reliant on a social world where, in patriarchal families, men acted in the public sphere as providers and protectors of women, while women created a secure and stable home environment or endured low status and low remuneration in paid employment (Jesson et al.1988:26-28; Park ed.1991; Armstrong 1994:118-121). It was also reliant on 'an affirmation of links with Britain and some consciousness of being British, albeit in an antipodean context' (Spoonley, in Jesson et al.1988:86), and on the marginalisation of Maori lives and politics. In the 1970s, however, Britain's entry to the European Common Market eroded New Zealand's ties with Britain, while immigration from Pacific Islands, a re-energised Maori activism, and proactive feminist and gay rights movements progressively challenged values and attitudes associated with the social democratic consensus. Maori campaigns to reclaim their land, language and sovereignty introduced both ongoing legislation and debates over bi-culturalism, multi-culturalism, the nature of

the state, and the national identity of New Zealanders, which remain unresolved (Spoonley 1995:40-52; Pearson 2001:22-24,118-122,145-149). The feminist movement opened the way for legislation that secured for women career and work opportunities that were more equal to those of men, and that provided women with more choice through, for instance, abortion rights, although social inequalities persisted through the 'structured dependency' of women on men (James and Saville-Smith 1994:48-62; Pearson and Thorns 1983:184-189). And by 1986 homosexual relations had been legalized.

A failing economy in the early 1980s, however, brought a shift in power. Libertarians challenged and overturned a liberal democratic philosophy through an ideology advocating the supremacy of private property and the individual—notably the individual as consumer—along with associated attributes of self-sufficiency, choice, efficiency, and competitive free voluntary contract as individual freedom (Armstrong 1994:123-124). Through the sale of national assets, privatisation and restructuring, and the halving of numbers of core government service employees, welfare provisions that many New Zealanders had come to accept as 'individual rights' (Jesson et al.1988:7) were cut back or eliminated. Collective vested interests once protected through trade unionism and through the legally recognized category of 'women' in, for instance, the repealed Employment Equity Act (1990), were undermined through the Employment Contracts Act (1991) (Wilson 1998:223-228). As the worth of human relations became measured in terms of market values, unpaid voluntary work—including the domestic labour of motherhood—became marginalized and unattractive (Armstrong 1994:124-125). A market force philosophy affected all aspects of employment, including state service sectors such as health, education and scientific research, and permeated the media.

Whereas, in New Zealand, class was less clearly structured than in many other capitalist societies, class differences were also overlain by gender and ethnic differences as women and ethnic minority groups were generally less well able than European men to access resources (Pearson and Thorns 1983:257-258,178-189,204-219; see also James and Saville-Smith 1994; Park ed. 1991; Spoonley et al.1994:65-73). Social inequity, however, did not imply the absence of strong egalitarian ideas, which in New Zealand are based on beliefs in equal opportunity and social justice (Pearson and Thorns 1983:239,258-259). Nevertheless, as Wilkes (1994:79) indicates, libertarians ascribed the accumulation of individual wealth to individual talent and hard work and thus celebrated socioeconomic

distinctions. Critiques of a libertarian individualist 'consumer sovereignty', through which large sections of society were disenfranchised, advocated recognition of the collective nature of human lives and sought public provision of social services and the protection of civil and political rights of all citizens. Following the 1980s, the debated nature of the state and civil issues, together with libertarian doctrines, affected people's perceptions and orientations. Increasingly a New Zealand identity implied needing to have and maximize a free market choice.

1.4.2. Personhood, National Identity and Citizenship in Japan

In Japan, theories concerning what it means to 'be Japanese' (*Nihonjinron*) were developed to counter both Chinese influences during the agrarian period and Western influences during industrial modernisation. Both eras produced revisionist rejections of 'imported' philosophies as foreign. From Meiji times (1868-1912) until now, successive attempts to define and redefine the meaning of 'being Japanese' have been concerned with concepts and ideologies related to modernism.[11] During pre- and postwar years,[12] the dominant conservative party has framed and promoted concepts of 'Japaneseness' in contradistinction to the 'West' in support of the view that Japan is culturally unique and has modernised in ways that differ from the West.[13] These views, which are prevalent in Japanese school curricula, are well represented in media debates.

Compared with the individualising principles in 1980s New Zealand, *Nihonjinron* theorising of the 1970s was a general search for unifying principles of social organisation where cultural forms were emphasised over material determinism. Themes from the seventies included notions of Japanese cultural and social homogeneity, group harmony and consensus, and a natural order of hierarchy. Influential authors of that period include Takeo Doi (discussed above) and Chie Nakane (1970), known for her representations of

---

[11] Pre-World War II debates on modernism are discussed in Pyle (1989), Duus and Scheiner (1988), and Najita and Harootunian (1988). Postwar modernisation theories were a counter to Marxism (see Koschmann 1993:412-414; Gordon 1993:454). For a critical analysis of theories of Japan as a nation see Morris-Suzuki (1998).

[12] In this thesis, the terms 'prewar' and 'postwar' refer to World War II.

[13] Since the late nineteenth century, the terms 'West' and 'Westerners' have appeared in the literature as the comparative 'other' to 'Japan' and 'Japanese'. Today the 'West' is used with reference to the United States of America and Western Europe. When used by Japanese, the terms sometimes denote traits that many Japanese associate with Western civilisation and regard as un-Japanese, such as the privileging of rational thought and notions of autonomous independence. In New Zealand, 'Asia'/'Asian' are similar umbrella terms applied to persons from India, China, the Philippines, Indonesia, Japan etc. without distinction.

Japan as a vertical society. Nakane argues that Japanese social and business organisations are hierarchically modelled on the (then assumed) 'traditional' Japanese pattern of a patriarchal household or *ie*. She describes the structure as reliant on a group consciousness among social superiors and inferiors that provides a sense of emotional security, comparing it with contractual, egalitarian and lateral forms of social organisation in Western society.[14]

In Doi's and Nakane's 'group model' of Japanese society a person's identity can be achieved only through membership in a group. The model therefore opposes Western individualism and autonomy. According to Doi (1981:175): '"Freedom of the individual" does not mean that the individual is free in himself, as he is; freedom is only acquired through the fact of participation in [a] group.' Nakane (1970:120, 115) depicts group organisation as the 'brake which hinders the development of individual autonomy', further arguing that a person located in the organisational group system in Japan is provided with the feeling comparable to that of citizenship in Western societies, in that membership in a corporation implies the rights, duties and responsibilities adhering to citizenship in Western societies. More recently, Ueno (1996:220) has pointed out that through industrialisation the Meiji government endeavoured to free the household as the *ie* rather than create autonomous individuals, a concept either unfamiliar to or disliked by Japanese.

Nihonjinron thought has been criticised on a number of counts,[15] one being that claims for Japanese cultural uniqueness based on images of harmony and the denial of individuality, especially through the notion of group consensus, are constructed through comparisons with a generalised 'West'. Further, anthropologists disputing the group model argue against its implication that a person's relations with others subsumes all sense of the person's individuality. Befu (1989:39-66), for instance, uses social exchange theory to suggest that among Japanese a complementary relation exists between group relations and the self-interest of actors in aspects of reciprocity and exchange, while Kondo (1992) describes as 'self-construction' the management of self-contradictory and fragile identities. Among anthropologists who have approached the question of whether, in Japan, there

---

[14] Nakane's model of vertical group relations is based on analyses of large business corporations and universities, whose members number approximately one third of the population, rather than on small family or retail businesses, farmers, labourers and part-time workers.

[15] See for example Dale 1986; Sugimoto and Mouer 1989; Moeran 1990; and Morris Suzuki 1998. Stockwin (1998:16) condemned the work of Sugimoto, Mouer, and Dale for its 'exaggeration and conspiracy-theory construction…[that] marred some of this writing', a comment with which I agree.

might be a concept of 'an individual/individualism', however, none suggests any approximation to the notion of an autonomous individual.

On issues of whether industrialisation in Japan is encouraging the development of an individualist perspective, most anthropologists take a cautious view. Rosenberger (1992:13), for instance, questions modes of inquiry that ask whether, with the growth of industrial capitalism and a partial adoption of 'Western lifestyles', the Japanese are 'becoming individualistic in an American sense'. Instead she prefers to examine the shifts that occur as Western lifestyles and concepts of individuality are incorporated into Japanese ways. As another example, Moeran (1984) points out that Western individualism is generally associated by the Japanese with 'evils of Western capitalism', thought to foster selfishness, irresponsibility and general social insecurity. He identifies new Japanese associations between consumerism, *kokoro* ('heart', 'mind', 'spirit') and other-directed rather than self-directed feelings, linking Japanese industrial capitalism with values deemed positive, such as *seishin* ('spirit'). Moeran suggests that the Japanese are crafting an individual that for them lacks the negative connotations they associate with Western individualism.

Other anthropologists (see e.g. Mathews and B.White eds. 2004) debate whether attitudinal shifts in young people's values and choices might register historic rather than generational change. A diversification in young people's ideas of Japaneseness, for instance, is argued for by B.White (2004:47-63) on the basis of conceptually (though untested) liberal multi-ethnic views among young people in a Kyushu hamlet, and by Miller (2004:83-97) on the basis of blurred ethnic and gender identity markers in youth fashion. On another front, Sasagawa (2004:171-187) suggests that young university-educated and dedicated full-time mothers pursuing lives dictated by choice and self-fulfillment, rather than sacrifice, might be unable to reproduce lasting mother-child bonds based on a child's debt of gratitude to the mother. Other areas suggestive of pluralising values and potential change, as discussed in the thesis, include the appearance of a 'singles' culture, conflicting attitudes to work and marriage among young men and women, and altering attitudes to returnees. Conservative pressures are, however, strong (Ackermann 2004) and, as noted by Mathews and B.White (2004:193) 'choice both is and is not available' to young people. Mathews and B.White (2004:9,10,200) conclude, and I

agree, that questions as to whether young people are introducing historic change are ambivalent, speculative and unanswerable.

On another level, Japanese government policy identifying with and invoking an ideology of harmony and consensus in Japan has been criticised for obscuring regional diversity, such as exists between central Japan and Okinawa, and class diversity, since policies claiming the existence of national homogeneity and a 'middle mass' overlook differences in Japanese living standards and lifestyles.[16] Moreover, the ideology of harmony advocated by conservative governments is challenged by Japanese citizens who are socially marginalized, such as the Burakumin, and by the 1-2 percent of the population marginalised as 'non-Japanese', such as Ainu, foreign 'guest workers' providing cheap labour, foreign spouses of Japanese nationals, and people of Chinese and Korean descent.[17] These social discrepancies are politically charged in that, before the 1947 promulgation of the new postwar constitution (designed by SCAP[18] to democratise Japan), Japanese conservative politicians made amendments by which Japanese 'subjects' were renamed 'nationals' and granted natural human rights. By these amendments former subjects who were Ainu, or of Korean or Chinese descent, were excluded and became non-Japanese.[19]

The marginal position of non-Japanese 'outsiders' appears even more extreme when compared with more liberal policies in the West. In New Zealand and other Anglo-American societies, where the domains of kinship and citizenship are almost entirely separated, adult citizens are regarded by the state as autonomous persons who owe primary allegiance to the state *as* autonomous persons. In New Zealand a citizen requires only a birth certificate stating parents, a document that must be produced for a passport. Moreover, citizenship is frequently granted on the grounds of residence regardless of a

---

[16] Concepts of a 'middle mass' wrongly imply that Japan has a mass (90%) middle class (Taira 1993:181-3; Kelly 1993:195).

[17] The Ainu are a small percentage of the population and the Ainu language is on the verge of extinction. The Burakumin were at the time of the Meiji Restoration an 'untouchable' class whose rights were reinstated with the abolition of the class system in 1871, but against whom prejudice remains. In 1998 foreign nationals totalled around one and a half million, 42% of whom came from Korea and 18% from China. (Statistics from *Facts and Figures of Japan*, 2000:5,7) For marginality in Japan, see Valentine 1990.

[18] The Supreme Command of Allied Powers, in this case the public administration division of Government Section under General MacArthur.

[19] See Koseki 1998:119-122, 128-129. For an overview of 'unplaced persons', see Upham (1993).

person's place of origin. In New Zealand these attitudes are part of the British heritage. According to Fortes (1984:114), the practice of autonomous citizenship in England dates back to the thirteenth century where, by English law of civil status, 'the concept of the individual as an autonomous legal personality [is one] deriving citizenship not through family or kinship ties but in his own right'.

Citizenship in Japan is based on certain structures, of which household registration is one, emphasising a dual family and state allegiance. By law, citizens are organised into what are primarily kin-based households. Every Japanese national is officially entered into a household register (*koseki*), and only by such entry is a person considered a Japanese national.[20] The *koseki* must record all details pertaining to a person's household allegiance. Details recorded involve legitimacy and illegitimacy, adoption, divorce, household structure, and regional and, in some cases, racial origins. An abstract of part of a *koseki*, or of the entire *koseki*, or a certificate containing items from the *koseki*, is required before a person enters school, when seeking employment, getting married, obtaining a passport, or registering real estate. Original *koseki* documents are kept at the local administrative office of a household's permanent domicile,[21] while duplicates are deposited with the regional bureau of the Ministry of Justice.[22] The official scrutiny of Japanese nationals and—through procedures requiring non-nationals to register as 'aliens'—of non-Japanese, have led to charges that government policy protects and advocates concepts of national/racial purity. Where some *Nihonjinron* ('what it means to be Japanese') writing has associated Japanese cultural traits with exclusivity, critics argue that claims on behalf of Japanese cultural difference often blur into concepts of cultural uniqueness which, in some cases, express notions of cultural or racial superiority. Contemporary *Nihonjinron* writing incorporates theories of the 1970s into civilisation theories proposing Japanese society as a model for a new (Asian) world order.

---

[20] Since 1947, a household can be a married couple. These structures derive from Meiji times when the *ie* household was instituted nationwide and granted corporate legal responsibility for the action and security of its members. Although the new postwar constitution abolished the corporate household (*ie*) as a legal entity, many *ie* precepts remain widely operative in practice, while some remain in law (see, for example, Taira 1993:175-177).

[21] The named domicile might not be the same as actual places of residence, which are recorded in different documents (*jumin toroku*).

[22] Further information on the *koseki* system is appended (see Appendix 1).

1.5. SOURCES AND METHODOLOGY

At the time of my research in 2000-2001, the population of Shizuoka city, situated on the south coast of Honshu Island, numbered approximately 470,000, while the population of Shizuoka Prefecture was approximately 3,782,000 of a total population in Japan of 125 million. The population of the greater Wellington region at the southern tip of the North Island numbered 300,000 of a total population in New Zealand of 4 million. Diversity in attitudes analysed in the thesis, however, is less a matter of demographic variation than of differences in cultural perceptions and social organisation in modern industrial societies.

As explained above, the New Zealand part of this thesis builds on the YFP research carried out in the mid-1990s by a team of anthropologists in Wellington. The YFP material I used consisted solely of questionnaire responses and verbatim transcripts of taped interviews with 37 sixteen and seventeen year-old high school students, comprised of 17 male and 20 female students, and 35 parents of high school students, comprised of 16 male and 19 female respondents. Seventeen parents were interviewed on a one-to-one basis while nine interviews were with couples (married or *de facto*). The four high schools representing Wellington city and the greater Wellington region comprised Wellington (Boys') College, Wellington Girls' College, and the co-educational Wellington High and Wainuiomata College.

The YFP questionnaires were carried out in 1995-97, followed by the interviews in 1996-98, and these collectively sought insight into the daily lives of young people and their parents and their views of the world. The questionnaires focussed on demographic and other information, while the interview guides sought amplification of questionnaire feedback and, among other concerns, a better understanding of concepts and perceptions of adulthood. In these guides, questions that served to gauge concepts of independence, responsibility and maturity explored themes such as young people's and parents' attitudes to school, schoolwork, and part-time work outside school hours, and young people's use of space, time and money. Other themes were covered by questions on gender distinctions, what made a 'typical' family, interactions between family members, attitudes to legal age restrictions, and ideas of being and becoming an adult and of the future.[23]

Use of the YFP material entailed my signing an agreement to maintain the interviewees' confidentiality and anonymity. Almost all the YFP interviews I analysed were conducted

---

[23] YFP questionnaires and interview guides are appended (see Appendices 3-6).

by Louise Grenside, Jonathan Thomson and Gwyn Williams, whose willingness for me to access them I gratefully acknowledge. The analysis, however, is entirely my own. Aside from two papers available on the YFP website,[24] no papers based on the YFP research have been published. My analysis of the Wellington material, which is referenced to historical and social science literature, was supplemented by my own observations and understandings of cultural patterns and transitions in New Zealand, based on having lived in the Wellington area for over thirty years during which time my husband and I had raised a family. Further knowledge had been gained when, over an eleven year period, I tutored undergraduates at the university.

My research in Shizuoka and its subsequent analysis was carried out ahead of my analysis of the Wellington data, although the research aims and procedures I initially proposed for Shizuoka were designed to replicate the YFP research as far as possible.[25] The Human Ethics Committee at Victoria University approved in principle my proposal to approach Shizuoka schools for participation in my research, while details concerning research populations, methods of recruitment and such were to be established later in Japan (see below).

Before leaving for Shizuoka I commenced background anthropological reading on Japan (which I continued while in Shizuoka), and established contacts at the Prefectural University of Shizuoka that were followed up after arrival. In Shizuoka I shared an office with my husband and was incorporated by the environmental science staff and graduate student group into various social aspects of university life, including daily lunch sessions in the canteen during which I was encouraged to ask about puzzling aspects of my research. These and other informal contacts proved immeasurably valuable as sources of information. Neighbours with whom we had university connections eased our way into day-to-day apartment life and the local environment. We also participated in social events, attended rituals and festivals, were invited to meals in family homes, attended several conferences, and enjoyed short stays with two separate Japanese families in their homes, all of which permitted an outward flow in my research. An invitation to attend an adult

---

[24] http://www.vuw.ac.nz/yfp
Sawicka, Theresa and Urry, James 1997: *Young People, Marriage and the Attainment of Adulthood in Contemporary New Zealand.*
James Urry 1998: *Setting an Age for Adulthood.*

[25] For YFP procedures see Appendix 2.

English class for Japanese speakers by one neighbour provided me with several Japanese contacts, valued for their hospitality as well as the further contacts they provided with other English classes attended by Japanese parents and teachers who were willing to be interviewed. I also taught English language and conversation to a Chinese high school student resident in Japan for eight years, through whom contact was made to her family and a number of their Japanese friends.

The methodology I adopted in Shizuoka ultimately differed from that used in the Wellington YFP research. The YFP team had approached schools in order to identify and establish a research cohort. Through school visits, students were canvassed for ideas, and through questionnaires students and parents were asked to volunteer themselves for follow-up taped interviews. My inability to speak Japanese and conduct interviews in Japanese ruled out a similar approach. After some months, Professor Nakayama-Watanabe, who had kindly agreed to assist me in arranging contacts with schools, proposed an alternative method of accessing school communities through multichoice questionnaires to school students and their parents and additional questionnaires to teachers. With a focus on four schools in the Shizuoka region, she suggested that questionnaires could substitute for, yet parallel, the YFP interviews with students and parents associated with four schools in the Wellington region. I prepared separate questionnaires for students, parents and teachers that Professor Nakayama-Watanabe submitted for approval to the Shizuoka Board of Education (of which she was a member). Two Board members then interviewed me about my project. The Board selected four schools for me to request participation in my research, and these schools agreed to cooperate. This procedure also differed from that of the YFP team in Wellington whose research had not required government administrative mediation and sanctions. Two of schools selected for me to approach in Shizuoka were in Shizuoka city, namely, Shizuoka High School and Shizuoka Agricultural High School, and two were in the Prefectural rural town of Tenryu, namely, Futamata High School and Tenryu Forestry High School.[26] I arranged for the questionnaires to be translated into Japanese and readied them, while the schools arranged their distribution and collection in March 2001. The multi-choice design

---

[26] Shizuoka prefecture has three educational areas: Hamamatsu, Shizuoka and Izu. Each educational area is divided into districts. The high schools participating in this research belonged in the Shizuoka district. Shizuoka High School and Shizuoka Agricultural High School were in Shizuoka city, the sixth district of the Shizuoka area, while Futamata High School and Tenryu Forestry High School were in Tenryu, a town with a population of 24,000 that is in the rural areas, the seventh district of the Shizuoka area.

of the questionnaires enabled me to read off and table the results on my return to New Zealand. In total, I received responses from 148 seventeen-year-old students to over sixty questions, many with several parts; responses from 120 parents to over seventy questions; and responses from 60 teachers to approximately forty questions.[27]

I had taken with me to Shizuoka copies of the YFP school questionnaires and interview guides for high school students and parents. These, along with the questionnaire for teachers that I separately prepared, formed the basis of my Shizuoka school questionnaires, although I added to and modified the YFP content in various ways. To give a few examples, questions on family composition and parental roles were supplemented by questions probing the attitudes of men and women to the role of family, and to men's involvement in the household sphere of work and responsibilities. I also asked questions on the role of the first-born child, and questions concerning whether young people, and their parents on their behalf, considered it important to marry. In addition to information on parent and teacher roles, I sought out those values parents and teachers considered important for young people to learn. Other modifications asked young people to name important signs of, and difficult things associated with, being 'grown up', and qualities associated with being a man and a woman.[28]

My Shizuoka research also included some formal interviews that I conducted and taped with English-speaking Japanese school students, graduate students and parents, and informal interviews that I recorded in notebooks. The interview guide that I prepared for graduate students was also used for taped interviews conducted on my behalf by a Japanese graduate student with her friends that I later arranged to have translated into

---

[27] In April 2002 I prepared six loose-bound copies of the raw figures resulting from this survey in tabulated form, entitled *Results of Questionnaire survey in four schools in Shizuoka Prefecture, Japan, March 2001*. I have retained one copy. Five copies were sent to Professor Nakayama-Watanabe, one for her own use and one each for her to present to the four participating schools.

[28] Shizuoka school questionnaires for students, parents and teachers are appended (see Appendices 7-9).
 In a few cases questions from the following publications were used:
Andreoni, Helen and Fujimori, Kumie. 1998. "*Shitsuke*: Child-rearing values and practices in a Japanese
    community in Sydney." *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, Vol.19 (1).
Lebra, Takie Sugiyama. 1984. *Japanese Women. Constraint and Fulfillment.* Honolulu: University of
    Hawaii Press.
Cho, Lee-Jay and Yada, Moto (eds). 1994. *Tradition and Change in the Asian Family*. Honolulu: East-West
    Center, in cooperation with University Research Centre, Nihon University, Tokyo.

English. All these interviews were separate from and complemented data from the school surveys, as did material I accessed from the media.[29]

Intimations that some assumptions made by the YFP team in their Wellington research were inappropriate for research in Shizuoka schools came through reactions from the Shizuoka Board of Education to some questions in my proposed questionnaires. As with the YFP research, Shizuoka school questionnaires began by asking for basic profile information. The Shizuoka parent questionnaire, for example, included questions on parent occupations, education levels, nationality, and religion. As to religion, I adopted a tangential approach by asking, for instance, whether families had a Buddhist altar, or whether they celebrated *Obon* (the annual festival of the dead). Another question asked, from a list of suggested possibilities, for reasons a respondent might visit a local shrine. All these profile questions were disallowed by the Board of Education. Questions on parent occupations were said to introduce class issues and those on parent education levels would invade privacy.[30] Where nationality was concerned I was told that: 'In Japan it is better to assume that everyone is Japanese.' Questions on religion were disallowed since the teaching of religion in public schools was illegal.[31] Other general questions included in Wellington interviews were disallowed. I was, for instance, asked to delete a question to high school students asking whether, in conjunction with other legal ages, the legal age for sexual relations was fair or logical.[32] Objections were that it would provide information some students may not have known, and that 'even graduate students would not know this [information]'. It was also suggested that I delete questions on the teaching of civic classes and on civil rights since these were more political than social science. I managed to retain one question on civics and civil rights, however, just as I managed to retain questions on the celebration of *Obon*. Ultimately, as discussed in the thesis, I grew

---

[29] Shizuoka interview guides for school students, young adults and parents are appended (see Appendices 10-12).

[30] A school faculty in Kobe similarly asked Rohlen (1983:128) to avoid questionnaire enquiries about the educational background of fathers.

[31] Inoue (2000:50-51) divides religious education into three categories: '(1) imparting knowledge about various religions, (2) nurturing religious sentiment, and (3) educating people about a certain denomination'. In public schools the first category, in the form of academic knowledge, is permitted. The third category however, refers to '"religious education" in the narrow sense… conducted from the standpoint of a specific religion or denomination and is strictly forbidden'. The second category, due to its overlap with ethics and morals, which may be taught in public schools, has been debated at length. In many cases the nurturing of religious sentiment is carried out 'within the framework of moral education' in public schools.

[32] The legal age differed according to Prefectural legislation but was around 16 years.

to appreciate that my position as a foreigner and the asking of questions in a school setting were factors limiting access to information.[33]

My initial thoughts were that, by limiting the areas open to research, the Board's restrictions would compromise my thesis. In time, however, a realisation that many YFP assumptions appropriate to adulthood in Wellington (and that were incorporated into my own questionnaires) were not culturally relevant in Shizuoka opened up a whole avenue of enquiry. This was also true for other factors that had appeared limiting, such as the Wellington informants' greater outspokenness and preparedness to discuss a wide range of topics than was the case in Shizuoka, where the ability to 'speak out' was culturally circumscribed. Further, the systemic nature of cultural integration in both Wellington and Shizuoka implied that what might often, on the surface, appear to be equivalence was founded on different concepts, or conveyed different connotations, that were nevertheless highly significant. For example, positive responses to questions asking whether civic classes were taught in schools, or whether today's young people were more focused on 'rights' than young people were in the parents' generation, did not convey equivalent information: civics in Wellington relates to an emphasis on rights associated with an egalitarian citizenship in a democratic state, whereas in Shizuoka civics implies knowledge of a dual state-kinship formation and national identity, with a strong focus on duties and responsibilities as well as rights. An attempt to convey the systemic interrelation of cultural phenomena therefore became an important part of my thesis.

1.6. METHODOLOGICAL REFLECTIONS AND ANALYSIS

In scope and emphasis the thesis is neither a whole of life or life-course study, nor an analysis of child/adult primary and secondary socialisation from childhood to adulthood. My primary interest throughout has been a comparative study of how young people and their parents perceived self, personhood and the maturation of young people, and how these perceptions and attitudes intersected with their lifestyles and relationships of home, school, and the wider community. This focus highlights the interrelation between people's choices and the nature of modernity.

---

[33] Some profile questions were acceptable in a non-school setting. As I pointed out to the Board, the format and wording for questions about school background and occupation had been adopted from a nationwide survey in Japan conducted in April 1988 by the University Research Centre of Nihon University in collaboration with Mainichi Newspapers (see Cho and Yada:1994). I successfully used the profile questions I prepared for school questionnaires in taped interviews.

Methodological factors often precluded closely calibrated comparisons as the data informing the study for each area differed in kind. The Wellington analysis drew on ethnographic interviews with high school students and parents and academic literature, whereas the Shizuoka analysis, along with academic literature, was based on data from school questionnaires supplemented by interviews in English, 'proxy' interviews in Japanese (for the most part with parents and young people at university or employed in the work force) and participant observation. These different sets of data imposed limitations on my analysis. My inability to interview high school students and their parents in Japanese, for example, deprived the Shizuoka analysis of the rich nuance and internal variation available in the data for the Wellington analysis. Although I analysed each Shizuoka questionnaire response according to differentials of gender, age, family composition and school, with a few noted exceptions variations were minor. On the other hand, the Wellington interviews were unable to produce the collective statistical information available from the Shizuoka questionnaires since Wellington interviewers did not always explore with interviewees all the questions on their guide sheet.

The systemic interrelation of cultural phenomena mentioned above, however, also made strictly calibrated comparisons difficult, an experience common however to anthropologists such as Rohlen and M.White, who respectively compare secondary school education and teen cultures in Japan and the United States. Rohlen (1983:325) and M.White use the concept of 'mirroring' to illustrate their position. M.White (1993:2), for instance, writes:

> Comparisons, to be true to the differences, must not be drawn in strict parallel: a category that counts in Japan, such as entrance exams to high school, may have no clear counterpart in the United States. I have chosen to emphasise Japanese youth and to use American experiences and evidence as a mirror, I hope both reflecting and illuminating.

A historical pre- and post-war divide in Japan, marked by changes introduced by the new postwar constitution,[34] complicated my attempts to generalise and analyse data collected in Shizuoka. As expected, in both Wellington and Shizuoka the views expressed by younger interviewees and informants were varied, and did not always agree with those of the parent generation. Attitudes among parents in Shizuoka, however, represented several different

---

[34] Among other changes, the new constitution designed by SCAP to democratise Japan granted women the vote and altered marriage laws and landownership rights to promote an egalitarian ethic.

historical eras. Parents born either at the end of, or following, World War II were themselves born to parents who had grown up according to Meiji codes and values. Some had attempted to replicate their parents' orientations while others had attempted to abandon or liberalise them.[35] Shizuoka informants' outlooks were therefore more divergent than those in the Wellington sample which, despite significant social change across the generations, did not involve the abrupt adjustments legally demanded by a new constitution.

A time difference of around five years between the Wellington and Shizuoka research had some affect on the comparative study since aspects of social organisation in Wellington changed across these years. By 2001 or shortly thereafter, for example, 'boomerang children' (young adults who returned from 'flatting' to live at home) and 'twixters' (young adults in employment who lived with parents ostensibly for economic reasons) were becoming a recognisable phenomenon that was, to a limited extent, comparable with young people in their twenties living at home in Shizuoka. In the Wellington interviews, however, the terms 'boomerang children' and 'twixters' did not occur, just as few older siblings of Wellington students lived at home.[36]

An age difference between me and the YFP interviewers (late twenties or early thirties) may have had a differing impact on interviews, thereby affecting the comparison, as would interviewee attitudes to local interviewers in Wellington compared with attitudes to a foreign researcher in Shizuoka. And yet, as Dorinne Kondo explains, foreign researchers in Japan, unlike researchers identified as being Japanese, are also advantaged in being able to ask 'indelicate' questions and speak with people across certain status lines (Rosaldo 1993:180-181).

Another factor affecting my research was reliance on YFP questionnaires and interviews designed by other people for purposes that differed from my own. Information on interviewee interactions with their siblings, for instance, could have added depth to my

---

[35] As some historians (Gluck 1993; Dower 1993; Koschmann 1993) have pointed out, during the early postwar years perhaps one third of the population supported liberal values that informed the postwar constitution. The political climate, however, quickly turned to favour conservative governments, postwar economic recovery and high growth, while supporters of liberal, socialist, Marxist and feminist ideals concerned with rights and equality rapidly diminished.

[36] Across all the Wellington schools, 3 tertiary students and 4 young adults in employment lived at home while 7 tertiary students and 6 young adults in employment lived away from home.

analysis of 'family' in Wellington. On the other hand, my research was stimulated by, and its direction followed from, a lack of fit between the nature of modernity in Shizuoka and concepts of modernity expressed in the 'Working Analytical Conceptualizations' used in the YFP research (a copy of which I had been given) and in Sawicka and Urry's (1997) paper, where modern industrial society was notionally equated with an autonomous individuated personhood whose social definition was disconnected from specifications of age, gender, status or role. My observations and findings, and the approach I have taken, synchronise with those of other scholars who have worked in Japan (e.g. Dore 1967,1973,1987; R.J.Smith 1985:108,138-139; M.White 1993:12) who affirm that a modern economy does not imply the convergence of effects in ordinary lives, or that Japanese values and attitudes are becoming, or will in future become, more and more like our own.

The thesis structure is a reflection of my analytical approach and focus. In analysing perceptions and concepts of personhood in Wellington and Shizuoka, I first seek to establish basic social orientations to, and legal prescriptions for, a person's 'becoming' through maturation (Chapter 2). This analysis will establish that, in Wellington, ideas of growth stress an internal transformation and the attainment of qualities over a relatively short period of time toward becoming an autonomous adult person. In Shizuoka, by contrast, ideas of growth imply gradual transitions through a long period of time, with a stress on the attainment of linguistic and performance abilities demonstrating respect for social distinctions of seniority and gender. In Chapter 3 I will examine the particular attributes and values identified by informants as significant for maturation. I note here that some attributes, such as independence, which are valued in both Wellington and Shizuoka, carry such different meanings that they will be analysed separately in different chapters and contexts. I further note that where citizenship is mentioned, the reference is to legal aspects of citizenship where these intersect with maturation (Chapter 1) or concepts of family (Chapter 5). In Chapters 4 and 5 my analysis will shift to consider how young people's and their parents' attitudes and choices operate within, yet in some cases challenge, the fundamental parameters set out in Chapters 2 and 3. In Chapter 4 I will analyse high school and community relations and young people's future directions. And in Chapter 5 I will analyse family orientations and young people's future directions.

When presenting my analysis I divide each chapter into a Wellington and a Shizuoka section, allowing for the different social and cultural influences affecting concepts of, and approaches to, adulthood among young people and their parents. In each chapter the Wellington section takes the lead since the YFP material prompted the nature and direction of my research. The methodology adopted favours a detailed textual analysis of the Wellington data. I have retained the 'voices' of the text to authenticate my analysis and provide texture and tone consonant with the richness of the interview material. The texture of the Shizuoka sections therefore differs from that of the Wellington sections, as does the length, since the Wellington-Shizuoka comparative points are largely set out and developed in the Shizuoka sections.

I note here that I have collapsed fieldwork information from the greater Wellington and Shizuoka areas with that of urban Wellington and Shizuoka, while occasionally referring to regional diversity in either the Wellington or Shizuoka areas where it appears significant. I also note that, in both the Wellington and Shizuoka analyses, student and parent responses are not individually correlated. In the Wellington case, with the exception of three parents, interviewees in the parent sample were not related to the students in the student interviews, while in the Shizuoka case all questionnaires were anonymous. In footnotes and tables relating to Shizuoka, student questionnaires are referred to as SQ, parent questionnaires as PQ, and teacher questionnaires as TQ. I refer to all secondary schools in Wellington as 'high schools' rather than 'colleges', as the latter term is used for some tertiary institutes in Japan. In New Zealand there are no separate junior and senior high schools. High schools are for students aged thirteen to seventeen and, at the time of the interviews, class levels were named Forms 3-7. Students interviewed were from Forms 6-7, the senior high school levels. In Shizuoka, there are separate junior and senior high schools. Senior high school students are aged sixteen to eighteen. Questionnaires involved students from the middle high school year.

Since research for this thesis was concluded, social changes have included the introduction and widespread use of cell phones in New Zealand, and an increased buoyancy in the economies of New Zealand and Japan. Throughout the thesis, however, I have used the ethnographic present, depicting the situation at the time research was conducted. I have also retained the exchange rate between the NZ dollar and Japanese yen as it was in 2000-2001.

CHAPTER 2

MATURATION INTO PERSONHOOD

AND THE ATTAINMENT OF LEGAL MAJORITY

This chapter concerns maturation into full personhood in Wellington and Shizuoka. In Wellington, 'becoming an adult' was considered integral to becoming a fully mature person. I argue that Wellington notions of achieving 'adulthood' implied attaining the age of legal majority but also—and significantly—maturity as an autonomously independent, self-responsible individual in an egalitarian society. By contrast, in Shizuoka there were no similar notions of autonomous independence and its attainment by young people. In Shizuoka, 'Coming of Age' occurred at or around twenty years and implied the reaching of legal majority, but notions of 'adulthood' made little sense, while cultural meanings associated with maturation were far removed from those in Wellington. In Shizuoka, personhood and its maturation required transitions throughout life in a society hierarchised according to seniority, gender and social status.

Wellington and Shizuoka therefore present quite different models of maturation and personhood. Both, however, are equally modern. Both are valid ways of being in and understanding the world—and Japanese notions cannot be seen as destined to 'converge' with those of individualist thinking in the 'West', as some commentators have suggested. It is the task of this chapter, and the one which follows, to explore in detail the profoundly different concepts of maturation and personhood in Wellington and Shizuoka. In addition to arguing for the existence of alternative modernities, my aim is to contribute to the anthropological literature on personhood by broadening and deepening our understanding of what it means to be and become a full person.

2.1. WELLINGTON: ADULT ARRIVAL AND ITS MEASURES

In Western Europe the notion of adulthood is of relatively recent origin. The term 'adult' first appeared in the English language in the C16th, deriving from the Latin *adultus*, from *adolescere*, to grow up. As Ariès (1962:18-25) points out, the term 'adult' was absent from C17th English translations of the Bible, while life sequences in the Middle Ages were childhood, youth and old age.

English language dictionaries currently denote 'adults' as persons of mature attitude or outlook and, in law, those who have attained the age of legal adulthood. The concept of rights, which emerged in Christian ideas of salvation, became politicised as rights of citizenship in an egalitarian state whose concepts were first elaborated in the C18th. Ideas of rights were given their fullest expression in the 1789 and 1793 French Declaration of the Rights of Man, which proclaimed for instance: that free and equal rights are a birthrite; that the source of sovereignty resides in the nation; that law voices the general will; that liberty of conscience, speech, association and ideas pertain where these are not injurious to others, or do not disturb the public order established by law; that education is universally necessary; that tax is for general utility; and that the unemployed are to be protected (Rudé ed.1965:205-210). Together these notions formulated principles that became commonly regarded as requisite for nurturing a mature adult citizenry.

More recently, concepts of rights have extended to include social and economic rights in a mobile consumer society within the state. In one extreme representation, Gellner (1986) depicts the modern state as being artificially contrived, composed of necessarily adaptable atomised individuals seeking survival and continuity in a world of change, chance, competitiveness and random selectivity. The egalitarian state is nevertheless said to endure through legal measures ensuring cohesion, universal literacy, and rights to equal opportunity where the emphasis is placed on individual rights over and above collective duties and obligations. These rights are fully claimable by adult citizens.

Among senior high school students and parents in Wellington, the attainment of independent adulthood, whose meanings are explored in detail below, was the primary goal in the maturation of young people.

2.1.1. The concept of arrival

When interviewed on what it meant to be 'an adult', high school students in Wellington[1] referred to a stage of being. With few exceptions, students understood life as moving through overlapping yet clear phases of 'childhood', 'teenager' and 'young adult', until a final phase—that of 'being adult'—was reached. As one student said: 'There's… a real big space for adults… Adults are what the law says from twenty until when you die.' Some students claimed they were teenagers while most positioned themselves as young

---

[1] '(Wellington) (high school) students' refers to 37 high school students of European descent at state schools in Wellington.

adults. Almost all students thought they would 'become adult' at nineteen to twenty-one years of age. A few students said they would be adult by their mid or late twenties, while one or two claimed they were more or less adult already.

Just five of thirty-seven student interviewees suggested that the term 'adult' held little meaning saying, for example, that there is 'too much emphasis on the word', or that being adult 'is just behaviour, it's the way you act':

> All it ('adult') means is that you're older than everybody… It just means that you're no longer a teenager.

One suggested that people might not ever think about themselves through categories such as teenager and adult ('I just think of myself as me'), while another remarked: 'It's hard to divide life up into child, teenager and adult' except in a physical way ('adult… [is] when… you stop growing'). Each of these students nevertheless nominated and discussed qualities and characteristics they would personally need to acquire in order to 'become adult'. They said they desired 'adult freedom', or associated the term 'adult' with independence, choice and responsibility, or even provided an age at which they would become adult. Whether high school students saw themselves and others as teenagers or as young adults, or between these states, or in a differently named category (a 'guy', or 'just me'), or even as never being totally in any one state ('there are aspects of a child's sort of mentality that I always would like to have'; or, 'my parents are fifty and they still act like kids'), they perceived a one-way-only progression of states toward full adulthood. Adulthood was the status they would all claim within the few years following the end of high school, or fairly soon thereafter.

High school students almost invariably described leaving school, leaving home (Schneider 1968:40; Bellah et al.1985:56-62), starting a career or having a job as transitions to adulthood. And for most students, 'becoming adult' implied attaining experience and maturity, achieving independence (Lukes 1973:52), and assuming responsibility. Together with the need for financial independence, these quality-type attributes of adulthood were seen to measure the attainment of adulthood.

Notions of paths to adulthood created the sense of progressive movement. Students spoke of being 'on the way' to adulthood, of the ability to 'choose avenues freely', and the freedom 'to negotiate one's way' through life. They wanted to reach 'a stage when I'm sort of like got everything sorted out… and I know I'm on the right tracks'.

Other students projected images of what arrival meant:

> When you're an adult you've probably been through the education system and you're living independently and… starting on your career path and you know where you're going.

The idea of movement toward a destination is also visible in its negation, in notions of getting stuck, as one student, for instance, said of his brothers:

> My oldest brother… [is] a druggy—he's made a mess of his life. And my other brother… [is a] bartender. He's got nothing going for him.

Other students suggested that young people could be hurried along paths toward adulthood too quickly, hindering their successful arrival:

> There are a lot of screwed up teenagers who don't know where they're going… [or] what they're doing… A lot of the time… [adults] give teenagers too much responsibility, too much independence, too much freedom… They don't stagger [i.e. space] it… It's just bang, "Okay, now you're an adult. You can take responsibility for your life".

Most parent interviewees also assumed that there was a state of adulthood reached somewhere between the late teens and early twenties.[2] Commenting on her teenage children, for instance, one mother typically observed: 'They are on the threshold of adulthood', while a father noted of his son: 'He's… twenty now… Sometimes I think he's very mature and adult-like but other times I think he's still getting there.' 'Getting there' is a poignant reminder that there was, after all, a point of adult arrival. In another example, the concept of arrival was considered appropriate for 'young adults' as well. When speaking of her sixteen year old daughter and her friends, one mother observed: 'I see them as approaching young adult[hood]... They're not adults and they're not young adults… They're still getting there. Another year or so and they'll be young adults.'

2.1.2. Legal ages and legal adulthood

In New Zealand the term 'adult' was also used to denote a person who was no longer a legal 'minor'. In order to learn young people's views of legal aspects of adulthood, YFP interviewers drew students' attention to legal age restrictions, asking for their comments and ideas. The following is how one interviewer typically introduced the topic:

> You can buy Instant Kiwis[3] at sixteen; you can consent to sex at sixteen; you can be tried in the adult courts at seventeen; you can vote at eighteen; you can get a credit card at eighteen; you

---

[2] Just four parents doubted that there was a transitional point in time for becoming adult.

can get the dole at eighteen; you can get the adult minimum wage at twenty; you can buy alcohol at twenty;[4] and you become an adult at twenty.

When commenting on legal anomalies and contradictions for those under twenty, students debated whether set legal ages had any useful value.

Among students approving the idea of set legal ages, one considered that legal ages established rights:

> I suppose you've got to have laws, you can't have anarchy… (Otherwise) five year olds would be smoking out on the side of the street and drinking beer.

Another suggested that current laws distinguished levels of maturity:

> I guess [that, without that law] you'd get thirteen- and fourteen-year old people buying alcohol… I think we've got more maturity.

A third appreciated how set legal ages promoted self-discipline:

> [They] teach you to wait… Patience… It makes you look forward to something I guess.

Still in favour of legal control, three students agreed that a universal age of seventeen or eighteen years would be simpler and more beneficial than graded legal ages. They argued that, as students separately mature at different ages, stepped legal ages could never establish appropriate ages for all.

By contrast, other students favouring legal steps toward adulthood queried the value of a universal adult age. One, for instance, thought people might be ready for certain activities earlier than any set age:

> You can't just say, "Well, you're eighteen now. You're an adult, and you can do this and this and this"… There are some things that… you can do when you're younger… One age for everything… wouldn't be fair.

Another student thought a universal age could rush people into freedom:

> It's quite good to gradually let people [do things]… There would be people who couldn't cope with it all at once if suddenly, at eighteen… they're allowed to do everything. It'd just be too much to cope with.

Aware that some laws designed to limit their freedom were often unenforceable, most students said that setting legal ages for certain activities was pointless. Ineffective

---

[3] An 'Instant Kiwi' is the name of a scratch lottery of small denomination.

[4] The age restriction for buying alcohol has since been lowered to eighteen.

regulations that were often mentioned related to smoking, drinking and sex. Students noted that smoking was common:[5]

> I used to smoke… for about a year and… I got away with it… About half of our school smokes and hundreds of people get away with it.

Likewise, students claimed that underage drinking was widespread.[6] When referring to regulations preventing their access to alcohol, students often mentioned how these laws failed to monitor what took place in households:

> It [the law] doesn't say when you can drink at home, but I guess that's any age as long as your… parents [or] someone else has bought it [alcohol] for you.

And attitudes to laws regulating the age of consent were mostly dismissive:[7]

> If people are going to have sex, they're going to have sex, and generally they don't get caught.

A few students nevertheless agreed with age-based restrictions on smoking, drinking and sexual consent. One student, who thought that 'most sixteen year-olds are able to choose', argued that legal ages provided a safety net before the age of choice:

> When I was fifteen and younger… legally not being able to have sex was a really good net for people… And [for not] drinking and smoking… To push back on peer pressure… [You can say]: "Look, I'm not into doing illegal things, okay? I'm not going to sleep with you, whatever"… It's an excuse, and it probably isn't the real reason, but it's a net.

This same student, however, suggested that age-based restrictions carried no legal weight:

> I really don't think they [legal ages] mean much at all… I mean how often are people… arrested for drinking under age [or] fined?… What happens? Does anything happen?

The observance of particular legal ages was mostly seen as a matter of personal choice and 'generally up to the individual'.

The explicit citing of legal phenomena as useful markers of adulthood was rare among students. Only one suggested that the law—in conjunction with maturity—might be a determining factor:

---

[5] According to the 1996 census, 25% of men and 23% of women over the age of 15 years smoked cigarettes. Among young adults aged 20-24 years, 31% of men and 33% of women regularly smoked cigarettes (*New Zealand Official Year Book* 1998:172).

[6] Excessive consumption of alcohol was a major personal and public health issue in New Zealand. A 1995 survey of New Zealand drinkers by the Alcohol and Public Health Research Unit showed that 89% of men and 85% of women were drinkers. The 18-24 year age group reported the highest level of alcohol consumption and related problems (*New Zealand Official Year Book* 1998:172).

[7] By age 18, 60-70% of young people had had sexual experiences. At 15-17 years, 2.3% of females and 0.8% of males were in sexually active partnerships, while at 18-19 years, 5.5% 0f males and 12% of females were in sexually active partnerships (Davey 1998:73, 78).

> [My parents and older sisters]… are mature. They're classified as adults… By law they're adults. They always act like adults.

The way people acted and the qualities they possessed, rather than a legal age and legal status, were seen as the major determinants of whether people were adult. By naming traits that defined adulthood—'earning your own money [for independence], a lot of maturity, and decision making'—students emphasised that adulthood implied more than attaining the legal age. As one student said:

> If… all they [i.e. people] want to do is just get out of school, go on the dole, they're not really responsible for themselves... They are adults… By law [they are]. But [they] sort of aren't really… Not really adults.

Once a person had attained adulthood, however, students expected some fusion between legal observances and maturity. Semantic use of the single term 'adult' to convey both the notion of full legal accountability at twenty and a set of qualities associated with people of full legal age created expectations that emotional and intellectual maturity would occur at approximately the same age as legal maturity, give or take a few years.

2.1.3. Legal passages to adulthood and attendant anomalies

Many students considered that laws affecting young adults were inconsistent, illogical and ambiguous, denying them fair treatment and respect. One student expressed this concern with reference to laws on national defence: 'You can join the army when you're… sixteen. You can die for your country but you can't buy alcohol and you can't vote. I think that's really idiotic.' At the other extreme were more minor, but irritating, anomalies:

> We can't drink. We can't vote… We can't… move out of home really without our parents' consent. But we still have to pay adult [transport] fares for everything… We have to pay [as] adult[s] for the movies… I'm not too happy about that.

Another student expressed similar frustrations:

> Whenever it suits them, we're adults… Like… [having] to wait until… you're eighteen to… get married by ourselves… We're not going to get married anyway. But [at eighteen] we can't… [even] buy alcohol.

Although previously unaware that in criminal law a person of seventeen would be tried in an adult court, students nevertheless indicated age anomalies:

> I suppose with the courts… they've sort of given you… an adult punishment. But you're still classed as a child because you still… don't have all of the adult privileges.

A few students argued that criminal law could justly apply from an even earlier age:

I think maybe it [adult rulings for minors] should even be younger… By the time you're thirteen or fourteen… when it comes to criminal offences… you know what you're doing. You know what's right and wrong.

Students working part-time jobs were most vocal over legal restrictions denying them the right to earn the minimum adult wage until twenty years of age.[8]

They… have this thing called 'Youth Rates'… It goes up [according to] how old you are… If you're sixteen you get five [dollars] forty. If you're seventeen you get six dollars [or] seven or something… They can pay you whatever they want. They can pay you three dollars an hour if they want… It's just criminal what some people pay… Terrible.

Students on Youth Rates felt unfairly paid less than others for the same work:

The minimum wage [at twenty] really annoys me… It's just pathetic getting paid five dollars forty an hour when you're working with other people who are really bad at their job and… get paid… twice as much as you… But… [if it were] higher than that… they just won't hire people our age, because they can get an adult to do it.

Other associated grievances were that the twenty-year commencement age for adult wages was too high and should be lowered to eighteen, or that Youth Rates should be entirely abolished. Students also objected that younger workers were given 'the crappier jobs like scrubbing the floors or washing the dishes'… 'just the yuk work'. Given that most students worked part-time, one student voiced a common grievance: 'People under eighteen shouldn't pay taxes if you're not allowed to vote.'

Students considered that legal anomalies and commercial practices denied them the fair passage to adulthood they most desired. Frustration sometimes led to cynicism and a disinterest in citizenship and politics. At the same time, it encouraged the anticipation of reaching full adulthood and its associated legal rights and benefits.

2.1.4. Barriers to adulthood and the overcoming of authority

Students frequently blurred the rule of law with parental and teacher authority. Associations students made between state law and parental authority occurred largely because the state held parents accountable for their children's actions until a child reached certain legal ages. Similarly, teachers were legally responsible for students at school. Many students regarded the laws of state and the authority of parents and teachers as

---

[8] A law change effective from 1 April 2008 abolished Youth Rates and established a minimum wage of $12 an hour before tax for employees aged 16 years and over, including home workers, casuals, temporary and part-time workers.

temporary restraints they would finally outgrow at the point of becoming a legal adult. For many students, therefore, the idea of 'becoming adult' encoded notions of a future free from the restrictive rules and authority of state, school and home. One student, for instance, described an absence of rules in the home as a release into adulthood: 'Oh, I think… they want to treat me as an adult. I think they… don't want to rule me.'

From the point of view of parents, raising children to adulthood involved both the exercise of authority and the need for negotiation and relinquishing controls. Compared with memories of a more authoritarian past, parents spoke of the possibility now for mutual respect between themselves and their children. As one parent said: 'The culture we've established here is of us as parents having some rights, but not necessarily being right all the time, and children having some rights as well.' Parents said they valued an environment where young people were 'listened to' and 'encouraged to speak out more and question more', thereby gaining 'a lot more confidence'. They appreciated that young people today had 'a lot more freedom and a lot more choice' and were more mobile with 'space to explore'. Parents encouraged self-discipline in their children, recognising and accepting that they were 'in a process' with their children: not 'up there', over and above them. They sought to establish trust, to 'tell and guide', 'build respect' and remain 'flexible'. Parents agreed that the negotiating process was open ended: that responsibility gradually passed from them to their young adult offspring, as the final outcome was 'up to them'. It was a process based on the expectation that young people would take on increasing responsibility for their actions and 'become adult'.

Flexible attitudes toward child-rearing, however, were also seen to have drawbacks. Parents disliked young people asserting themselves and claiming the right to make decisions irrespective of their views. They noted in particular a dwindling respect for parental authority. According to parents, respect was no longer a given: 'You've got to earn it.' Many parents complained that respect, good manners and young people's helping with jobs at home could no longer be taken for granted: 'Unless you sit down and spell it out… they just don't… see it for themselves… which is wrong.' When requests for cooperation and compliance were ignored, parents lost their sense of dignity as well as authority: 'It usually winds up with me yelling at them.' A point of contention was the failure by young people to clean and tidy their rooms: 'They leave stuff all on the floor [and] it gets a bit musty.' Some parents complained that young people had become 'more

defiant', often expressing themselves in language that many parents found unacceptable. And house rules disappeared as curfews were abandoned. As one parent expressed: '[If our daughter] was… eighteen and I said, "Right, you've got to be home by half past eleven", I don't know who would laugh the loudest.'

Through a variety of comments, parents revealed how they were forced to juggle authoritarian rule-making with the granting of increased freedom. They conveyed their constant struggle to provide for the safety of high school children while, at the same time, wanting their children to freely explore life, gain experience, and cope independently. On the one hand, parents were anxious to establish boundaries: 'Nowadays you've got to teach the kids to be careful.' They said they set 'quite strict rules about going out', and commented on the need to 'keep a very, very close eye on them'. As one parent said: 'For… safety['s] sake, I want to know where she is and how she's getting there and how she's getting home.' Parents constantly re-negotiated rules and worked hard to establish relationships of trust whereby their children felt able to approach them to discuss any serious problems they encountered. At the same time, and in keeping with their ultimate goal of allowing their children to live independently, they encouraged sons and daughters of high school age to develop a sense of responsibility for their own lives.

The pattern of alternating strict parent (and teacher) controls and negotiated authority created in the student generation a sense of being in limbo—of being between states (Elliott and Feldman 1993:2-6). One student described it this way:

We're sort of caught in the middle… You're never quite sure where… you fit in… I can be a child when they [my parents] want me to be, and an adult when they want me to be as well.

Another student commented:

From about fourteen to… about… eighteen [or] twenty is one of the hardest times in your life… You're mixed between an adult and a teenager. You can't mix with adults, but you don't want to mix with kids. So you're stuck in the middle… You want to be responsible but you want to be defiant and it's quite weird.

Of the few students positioning themselves as 'teenagers', or as 'teenager-young adults', some distinguished between young people who 'achieve or do really well' and 'have a lot to give', and those who were 'really screwed up teenagers'. Most, however, employed a vocabulary of 'testing boundaries' or of 'learning where the boundaries are'. They pushed the limits, and broke rules for 'fun, excitement [and] a thrill', explaining that teenagers

were rebellious because 'rules are made to be broken'. Teenagers said they preferred parental advice to authority because 'you get a better sense of what's good and what's not', although rebellion was justified as an adventure in self-learning and the need to gain experience. Sometimes students tried to separate and distinguish the rebellious aspect of teenage experience from the learning aspect, at the same time shying away from wishing to accept legal responsibilities:

> Well, [being] a youth [is] like [being] a teenager without the bad vibes… A youth is someone who's… changing… They're going through a new stage of life… [They're] learning and making a lot of mistakes but learning from them… A year ago I could have done… something illegal and it would go on my record but it would be… wiped off when I was eighteen. When you're an adult you just… don't have that sort of security… You're responsible.

When parents spoke of their children becoming independent as fully individualised adults (La Fontaine 1985:124), it was common for them to speak of allowing their children to 'claim' or 'own' their lives, and of finding an 'identity and sense of self'. They used terms such as young people's 'claiming' or 'owning' their lives to express both parental ideals for their children as well as their children's own ideals for themselves. Parents, for instance, said: 'You've got to… encourage them… [into becoming a] person in their own right', and: 'She was definitely… wanting to be her own person.' Concepts such as 'ownership of self' and owning the 'right to be oneself' were often linked to decision-making abilities. As one parent observed: 'We used to make decisions for them… As the years have gone on we've just sort of let loose a wee bit… I want to let them be their own people.' While commenting on her children's experiences away from home at different universities, another parent observed: 'It's matured them… They've had to make their own decisions [and] stand by their own decisions… They've had to take some form of ownership within themselves.'

Finding a sense of self, or taking ownership of self (Gullestad 1996), were thought to require an inner transformation prior to reaching adulthood. Referring to two stepsons and son, a father noted:

> I'd say that E [a stepson of fifteen] has still got a few years to go [to adulthood]… I don't think he's really gotten to that really deep felt struggle with himself… J [a son of sixteen] is… really struggling with himself, and I think that's… the process of forming his own identity in his own mind… That's certainly a real key to adulthood… getting through that struggle and finding a sense of yourself… Once T [a stepson of 17] got through that … he felt more comfortable with

who he was… But I don't think E...'s quite, quite coping with that yet… Certainly I think there's an adult emerged in there somewhere. He's got a lot of… rough edges at the moment.

Parents tended to assume that the 'individual' was a natural category. Some saw their role as assisting in their child's attempts to find a sense of self, a process referred to by parents as 'self-discovery': 'The parent helps the child to discover themselves.' Other parents saw this transformation as part of the natural process of a child's pulling free of parental controls. As the mother of a sixteen year old son put it:

From… mid 5th Form… through until now there's been a major assertion of independence on his part… I think that's normal. I think that's reasonable… I can't stop him... [His] desire to please me and to comply with my expectations is still strong and… I expect that to become less and less… He'll become more and more indifferent to whether I'm happy with him. And I just see that as a normal part of [becoming adult]. He's got to go through that to become an adult and sort of detach from me.

The strong connections made between 'becoming adult', a 'right to self', and the emergence of 'selfhood', went hand in hand with full legal answerability at twenty as an individual citizen of the State. Just as parents wanted their children 'find themselves' and become sufficiently independent to step into adulthood by their late teens and early twenties, so their children wanted to free themselves from parents to 'become' adults by the same age. Once young people had become their own individual adult selves, co-dependence and co-responsibility dropped away. Subsequent development in social responsibility and maturity occurred independently and without any accountability (except to the State) beyond the self. The various barriers to full independence and responsibility were thus brushed aside within a few years during a person's late teens and early twenties, in order for the person to stand alone as an autonomous individual adult.

2.1.5. Democracy, citizenship and the egalitarian self

The right to vote at eighteen, which might be considered a point of entry to full adult citizenship, was not particularly valued by students as a primary marker of adulthood, even though voting was approved or considered important by almost half the students. Students who valued the legal provision for voting at eighteen said they were 'looking forward to voting' or that 'voting makes a difference'. Students who were indifferent to or negative about voting said they 'don't really care', often because 'the system is illogical' or ineffective, or because they held politicians in low esteem. As attaining voting rights at

eighteen preceded the attainment of full legal adulthood (the point when all legal restrictions against 'minors' were lifted) at twenty, associations between legal adulthood and citizenship, or between legal rights and adult citizenship, were not obvious.

We have seen that, in student discussions concerning legal ages, ideas of equality, fairness and a sense of justice were expressed in individualistic and personal terms, rather than through concepts associated with democratic rights as citizens. Qualities of independence and responsibility were also sought by students in relation to the self. If democracy is theoretically perceived as a system safeguarding the equality of communal and collective rights, it might be more accurate to say that for most students democracy was thought of as involving a rights-based independence with responsibility primarily owed to the self as indicated in the following comments:

> Interviewer: Do you have an idea of being a citizen at eighteen, or are you a citizen now?
>
> Respondent: I don't think of myself as fully attached… through my parents to the country, to the state… I'm a person in my own right.
>
> Interviewer: And it doesn't suddenly change at eighteen when you can vote?
>
> Respondent: No. I… feel like I'm a person in my own right. I make my own decisions. I've got my own opinions that may differ from my parents… People tend to treat me as an equal, as an adult.

Student growth into adult personhood implied adaptations to a general egalitarian and tolerant ethos where, however, democratic independence was focussed on the individual rather than communal and collective rights and responsibilities.

2.1.6. Democracy, gender equality, and adulthood

Students held to the fundamental principle that, in adulthood, a form of gender equality would prevail. As argued in Chapter 3, all students emphasised their rights to freedom through the exercise of independent choice and personal preference, and that these qualities would determine the course their future lives would take. Moreover, students considered that financial independence resulting from equal access to employment established a level playing field, where gender did not dictate a person's future social position or social status. As one female student said:

> I think [today] it [becoming an adult] is pretty much the same [for men and women]… A few decades ago women couldn't do anything… so obviously men were adults well before women… [The] guys could go out and live by themselves [but] women couldn't. Whereas… today there are opportunities [for both].

And in the words of another student:

It [adulthood] is probably the same [for men and women]… Everyone has to go out and get a job and be responsible [so] in that sense [it is the same].

Among students there was the prevailing sense that adulthood arrived first, after which choice determined the type of adulthood a person would live out. Thus, in relation to the concept of adulthood, gender differences were considered unimportant. As one male student said: 'I don't think there is such thing as a man or a woman, it's just an adult.' Rather than becoming culturally differentiated 'men' and 'women', young people in Wellington became undifferentiated adults who, as autonomous individuals, shared the same rights and responsibilities.

2.2. SHIZUOKA: NO 'ADULT ARRIVAL'

2.2.1. Cross-cultural dilemmas

'In Japan people don't think in terms of becoming adults.' This comment, on my first day in Shizuoka, was made by my husband's colleague when asking me about my research plans. The idea of 'becoming adult' seemed as strange to him as it seemed normal to me.

The issue of 'becoming adult' in Japan also troubled the American anthropologist William Kelly. He writes:

> [A] constructive ambiguity surrounds contemporary society's measure of full maturity. When is one considered adult? When do young people "enter society"? At the "ceremony of adulthood" at age twenty? With employment, in this age of nearly universal wage work after graduation? At marriage? Or with the birth of the first child, that is, at parenthood? (Kelly 1993:210).

Kelly's questions are rhetorical and tangential to a discussion of marriage patterns, with no further attempt made to address or answer them. They do, however, reveal assumptions similar to those found for Wellington European New Zealanders, namely, that although the line drawn between adolescence and adulthood is not necessarily absolute, there is the cultural expectation of an arrival into a state of adulthood. These assumptions informed the YFP questionnaires and interviews that guided my own fieldwork.

When, after our return from Japan, I attempted to make sense of my Shizuoka research, our Japanese friend's comment took greater effect. General fieldwork had cast doubt on earlier assumptions that young people in Shizuoka 'became an adult' in ways similar to those of young people in Wellington, and that notions of 'becoming adult' or, to use Kelly's phrases, of attaining 'full maturity' or of 'entering society', were tangential to more established patterns of thought in Shizuoka. Four parents' comments that they felt their 'own thoughts were not really being considered' in the questionnaires, or that they did not understand 'the main point of the question', also indicated that questions based on the cultural understandings of members of one society did not slip easily into the thinking and life experiences of members of another.

In Wellington, the notion of 'becoming an adult' or 'attaining adulthood' suggested singularity and equality within the membership of the adult group. That is, the arrived state of being, while personal and singular, was also common to all members. Moreover, the

notion of 'attaining adulthood' de-emphasised or subsumed distinctions of gender as the person referred to as 'an adult' was spoken of in gender-neutral terms. Kelly's concept of 'entering society' (which also fosters the idea of an arrival) opposes adolescence to 'society' in the sense that an adolescent is not yet assumed to be fully 'in', or a full member of, society. There is the further assumption that 'society' consists of adults (mature people). Arguably, then, the Wellington concept of 'getting there', which implies reaching or entering a nationwide social group of full, equal adults (i.e. society), is the equivalent of Kelly's concept. As concomitants of legal constructions of maturity, these notions arise within a modern nation state concerned with citizenship rights of individuals.

Despite post-war constitutional changes in Japan and a 'Coming of Age' day for young people aged twenty years, the notions and concepts outlined above are far removed from Shizuokan orientations.

2.2.2. The 'Coming of Age Day': the lifting of legal barriers

In Shizuoka the full legal age, as in Wellington, was set at twenty years and was officially celebrated. At twenty, young people could marry without parental consent (but see Chapter 5) and became eligible to vote. They were also permitted to legally drink alcohol and smoke. As in Wellington also, other transitional ages in Shizuoka were legally set below twenty. At sixteen a person could be tried for crime in an adult court.[9] With the approval of one parent, a young woman could marry at sixteen, and a young man at eighteen. At sixteen a person could qualify to ride a motor scooter, while at eighteen s/he could qualify to ride a motorbike or drive a car. And after fifteen a person qualified for the minimum wage.

Seijin-no-hi or the 'Coming of Age Day' was celebrated as a public holiday throughout Japan on the first Monday of January (New Year's Day excepted). Japanese citizens who were officially twenty years old[10] were invited to attend official ceremonies (*Seijin Shiki*) to mark their attainment of legal majority. The ceremonies were held in municipal halls where local dignitaries addressed young people and family members and presented certificates to mark the occasion.

---

[9] In 2000/01 legal changes were underway to reduce the adult age for serious crimes such as murder to 14 years.

[10] Those who were 'officially twenty' were born between 1 April of twenty years before the day of the ceremony and 31 March of nineteen years before the day of the ceremony.

In its present form, the 'Coming of Age Day' was instituted in 1948 in response to the postwar Civil Code (article 3) drawn up by SCAP (defined above). Ceremonies celebrating the Coming of Age had been observed in Japan since the seventh century. In the Tokugawa period they involved a *Gempuku* (or *Gembuku*) ceremony at adolescence, recognising progress toward a change in status by an altered hairstyle and bestowal of another name. After an interval (by the age of sixteen for women and eighteen for men) gifts of adult clothing and, for a man, a pipe and tobacco pouch, marked an alteration in status, at which time a person assumed new responsibilities and was recognised as being of an age that permitted an arranged marriage.[11] Concepts associated with the modern Coming of Age Day, such as the recognition of marriage rights, smoking rights, the gift of a business suit or kimono from relatives and visits to shrines have reconstructed earlier concepts.

Despite attempts to formalise the coming of age nationwide, not all young people take part. As a (non-Japanese) teacher from one high school told me: 'Mostly the Coming of Age Day is a bit of a farce.' Following nationwide Coming of Age Day ceremonies on 8 January 2001, NHK[12] television news reported that, on that day, over one and a half million (1,570,000) people had come of age. Governors in various cities were shown attending ceremonies in school halls that were only part-filled, as had also been the case, viewers were told, in the larger venues of previous years. The ceremonies in 2001 were described as disappointing. Although young women were shown formally dressed in kimono, not all who attended took the day seriously. A clip was shown of drunken young men at one assembly throwing paper darts and hurling abuse at the mayor, while another highlighted bouts of heckling during formal speeches. Older people, asked for their thoughts of the day, hinted that young people's attitudes needed to improve. One man advised young people not to abandon their pursuit of goals. Another said that young people could make mistakes but must try again. Another lamented that young people these days did not know how to speak properly, did not use honorifics, and did not respect the elderly.

Young men and women in their early twenties replied to my questions on the Coming of Age Day with casual indifference: 'The day is not so special'; 'I went but can't remember if I got the paper certificate'; 'I went—I think I got cards and a book token from the city

---

[11] Shively (1991:722); Kodansha Encyclopedia of Japan, Vol.1 (1983:16); Vol.3 (1983:17); Vol.5 (1983:4).

[12] *Nihon Hoso Kyokei*, a publicly owned radio and television agency similar to the BBC in Britain.

council.' Less than half had bothered to attend, and only half had celebrated with family and/or friends. Some did nothing. One young woman said her mother thought that to purchase a kimono, and therefore to attend the ceremony, was a waste of money.[13] Another transferred her own celebration to New Year when, at home from university, she could enjoy a family gathering. Almost all were students who, after graduating from high school, had gone on to attend university. From age nineteen most had begun living in apartments in cities away from their families, and many had acquired a motor scooter, motorbike or car.

Why was the Coming of Age Day (sometimes translated as 'Adult Day') so insignificant for many young people in Shizuoka? Did they think they were already 'adult', and that the ceremony was therefore meaningless? Or did they think they were not yet adult? Students were bemused by my questions and could provide no satisfactory answers. A breakthrough in my understanding occurred when, back in New Zealand, I started working through the questionnaires. I noticed that, when translated into Japanese, two different terms had been used for the word 'adult'. No one in Shizuoka had alerted me to the existence of these two terms. Not only did it become clear to me that different terms had been used in quite different contexts, but also, by implication, that they probably represented two distinct semantic fields.

In Japanese versions of the questionnaires, almost all references to 'adult' or 'adults' were conveyed by two *kanji* characters: 大人   . According to my dictionaries,[14] the first character 大 denoted 'large' or 'big' (as opposed to 'small'), while the second character 人 denoted 'person/ human being'. The *romaji* equivalent was *otona*.[15] In the questionnaires, *otona* was therefore the term used to translate 'adult' or 'adults' in questions concerning, for instance, student attitudes to 'adults', the amount of time students spent with 'adults', what things students looked forward to about being 'adult', or whether teachers thought students would like to be treated as being responsible and 'adult'.

---

[13] A kimono cost between NZ$2,000 - NZ$20,000 (US$1,000 – US$10,000) or more. Informants told me NZ$10,000 was not unusual.

[14] Random House Webster's Pocket Japanese Dictionary (second edition), 1996. New York: Random House. Kodansha's Romanised Japanese-English Dictionary (new edition), 2001. Ed. Timothy J. Vance. Tokyo: Kodansha International.

[15] *Romaji* is the term used when Japanese is written in Romanised script.

The other Japanese term used to translate 'adult' in the questionnaires was represented by the two *kanji* characters 成人 . According to my dictionaries, the first character 成 helped to convey the idea of 'being mature' or 'grown up' in the sense of being 'of age' when it occurred along with the second character 人 , which was 'person/ human being' (as in *otona* above). The *romaji* equivalent for this term was *seijin*. Dictionary examples of how s*eijin* was used were *Seijin no hi* (literally, 'Coming of Age Day') and *Seijin shiki* ('Coming of Age Ceremony'). Dictionary use of s*eijin* also occurred in phrases such as *seijin-muki no* meaning 'intended for adults', although it could also be used in sentences to mean that someone had 'grown up'. In questionnaires, *seijin* was used to translate the words 'adult' or 'adults' only when these terms related to legal ages or civic rights.

My tentative conclusion was that people drew a sharp line between the concept of 'being adult' in the narrow sense of legal ages and civil rights, and the concept of 'being adult' in ways conveying an ability to show good judgement. This idea was confirmed in correspondence with two of my informants, who made additional observations on the terms' popular usage. According to these informants, in recent times the word *seijin* was not generally used in ordinary life at all. *Seijin* was said to indicate that there was a difference between ages, or that a person was over twenty years old, and only in that sense would *seijin* suggest that a person was 'of age'. *Otona*, by contrast, was said to indicate 'maturity in mind'. The term *otona* was applied to a person with this quality even if s/he were younger than twenty. A person with good thinking and/or good judgement was referred to as someone who 'is *otona*'.

Because each Japanese term used to translate 'adult' denoted a distinctly separate context, the translation of questionnaires into Japanese had not always been straightforward. One question to parents asked: 'When did you start thinking of yourself as being adult?' A number of alternatives were then listed as possible answers, ranging from 'at age twenty', through 'getting a job' and 'financial independence', 'getting married', 'becoming a parent', and on to the practice of certain values. The Japanese version of this question used *seijin* in the phrase 'as being adult' to cover the first possibility ('at age twenty'), but used *otona* for 'adult' to cover all other possible responses. In fact, because these two terms for 'adult' in Japanese served separate conceptual domains, there was one question to parents

where the more subtle distinctions of 'adult' conveyed and sought in the English version were completely lost in Japanese translation.[16]

A Japanese linguistic association made between s*eijin* and the 'Coming of Age Day' and 'Coming of Age Ceremony' unambiguously connected transitions at twenty with age-demarcated legal adult rights *without* reference to any other form of 'adult' maturity. That is, these transitions did not denote *otona* (people with good thinking and good judgement), although most Shizuokans expected people of twenty to have a sense of responsibility. Thus, in Shizuoka there was not the same semantic convergence between concepts of independent maturation and legal adulthood as there was in Wellington. In Shizuoka cultural notions of a 'continual becoming' were implied by social hierarchies (see below) and Buddhist ideals of constantly striving for self-improvement. Reaching the age of full *legal* adulthood was not therefore associated with arriving into a 'state' of autonomous adulthood as in Wellington. As will be seen, concepts of autonomous independence and democratic rights were culturally foreign and unimportant to young people in Shizuoka. As a result, there is no easy Japanese equivalent for the concepts of 'adult' and 'becoming adult' as they are used in Wellington, and no equivalent linguistic terms for 'adult' and 'adulthood'.

Unlike in Wellington, where high school students chose self-reference terms such as 'teenager' and 'young adult' to signal social progression toward adulthood and maturity, most high school students in Shizuoka were averse to terms that implied an approaching maturity. Not only did people refer to high school students as 'high school students', or 'high school girls' or 'high school boys', or as belonging to the *judai* (10-19 years) generation: most students said they *preferred* to be known as 'high school student' or perhaps 'high school girl' or 'high school boy'. Few students (11%) said they wanted to be known as 'young adults',[17] and even fewer (4%) as 'young men' or a 'young women'. Although there was a preference for the neutral term 'student' over the gendered terms 'girl' and boy', students nevertheless preferred an identity more closely linked to specific age groups ('high school student' over and above just 'school student', '*judai* generation'

---

[16] Question PQ68 in the Parent Questionnaire asked whether parents agreed that a person over 20 yrs, who had life-management skills and who was obedient to the law, but who lacked a sense of responsibility, was properly adult. Because the word 'adult' was translated by *seijin*, the question failed to convey distinctions between the legal and ethical considerations implied in the English version.

[17] The questionnaire translator wanted me to omit 'young adult' as, in her view, 'no one uses the term'.

or 'teenager'). Unlike Wellington students, they also preferred terms that stressed a link to school. As one high school student pointed out, there was a strong reluctance at this age for a person to want to change and become responsible for his or her mistakes (a sign of *otona*). Most high schools students projected this transition far into the future. Of four high schools, only Tenryu Forestry High School had a majority of students (57%) who wanted to become adults (*otona*). In the other three schools just one third or less wanted to become *otona*.

Some reference terms applied to Shizuoka students showed awareness of their specific age group; others represented a broader age-range. Rohlen (1983:195-196) notes with surprise that senior high school students in Japan are referred to as 'children' (*kodomo*), contrasting this attitude with 'the American understanding that high school students are, if not adults, largely adult and properly viewed and treated as adults' as they gain independence. Ackermann (2004:68) imputes that general use of the term *kodomo* must place unwarranted social pressure on older youths by causing 'the 17-year-old' to identify with 'the same social status and... self-image as the 12-year-old.' As M.White (1993:11,45,105; see also Rohlen 1983:278-279) explains, however, adolescence does not feature as a life-stage in indigenous Japanese psychologies, while 'teenager', a recent linguistic borrowing popularised through the consumer/media industries and focussed on 15 year-olds, has no clear age-range and no associations with conflict and rebellion as in America.

In Shizuoka, growth toward maturity occurred across age cohorts and along gender lines. Gender differences were clearly articulated. They were made explicit through language, as described below, and through gender-linked behavioural patterns and social roles.[18] Although a gradual growth toward maturity was anticipated, there was widespread reluctance, even among parents, for people to admit they were 'mature'. As one interviewee explained, although everyone looked up to an older person, the older person would not want to be thought 'older' or 'wiser' or 'more mature' as such descriptions were considered negative.

Maturity was not desired by young people in Shizuoka as a mark of being 'grown up', as in Wellington. In the Japanese language, 'wise', 'clever', and 'smart' (i.e. 'intelligent') were said to mean 'all the same thing', conveyed through the same term (*kashikoi*). While it was

---

[18] Gendered qualities are discussed in Chapter 3. Gendered roles are discussed in Chapter 5.

agreed that wisdom was generally honoured, its value was said to lie 'just on the surface' as 'most people would rather be seen as a young person, meaning more immature'. Claims by a person to maturity were associated by others with that person's failure to observe modesty; or they were associated with attitudes that, because they showed unwillingness to be co-dependent and adjust for harmony, were considered selfish. Thus a typical response to the statement: 'You're wise', would be deflected by: 'No, my grades were bad when I was at school.'

In Shizuoka, the tendency to deny maturity and remain youthful was also associated with people of middle age. The desire noted in some older adults in Wellington to adopt the language and lifestyles of younger people, however, did not occur in Shizuoka. Working men, for instance, would not bleach their hair or wear earrings. While adults in Shizuoka did not want to claim maturity, the need to maintain place kept people in recognisable cohorts. Even so, life was compartmentalised. In certain situations older people would 'let go' and act youthfully, especially when alcohol was present, yet such activity did not imply that demeanours associated with older people were compromised, nor that older people were trying to identify with a younger age group.

People told me that while twenty was thought an important age, it did not imply a state of being 'grown up'. Only two university graduate students in their twenties thought they had begun to approach being *otona*, most saying they were 'far from getting there' or even 'still a child'. Women younger than thirty (but also men) also disliked being thought *otona*, considering remarks such as 'you are mature' negatively. To them, being thought older carried the threat of becoming an obasan (an 'aunt') or ojisan (an 'uncle') to someone younger, a status hinting at the approach of middle age.[19] Thirty was thought the age by which a person should be married and (particularly in the case of men) starting a career, and these events carried with them impending new responsibilities and obligations. Yet even the age of thirty, which was considered an important milestone, did not herald a final point of adult arrival.

In Shizuoka, relative ages established the form social relations would assume. Informants pointed out that as age difference was so important, an awareness of age was inculcated from early in life (see also Hendry 1984:109). People would often ask me my age (as they

---

[19] *Obasan* and *ojisan* are literally 'aunt' and 'uncle', but can also refer to a middle-aged man or woman.

would of others), or ask for the Buddhist animal year of my birth, in order to establish proper relations. University students now in their twenties told how throughout school, and especially in Junior High school, the significance of age difference was drummed into every student. Younger students at school had to acknowledge and greet more senior students by bowing and addressing them with honorifics and polite forms of speech. In return, seniors did not need to bow or use honorifics and could ignore a greeting if they so wished. University students remembered how, in Junior High school, respect practices were 'rules' and, even when disliked, were never questioned and always obeyed.

When high school students listed three things they would find difficult about being *otona*, they included 'to have a pure heart and thoughts'; 'to show resolve instead of weakness'; 'to show manners and endurance'; 'to show proper thinking, acting and speaking'; and 'not to act immaturely'. These concerns were linked to attributes of intellectual independence and emotional control, both of which were considered important signs of being grown up. These descriptions revealed that students took social expectations of obligation and respect, and the need to learn to maintain a proper place, very seriously. As will be seen, such considerations counterbalanced thoughts of freedom and opportunity which, in Wellington, tended to dominate students' ideas of approaching adulthood.

As in Wellington, high school students in Shizuoka were aware that legal restrictions curtailed certain activities. Except for age restrictions on driving and on earning the minimum wage (of concern to around 40%), most students were indifferent to them. However, to about a quarter of the students legal restrictions were a problem. In addition, almost half the high school students thought the drinking age should be lower, and almost a third thought the smoking age should be lower. Similar numbers thought the ages at which restrictions were set were neither fair nor logical. Interestingly, when students were asked to list three things that they would find enjoyable when they were 'grown up' (*otona*), almost a fifth of those who replied nominated being able to drink alcohol and/or smoke, and these activities ranked highest over all other suggestions, such as being free to manage time and make choices, or having a career or a job. The Coming of Age Day lifting of legal restrictions on drinking alcohol and smoking, which was celebrated by many young people, accounted for associations they made between reaching the age of legal majority and being *otona*. Since these activities were balanced by the 'difficult things' students identified with *otona*, which could be realised only through time, they did not indicate that

students thought they had 'become adult' in the Wellington sense. As one mother wrote on her questionnaire: 'If you watch coverage of the Coming of Age Day ceremony on the news, there is usually more emphasis on rights/privileges. But isn't education [in values] from a young age at home just as important?'

In line with the postwar extension of voting rights to all over twenty, the Coming of Age Day theoretically celebrated attributes of democracy. However, as young people in Shizuoka were acculturated in a language of gender distinction and hierarchised respect, the egalitarian democratic adulthood suggested by the postwar constitution was in reality extremely muted. The age of twenty did not suggest to young people I interviewed an ability to stake out rights as equal citizens, nor that they could effectively create their own lifestyles through free choice. Nor were these attitudes suggested in questionnaire results. Further, while half the teachers in each school affirmed there were classes in civics, the comprehension of citizenship in Shizuoka, as mentioned, differed from that in Wellington. Also, compared with almost half the Wellington students who were ready to vote, just one high school student thought s/he would enjoy being able to vote as an adult, and just one other that s/he would enjoy contributing to a changing society.

The Coming of Age Day ambiguously cast democratic civic maturity over a young population having no interest in voting and no real concept or experience of egalitarian democracy. Further, the traditional kimono worn by women reflected a historical period before women had been granted the franchise and before notions of gender equality were written into the constitution. Kimono were identified with values associated with hierarchy and respect. At the same time, these values conflicted with an emerging assertiveness and independence in women causing ambivalence about their social roles. What the Coming of Age Day continued to emphasise, however, was the marriageability of men and women over twenty and their readiness for taking on an 'apprenticeship'—whether through tertiary education, a family business or employment—into gendered roles. Despite a legal maturity that included democratic rights, life's transitions were understood to stretch ahead in accordance with certain qualities, values and expectations in ways that, as will be seen, contrasted markedly with those in Wellington despite some areas of convergence. Thus, although young people in Shizuoka attained legal adulthood at an age identical to that of young people in Wellington, their concepts of personhood were very different. In place of expectations among young people in Wellington of a relatively short transition to

autonomous independence, young people in Shizuoka anticipated growth into personhood as measured transitions over decades.

2.2.3. Principles mediating social relations in Japan

Values and attitudes basic to social relationships in Japan are tied to structured principles. Here I give a simple outline of these principles, as subsequent discussions about values and attitudes concerning self and personhood are dependent on them.

Descriptions of life in Japan refer to paired concepts that together form interlinked sets. The paired concepts are consciously employed and linguistically paired. These dualities are the principles by which a person creates order in his or her mental and physical universe, and provide the organisational base for knowledge of how to relate to all other people in different situations. There are no equivalent dualisms in New Zealand through which human relations must be negotiated. The concepts include at least four paired notions: 1) 'outside' versus 'inside' (*soto: uchi*); 2) 'outside/front' versus 'inside/back' (*omote: ura*), which can refer to spatial arrangements of identity (in the sense of 'outside others' versus 'inner group'), or to aspects of self, when 'face' is opposed to 'inner reality'; 3) 'façade' or 'surface frame of reality' versus 'truth' or 'inner feeling' (*tatemae: honne*); and 4) 'social obligation' versus 'human or personal feeling' (*giri: ninjo*). For these and other related concepts see Doi 1981:33-44; 1988:23-58, 151-156.

Doi (1988:158, 162) refers to these paired notions as sets operating across a 2-fold structure of consciousness, where those concepts denoting the 'inner' side (*uchi, ura, honne* and *ninjo*) sometimes interchange and merge with each other, as do those denoting the 'outer' side (*soto, omote, tatemae,* and *giri*). The two streams always remain in consciousness as oppositions. Doi suggests that the 2-fold structure is founded on a universal human trait that occurs as a child learns to distinguish between what to say and what not to say in front of others. He further argues that the trait was 'cultivated to an unusual extent in Japan so that it has come to represent a definite pattern of living'. These oppositions were consciously known, used and easily articulated by my informants (see below).

Gradations from open familiarity to formal distancing, along which every relationship in Japan is established, are socially structured according to these demarcations of 'inner' and 'outer'. True 'inside' relations are found among family members. For this reason, the family is not 'grown out of' in the way it is in Wellington as young people mature and

63

become independent. Through socialisation a person learns how and where to place a boundary between 'inner' and 'outer' in relations with members of other groups (in addition to family) to which s/he belongs. A person also learns how and where to place boundaries between group identities and outsider non-group relations. It is as a member of these various groups, rather than as an individual self as in Wellington, that a person achieves his or her sense of identity. The degrees of insideness or outsideness a person will observe with another person can vary according to situation, according to who else is present, and according to who may join or leave the group. Boundaries distinguishing 'inner' and outer' are continually shifting, even within a single occasion of meeting (Bachnik 1992; Koschmann 1993), as the line of demarcation (*kejime*) separating 'inner' from 'outer' is never static. '[A] Japanese can move adroitly from one standpoint to another, so adroitly in fact that we are not sure which is *omote* and which is *ura*. The distinction, however, never disappears.' (Doi 1988:152).[20]

Symbolic representations denoting degrees of inclusion or exclusion are found everywhere. As well as through language use (see below), degrees of inclusion-exclusion are revealed by shades of deference indicated, for example, through a person's bowing or not bowing, or through the depth of the bow, or rituals of exchange, or the degree to which 'face' is maintained. Rituals at the house-threshold or at school, such as the removal of shoes, and rituals of purification for hygiene and health (Ohnuki-Tierney 1984), protect the 'inside' from the dangerous 'outside'. Knowledge of how not to offend, or of when to extend courtesies, preserve the formalities of balance and harmony that every person, in order to be socially accepted, must learn. So fundamental to relationships are distinctions between inner and outer, and so necessary is the knowledge of how to manage relationships on the foundation of what is in and what is out, of who is in and who is out, and by how much and in which situations, that training in how the concepts are applied begins in infancy (Hendry 1984, 1986; Tobin 1992). Mastery over these concepts in all aspects of daily life is important for living. As Doi (1988:154) has frequently been quoted as saying: 'A Japanese is not considered to be an adult [i.e. *otona*] until he has become aware of these distinctions.' When referring to a person who can act in all situations using these concepts,

---

[20] *Kejime* is a distinction, a division, or a mental act of demarcation. According to Tobin (1992:24), *kejime* refers to 'the knowledge needed to shift fluidly back and forth between *omote* and *ura*'; and according to Bachnik (1992:157), '*kejime* consists of the decision of how much *omote* versus *ura* one wants to convey'. A more visible sign of demarcation (*kejime*) is the left-twisted rope (*shimenawa*) that is tied around trees thought sacred to Shinto throughout Japan and also hung over house thresholds at New Year. The rope marks the *kejime* separating any purified region from an impure region beyond.

one informant told me: 'We say, "that person has *kejime*." ' Another informant pointed out that, by age thirteen, young people 'know how to act like [as do] adults with adults.' That is, by the beginning of Junior High school, a person in Japan has acquired the knowledge of how to conduct social relations with people of all ages in all social categories, understanding when to switch modes in each changing social situation.

Besides the sets of dualities and *kejime*, principles that mediate social relationships in Japan concern systems of rank, where deferential respect is shown to those of higher rank. Included here are hierarchically ranked positionings of men over women (which can be reversed through age and status differences), of older persons over those who are younger, and of persons with more social status over those with less. In noting how, in Japan, the absence of an individual birth certificate defines a person within a network of human relationships, Ohnuki-Tierney (1984:216) coincidentally outlines concepts of rank within the family:

> A person is born into a family and is recorded in the family registry as the first son, the fourth daughter, and so on, of the head of the family, who is usually a male... In Japanese kinship terminology, there is no word equivalent to 'sister' or 'brother'; both the address and reference terms for sibling include 'younger' or 'older'. For example '*ane*' (the reference term) or '*onesan*' (the address form) means older sister, not simply sister. The same applies to kinship terms for male siblings.

Ideas of rank are thus instilled from the first years.

Social hierarchy was noted and deferred to as a part of normal daily life. One young woman, for example, conveyed how notions of rank permeated social relations through an incident at a local bank. The woman and her mother, who thought they had been rudely treated by a bank teller, made a formal complaint. The bank manager sent a representative to their house to apologise to 'the professor' (the woman's father, who happened to be out) who had neither made the transaction, nor the complaint, but whose status ranked high. The mother and daughter deduced that the bank manager had checked their background and, wanting to be well thought of by 'the professor', and in order not to lose face, had sent the representative with an apology.

Recognition and affirmation of hierarchy and place are parameters within which 'being a person' is conducted. These cultural forms are reinforced through the Japanese

language.[21] Through informants in Shizuoka I learnt that language was used to demarcate lines of difference between people of differing status, between family members and neighbours, and between neighbours and people of a far city.[22] I was told it was possible, for example, to distinguish insiders from outsiders through action verbs and verb endings since verb endings have honorific and humble forms. Honorifics were used to honour someone or be polite. Humble forms were used to speak about a person's own family to someone higher (in polite conversation an addressee was always considered higher, even when of equal social standing). As well, there were different language modes, usually referred to as casual, rude, plain, and polite. The casual mode however could have honorific and humble forms, just as the polite mode could have regular, humble and honorific forms.[23] In the polite mode, the humble form would be used by a person when speaking of him- or herself in relation to his or her insiders. The honorific form would be used by a person when speaking with outsiders. The distinction between insiders and outsiders could change, however, depending on the context. For example, an office worker talking to her boss directly would use the honorific form when talking about him, and use the humble form when talking about herself. When talking to a customer, however, she would use the humble form when talking about her boss, who in this case would be her insider, while the customer was her outsider. Even when a person was within the family group, respect required the use of honorifics, although this could change when speaking to outsiders. Thus a son would use respect terms to address his parents, but in speaking to outsiders would always refer to his parents in the humble form.

In describing the exactness of such language, one young woman commented: 'Because we are trained to be so linguistically aware of insider-outsider differences, we want to make sure the difference is always clear.' This need for clarity called for the strict use of *kejime*

---

[21] While different forms of address systems cannot be compared in terms of different measures of people's feelings, they nevertheless reflect different ideologies and indicate different types of consciousness: a simple address system composed of dyads (as in English) ignores social distinctions while complex address systems draw attention to them (Braun 1988:64-65).

[22] Insiders are *uchi no moto* = inside/of/persons = 'persons of inside'.
Outsiders are *soto no moto* = outside/of/persons = 'persons of outside'.

[23] The example given to me was 'to go somewhere':
 Casual form: *iku*
 Plain form: *ikimasu*
 Polite form: - regular: *ikimasu*
         - humble: *mairumasu*
        - honorific: *miemasu*

(boundary placing). For instance, when referring to someone in the third person, even when all pronouns were omitted, the addition of direction verbs would be used to indicate whether the person was 'inside' or 'outside' to the speaker. The example given referred to the various ways one person could inform another person that a man had phoned. In every instance the verb was used alone without pronouns (e.g. 'Called.' instead of 'He called me.'), but by adding the appropriate suffix to 'called' the listener would know whether that person was inside or outside her group. Maturation into personhood demanded perfecting the ability to signal these demarcations efficiently and precisely.

The literature on language use in Japan clarifies that as pronouns, nouns, verbs, and verbal prefixes and suffixes all convey gradations in distance, rank, respect and intimacy, word choice is very important. And pronoun choice is always problematic (Nakamura 1967:182).[24] Context free utterance is therefore rare, precluding radical challenge to social structures. The immediate reality of speaker and addressee determines the level and the form of address. It also places an individual in circumstances where the self is never constant but is always shifting in relation to others (Nakamura 1967:181-182; Ohnuki-Tierney 1987:23). Misuse of correct shifts can have a negative affect on a person's image.

Language use is also gender specific. Ide (1997:51, 64) points out that in Japan, where 'the inferior status of women is axiomatic', women's speech is by expectation soft, gentle and formally polite. Hendry (1993:53) mentions cases where forms used mainly by men are being adopted by women and girls in order to emphasise their inherent equality with men. One informant told me that the use of final particle endings is changing to emphasise a difference in generation (younger/older) rather than a gender difference. Again, in interviews conducted in Japanese on my behalf, graduate student interviewees used the honorific form when speaking of their parents to indicate gratitude for how they were raised and for what their parents had done for them. My translator remarked that, as interviewees should use the humble form when speaking to an interviewer (an outsider), this use of the honorific form was very unusual and therefore interesting. She suggested that the interviewees might have wanted to show a positive regard and emotion for insiders,

---

[24] Because pronouns, prefixes and suffixes indicate rank, they also indicate feeling. Any choice that selects for attitudes that are humble, or respectful etc. may also intentionally or unintentionally be selected to convey attitudes of hatred, disrespect, flattery, dismissal etc. through that same choice (Nakamura 1967:180; Hendry 1993:56-57).

reversing the trend of putting insiders 'down' (a way to show respect for outsiders).[25] Although people would always be expected to say positive things about outsiders, the translator mentioned that her own parents now switched attitudes to match different cultural expectations of those with whom they were speaking, alternating between praise for their daughter in front of Westerners, and a lowering of their daughter in front of Japanese.

As will be seen, and in contrast to the situation in Wellington, gendered roles were factored into how young people and their parents perceived self and personhood. Despite changes in language usage, it is nevertheless reasonable to suggest that men and women were locked into gender roles as much by language as by social expectation.

2.2.4. The issue of respect

Language and language use, recognition of social hierarchies, and attitudes of respect are so closely inter-related in Shizuoka that issues of respect are included here as a sub-section to the previous discussion.

In Shizuoka, informants appeared confused by my attempts to explain New Zealanders' concepts of autonomous independence, rights and equality, and New Zealanders' assumptions that the attainment of independence enabled adult people to freely choose the conditions of their lives and social relations. They indicated that their outlook could only differ since, despite increments in their age, they would always be indebted to others and need to show respect to older persons ('older' in Japan can mean one year older) and thus would never attain such an 'arrived' state of freedom.

Some scholars (Mathews 2004; S.Mori 2004) suggest that choices made by some young Japanese represent a conscious desire to reject a social order based on deference to seniority. Other scholars (Kotani 2004; McVeigh 2004) argue that young people and their parents are socially and politically conservative. Based on my research, there is no conscious rejection of the social order despite some attitudinal change.

When defining 'respect', older informants in Shizuoka included an appreciation of, and visible show of, deference to persons who were knowledgeable or senior, and deference to

---

[25] As this particular set of interviews was being done on my behalf, those interviewed may have elevated their parents as if speaking through the interviewer to me, a Westerner.

those who were of higher social status. Informants nevertheless suggested that attitudes to respect were changing. Older people regretted the loss of language skills as they remembered them, just as they regretted a waning in respect shown to seniors. Some senior staff members at schools and universities willingly admitted to me that they did not know all the codes of respect. Although respect language was affirmed at home and in school, one father I interviewed (a journalist) placed his discussion of loosening attitudes toward respect in the wider context of a generation gap. He noted that some members of the parent generation were sufficiently appalled by attitudes of some school students to refer to their children's generation as *uchu-jin* ('creatures of outer space'), *isei-jin* ('aliens') or *gaikoku-jin* ('foreigners'). As will be seen, these generalisations sometimes typed an entire generation through reference to extreme cases of sociocultural divergence.

As did parents in Wellington, the majority (73%) of parents in Shizuoka agreed that today's high school students were less respectful towards seniors than their own generation was at the same age. Similarly, most teachers (75%) thought this generation of high school students, when compared with others in the past ten years, showed less respect to older people and less respect to teachers, even though teachers tried to teach attitudes of duty and respect toward self and others. On the other hand, high school students generally thought that they *were* respectful to their seniors. The majority of high school students said they related to the parents of their friends and to teachers with polite conversation. Of those who played sport (many had no time for sport), the majority said they used polite conversation with their coaches, while 10.8% said they related to their coach with 'great respect'. By comparison, only 4.73% of the students said they related to the parents of friends, and to teachers, with 'great respect'.

Interviews and discussions provided some idea of what respect implied. Informants indicated, often by default, a correlation between respect and worthiness. One (non-Japanese) high school teacher I interviewed, for instance, said respect shown by high school students to teachers was mostly negative conformity, occurring more because teachers stood on a dais than because it was earned. Similarly, a high school student suggested that teachers holding double standards, in that they expected students to endure harsh winters in flimsy uniforms while they themselves dressed warmly, did not deserve respect. Another (non-Japanese) teacher indicated a correlation between showing respect and controlling the emotions. He agreed that respect for teachers was mostly a formality

yet nevertheless welcomed it, arguing that formal respect provided students with a sense of self-discipline and prevented students from losing control and lashing out. In another case, respect was associated by students with maintaining proper relations, such as keeping conversations with parents of high school or other senior friends on a formal level.

Several school teachers (who were also mothers of high school children) recalled their own childhood experiences, offering comparative explanations for a lessening of respect for teachers. Associating fear with respect, she suggested that because the fear of teachers had disappeared, respect had in turn decreased. Another suggested that, because teachers and parents were now educated to the same degree, students did not respect teachers today as they had in the past when teachers knew more than parents. Thus respect was acknowledgement of authority and the control of a desired resource.

In explaining 'feelings of' respect, university students suggested that respect language was used for those who helped people, or for people who were trusted. One named his diving instructor as someone he respected for that reason, another named the senior students in his senior project team, while a third named his parents. These traits connect respect with seniors who share a person's concerns. Another member of this group respected his teacher from high school, whom he still consulted, because the advice given by him was always 'right on target'. A female student said she felt respect for 'someone who leads using his thoughts or ideas', even when the person was younger. These students associated respect with valued knowledge. Despite distinctions between the categories of respect that were 'felt' toward another and the convention of respect shown toward others, all students agreed that visible and spoken signs of respect were important and 'part of being Japanese'.

High school student respect for schoolteachers and seniors was maintained through language use and social formalities (*tatemae*) over and above genuine feelings (*honne*). As both family and work environments encouraged deference and respect, reluctance by a person to show respect jeopardised their own or their family's social place. Parents as well as teachers indicated that, although the 'felt' substance attached to respect might have lessened, negative conformity was still important for *tatemae* (the outward form of social obligation), and most young people with whom I spoke agreed.

While parents both in Wellington and Shizuoka mentioned a reduction in respect in young people, cultural expectations and values in each society place respect issues into such

different categories that direct comparisons are extremely difficult. In Shizuoka, respect relationships acknowledged the worth, helpfulness and knowledge of others, indicating an 'ethics of indebtedness' (Benedict 1989) together with an appreciation of *tatemae*. In Wellington, the lessening of respect in young people implied the replacement of authority by negotiated rights and equality in social relations, yet I found little indication in Shizuoka that a reduction in respect was accompanied by concepts of equality. In Shizuoka, respect language and formal signs of respect continued to uphold hierarchical principles, even though the degree to which they did so was said to have lessened in relation to the past.

2.3. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In Wellington, personhood and maturation in young people was associated with their 'being adult'. The concept of adulthood held by young people and their parents in Wellington was that of a state of being into which young adults arrived in their late teens or early twenties. It was the final state in a series of states that involved stages of growth and maturity. Adulthood implied qualities of maturity, responsibility and independence. Ideally, attaining these qualities was consistent with the attainment of full legal adulthood at twenty years of age, give or take a few years. Stepped legal ages created some frustration and cynicism among young adults yet encouraged in them a desire for full legal adulthood as a sign that immaturity and restraints attendant on minors had been overcome. Attaining adulthood implied an inner transformation and the realisation of an autonomous self. This self was identified with a rights-based independence focussed on the independent person rather than on answerability to the collectivity, although values of tolerance, equality and fairness associated with egalitarian democracy were considered important. A perceived equality between the genders encouraged a focus on young people's becoming autonomous, gender-neutral *adult* individuals rather than culturally differentiated men and women.

In Shizuoka, the timing of a person's maturation was not closely identified with gaining legal adulthood as in Wellington. In Shizuoka legal adulthood represented the attainment of rights and responsibilities in a few areas of a person's life, namely, the right to vote, to marry without parental consent (but see Chapter 5), to drink alcohol and to smoke. Unlike in Wellington, where people conceived of a clear and relatively abrupt (from late teens to early twenties) transition to a state of autonomous adulthood, parents and young people in Shizuoka anticipated transitional changes throughout the entire course of a person's life.

These transitions did not imply growth toward autonomy but involved a self-in-relation with others, where a person's social place and relations with others were determined through gendered roles, seniority and status. Young people in Shizuoka, therefore, did not—as did young people in Wellington—seek to 'claim' or 'own' their lives as adult individual selves in an egalitarian environment. In Shizuoka, young people's relations and identification with others were conceived of as being a part of a whole social fabric. These relations were, in different and changing situations, always established with precision and reinforced through use of language and boundary-placing (*kejime*) that together marked out gender distinctions, seniority and status as well as gradations in relations between inclusion and intimacy on the one hand, and distance and respect on the other. Rather than claiming autonomy as a sign of maturity, as in Wellington, young people in Shizuoka anticipated a slow development toward full social maturity in middle life.

As will be further elaborated in Chapter 3, development toward 'being adult' in Wellington accentuated biological, emotional and intellectual growth toward autonomous independence. In place of the inner struggle for separation and autonomy sought by Wellington students, young people in Shizuoka sought through self-discipline to transform themselves through time into good (social) persons (M.White and Levine:1986), able 'to show proper thinking, acting and speaking'. Ideas of development in Wellington may support psychological theories that human development peaks at the end of adolescence (summarised by Drewery and Bird 2004:11-15,17-20) yet these theories are at variance with Shizuoka students' anticipation of transitional changes throughout their lives (see also Rohlen 1976), and the twenty to thirty year-old age group's denial of maturity and of being *otona*.

Of greater significance, perhaps, in the formation of these different perceptions of growth into adulthood in Wellington and Shizuoka was a variation in notions of national belonging and state allegiance. In Wellington, a relatively abrupt transition to an autonomous adulthood that more or less coincided with the attainment of full legal adulthood at twenty implied 'an autonomous legal personality deriving citizenship not through family or kinship but in its own right' (Fortes1984:114). That is, becoming 'an adult' and 'adult citizen' meant assuming civil rights as an autonomous person. The idea that autonomy adhered to legal adulthood was, however, absent from perceptions in Shizuoka where, as already discussed, citizenship was determined through and associated with familial

allegiances recorded in the *koseki* (family register) system. In Shizuoka, becoming legally 'of age' did not convey notions of independent autonomy as a citizen of Japan.

Several concepts held by students in Wellington correlated with and perhaps partially echoed libertarian views of the day. The students' extremely self-focussed concept of responsibility (see also Chapter 3) obscured a sense that citizenship implied responsibility to other citizens, and upheld the supremacy of the individual as a self-sufficient entity possessed of the same freedoms and choices that libertarians associated with competitive voluntary contract. Jesson et al. (1988:17) suggest that, in cases where market competition reflects not simply individual strengths but also matters of class, ethnicity, and gender, a focus on self-interest alone is insufficient as the basis for social organisations or the functioning of a society. Thus it will be seen that, among high school students in Wellington, student affirmations of gender equality and the 'sameness' of adulthood for men and women encouraged both young men and women to seek and develop a career, yet assumptions that individuals shared free and equal access to work through individual merit overlooked a social reality where more permanent highly paid positions were held by men than women.[26] Further, men's incomes were on average higher than women's incomes and, since women's careers were often interrupted by the birth and care of children, more women needed to work part-time than men.[27]

Two striking themes in student-parent relations in Wellington, namely, an emphasis on student-parent negotiation in place of the parent generation's obedience to parental authority and the need for a young person to take control and 'be oneself', paralleled Gullestad's (1996) descriptions of parent-child relations in Norway, where a rhetoric of negotiation and independence had replaced a former emphasis on 'obedience' and 'being of use'. As in Wellington, where similar generational changes (Park 1991:29-34; Rosemarie Smith 1991:76) can be linked with economic transitions from a social

---

[26] In 1997, 13.6% of the male workforce and 8.9% of the female workforce were legislators, administrators and managers: 11% of the male workforce and 15% of the female workforce were professionals. Among European New Zealanders, the male median income was $660 per week while the female median income was $550 per week (*New Zealand Official Year Book* 1998:310, 321).

[27] In 1996, almost 8 out of 10 workers receiving an annual income above NZ$40,000 were male, while just over 6 out of 10 workers receiving an annual income below NZ$10,000 were female. For all workers aged 24-64 years, the highest female median income was lower than the lowest male median income regardless of age, and gender was the dominant factor. Of the male work force, 59.6% worked full-time and 8.6% worked part-time. Of the female workforce, 34% worked full-time and 19.1% worked part-time (*New Zealand Official Year Book* 1998:320-321).

democratic consensus to a more libertarian philosophy, Gullestad argues for a correspondence between economic and sociocultural changes in Norway. Gullestad (1996:26) links sociocultural changes with 'an accelerated globalization of capital, information, ideas and lifestyles, as well as… changes in production processes'. She describes this complex as the variously termed 'late' or 'advanced' capitalism which she links with the sociocultural 'post' or 'late' modernity depicted by Giddens (among others). That is, Gullestad's analysis upholds Giddens' perceptions of a global progression from 'classic modernity' to 'transformed modernity'.

As noted in my introduction, an Anglo-American model of modernity is not globally valid and does not represent modernity in Japan. When summarizing shifts in economic theory during the second half of the twentieth century, Berger (1996) depicts a period in the 1950s and 1960s when, based on an assumption that technological imperatives 'would pull modern liberal politics in [their] wake' (Berger 1996:14), theoretical economic models converged globally. By the 1990s, however, these views were largely replaced by a recognition that valid and alternative forms of capitalism—such as the market-based economies of the United States and England, and the societal and state coordinated economies of Japan and Germany—coexisted, each type being characterised by different institutions, practices, values and politics. Within this framework, the 1980s New Zealand economic model advocating an open, deregulated contractual market aligned with the economies of the United States and England.

More recently, as described by Berger, renewed arguments have surfaced on behalf of economic convergence, based on assumptions that some institutions and rules for capitalism are unique and natural, and therefore more legitimate, than others. According to this view, systems based on concepts of free and fair trade (as in the Anglo-American system) are seen to be unique, natural and legitimate whereas institutions and market rules of capitalism developed by late-comers (such as those of Germany and Japan) are considered as distortions of history, or unfairly shaped by powerful government or corporate groups. In a comprehensive study initiated by Berger and Dore (Berger and Dore eds.1996), however, no evidence has been found for a *de facto* 'global' convergence of economic institutions of production and distribution in advanced capitalist economies, while predictions concerning future convergence are uneven. Significantly, the 'world economy' is shown to be international rather than global (Wade 1996:84-85),

interdependent rather than integrated (Streeten 1996:354), and the universal adoption and application of any one single best practice is said to be unimaginable (Boyer 1996:30). Diverse institutional influences are argued to promote diverse yet rational alternative systems (Gourevitch 1996; Kester 1996; Kosai 1996). While *aspects* of convergence are deemed likely through the diffusion of best practice (Kester 1996; Kosai 1996), or through international negotiations over rules and institutions (Kahler 1996; Ostry 1996), it is also argued that integration of philosophies, policies, regulations and practices within each system imply that small institutional changes will leave national systems relatively untouched (Woolcock 1996). Moreover, specific attempts by any one nation to negotiate micro-changes in another nation's economy are shown to have failed in the past and—unless politically superimposed in a regional union such as the European Union—are thought unlikely to succeed in the future.[28] From a different perspective, two authors (Streeten 1996; Dore 1996) argue that some convergence could emerge should the opportunism of market forces erode the ability of national institutions to protect their particular sets of values, ways of life, and styles of community. Dore (1996: 373) argues that protective measures are necessary to safeguard differing ways of life, while Streeten (1996:353) points out that all economies, inclusive of free trade economies, are 'managed'.

Given the above, and although similarities can be drawn regarding socioeconomic transitions and cultural understandings in Norway and New Zealand, there are no grounds to assume that these same sociocultural progressions are occurring in Japan. On the contrary, just as we saw that no strict comparative parallels could account for the different respect relationships in Shizuoka and Wellington, so it will be seen with other phenomena that a different complex of values and understandings influenced and affected the perceptions and choices of young people and their parents in Wellington and Shizuoka.

---

[28] The Structural Impediments Initiative agreement of 1990, by which the United States attempted to initiate changes within the Japanese economy to redress a Japanese-United States imbalance of trade, failed to impose fundamental moves toward deregulation in the Japanese economy and was seen as an intrusive bilateral agreement (Upham 1996; Kahler 1996).

CHAPTER 3

QUALITIES ASSOCIATED WITH MATURATION AND PERSONHOOD

Different concepts of personhood in Wellington and Shizuoka implied that valued qualities in the maturation of young people in Wellington and Shizuoka lacked common ground. In this Chapter I continue the task begun in Chapter 2 of exploring the cultural complexities of personhood and maturation in Wellington and Shizuoka. My aim is to argue for different modernities, and to clarify and enrich our insufficiently developed understanding of young people's maturation into full persons by comparing quite different social contexts. My focus here will be on the range of qualities associated with full personhood. While, on the surface, some of the qualities valued in Wellington may appear similar to those regarded as important in Shizuoka, in reality they partake of quite different cultural logics and social structures.

In Wellington, in response to the questionnaire question 'What makes an adult?' students and parents, regardless of gender, identified four main qualities: maturity, life experience, responsibility and independence. In this chapter I explore how, in Wellington, the development of young people toward autonomous adulthood was associated with the need to attain these attributes. In Shizuoka, where personhood was identified with *otona* (maturity in mind), valued qualities associated with a person's development included responsibility, leadership, judgement, challenging spirit, honesty and harmony. I analyse perceptions of these and other qualities in terms of their significance and relative importance in the maturation of young men and women. Unlike in Wellington, maturation in Shizuoka does not imply the development of an 'autonomous individual'.

3.1. WELLINGTON ADULT MARKERS: MATURITY, LIFE EXPERIENCE, RESPONSIBILITY, AND INDEPENDENCE

A general consensus among parents and students that maturity, life experience, responsibility, and independence signified adulthood pointed to consistency in attitudes across the generations. In particular, the association of adulthood with every person's right to self-assertion and self-development as an autonomous individual implied a focus on the self over and above others. Fear of dependency in relations with others marked independence and freedom of choice as ethical, even moral, ideals (Rose 1999:83-97).

Attitudes in Wellington were consistent with those described for other Western societies where self-actualisation is seen as a moral affirmation of truth to self. Giddens (1991:80) notes that self and self-identity in the modern (Western) world implies a personal integrity where a person's 'first loyalty is to him [or her] self', while Swidler (1980:138-9) claims that the 'cultural legitimation of "selfishness" is in many ways a claim on behalf of adulthood'. Accordingly:

> The moral ideal is the person who is complete in him or herself, who is able to stand alone, whether or not she chooses to do so. (Swidler 1980:137)

The following analysis of student and parent understandings of maturity, life experience, responsibility, and independence illustrates what these qualities implied for adulthood, and how this knowledge affected student self-assessments in relation to becoming or being adult. Parents were not directly interviewed on these qualities and their comments are generalised.

3.1.1. Maturity

As discussed, in Shizuoka maturity was an undesired quality whose connotations of being clever and wise opposed values of modesty and remaining young. Wellington students and parents associated maturity with adulthood as a desirable quality.

Students in Wellington defined maturity as knowing how to draw boundaries and keep to rules, or as being realistic or 'intelligent' and 'sensible about things':

> [Maturity is] just that you've gone through life and… learnt things and… know how to deal with certain situations… You're mature enough to know what's best for you.

Accordingly, adults knew 'when to be mature and when to be joking' as maturity provided judgement. Maturity was therefore learned but also linked to an innate or intuitive ability to apply reason:

> Someone… [who is] not responsible… just won't mature. [You need to be] brainy enough to know not to do [things]… [Then] you might not need experience.

Students suggested that wider experience in paid work environments aided the maturation of young adults, while some doubted that students in a university or polytech environment could be 'properly' mature:

> When somebody leaves school at our age and is working fulltime [s/he] is likely to be more mature than we are because they've had a much larger dose of reality… The people… we know that are going to university… are likely to be young, slightly.

Attaining maturity was understood to be age-linked and described as 'growing out of childhood'. It was, as one student explained, achieved through resisting delinquent temptations:

> I've been taken to the police before for... throwing beer bottles on the road at the cars...
> I've matured a bit [since then]… [But] I've still got a devil in me.

Growth away from childhood toward maturity also allowed students to recognise ascending levels of development, with expectations that maturity would arrive with legal adulthood: 'By twenty most people are sort of considered as adult, as reasonably mature.' General associations made between maturity and adulthood could, however, be proven unreliable, as when older people appeared both adult and 'young':

> I'm the only kid in [my] whole theatre [group]. But… they're all really young people… Drama people… stay young… There's even a fifty year old guy… quite up with the play on… all the lingo… And it's quite… nice.

Associations between maturity and age were also confounded when adults were observed drunk and 'act[ing] more… immaturely… than you'd think they would… [for] their age':

> You… tend to think of adults as being more… self controlled and calm… But… I went to this party at my friend's house… There was a woman and she's… forty or something and she's acting like I'd expect a sixteen year old to act… Really having fun… really letting her hair down and stuff.

While experiences such as these led a few students to question whether all adults matured, their comments upheld the view that mature adults were expected to act their age and remain 'calm' and 'self-controlled'.

Friendships between younger and older people could also work against general correlations between adulthood and maturity. A twenty-year old who had attained adult status was not considered mature by one student who had known her as a friend for a long period of time:

> M... talks about herself a lot and her experiences and if you're talking to her… [you] remember when [you] did that… She's not really mature so I don't think of her as an adult. But then… she's married. And she has a job, and she pays her own bills and cooks her own food and everything.

A number of students suggested that maturity was a quality that could be assumed at will:

> I'm a child when I'm with my friends… I show off… I try and get attention... Not recently. With friends now [I] want to go out nightclubbing… I can... be immature when I want to… [or] I can be mature.

Students who associated maturity with the appearance and demeanour of an adult person were able to 'clothe themselves' with maturity. A belief that people rose to new levels of maturity, together with the notion that maturity would accompany adulthood at around the age of twenty, encouraged young people to 'try on' maturity, enabling them to assume and discard it at will. The association made between external physical appearance and dress made this possible:

> It would be from the way they look that I'd decide [if a person is adult]... And the way you dress. I mean if someone… is dressing [in]… trendy teenage clothes I wouldn't really think of them as an adult as much as if they were wearing… a suit or something.

By dressing and acting appropriately, or by applying makeup or assuming different hairstyles students were able to suggest they were older and more mature. One student described qualifying to enter a nightclub in this way:

> [I try to] look older… [I] stand tall… [and] just dress up… [I] don't wear jeans. [You] wear your dress pants. [And you] wear a tie... to get into the club… [and] take it off when you get inside.

Students were also adept at faking identity cards that 'legitimised' an assumed older age: 'Fake IDs are easy to get hold of. They cost about twenty dollars… [to] get a good one.' Some students owned a selection of identity cards, shuffling them to appear older or younger as the occasion demanded: 'I've got all these different IDs saying different ages.' The 'faking' and ready assumption of an external maturity in order to appear more adult illustrates the desire on the part of students to reach adulthood in order to enjoy its privileges and status. By the same token, a conscious adoption of alternating images either as young adults or adults illustrates that students placed a high priority on the ability to choose and control situations that involved the self.

In sum, attributes of maturity that students expected to acquire as they became adults included discernment, intelligence, good sense and judgement. These attributes complemented parents' ideas of maturity. Parents saw maturity as possessing a balanced outlook and the ability to make appropriate decisions, comprehending social and moral boundaries, and showing good judgement. The distinction students made between 'young' adults and 'mature' adults was occasionally dispelled by friendship, for instance, or because adults were 'immature' or acted young. These experiences were exceptional and did not erode associations made by most students between maturity and adulthood. Rather, student appropriations of more sophisticated images to gain access to the privileges and

status associated with being adult revealed a conscious awareness of the tight cultural connections between maturity, age and adulthood.

3.1.2. Life Experience

Over half the students interviewed referred to life experience as essential for becoming adult or a defining attribute of adulthood.

Students agreed that the kind of learning required for adulthood could not be taught at school:

> I don't think you really learn a lot… about [life at] school at all… [At school] you're merely training your brain… I think it [learning] is… done… within the theatre [of life]... You know… [in the] outside [world].

The 'outside world' referred to a social environment beyond the experiences of home and school. Parents were concerned that social problems and dangers faced by young people had increased since the time of their own youth. Problem areas most commonly mentioned were those associated with cars, easy access to alcohol, nightclubs and drugs, and the availability of new entertainment through video parlours. They also included the prevalence of sexually or intravenously transmitted diseases such as HIV, hepatitis and AIDS,[1] and increased violence, including bullying.

Looking back at their own youth, the majority of parents considered that the current social environment was more dangerous, and that young people confronted temptations at an earlier age. Speaking of her high school daughter one parent remarked: 'They got into Shooters and got into Barney's [both Wellington nightclubs]… It worries me… I didn't… drink or anything at that age.' This group of parents referred to their comparative naïvity when young, or their lack of similar experiences until a later age. However, a minority of parents held that exploration among young people was usual and that dangers had always existed. One father who, in the 1960s, identified with the Beatles and Rolling Stones, doubted that dangers were greater now than they were in his youth. Experimentation and mistakes were to be expected: 'It's just part of living… just part of the learning process.' This group of parents, however, conceded that the range of risks had multiplied: 'It's the

---

[1] AIDS was first identified in New Zealand in 1984. By the end of 1997, 641 people had been identified with AIDS, of which 501 had died, while 1231 were reported as testing HIV positive (*New Zealand Official Year Book* 1998:174).

availability [of choice] within society that's different.' Most of this group concurred with the more generally held view that:

> The whole of society has changed… There's just a lot more… danger out there for them, a lot more traps to fall into. And it's harder.[2]

Some parents, concerned about the early age at which young people were exposed to alcohol, drugs and alternative media viewpoints, thought childhood ended too early:

> They [young people] don't seem to have… much of a childhood… From thirteen on… they seem to want to do adult things instead.

Along with proliferating choices, parents worried that peer pressure increased the likelihood of major risk-taking. Parents said that peer pressure was 'probably more dynamic and complex just because of those sheer choices.' They worried that what was once considered daring was now thought 'cool' or sophisticated.

Parents also commented that the younger generation's attitudes to sex were more open than in their own time when sexual matters were 'left unsaid', where 'a lot of communication was by inference' and where 'you weren't necessarily given direct answers to questions'. One father mentioned that the Catholic College he attended taught: 'If you kissed a girl, that was going to lead to a sinful occasion', while one mother said:

> I didn't know how you got pregnant… We had no sex education at all… [For] most people my age… their mothers couldn't talk about sex, and neither could their fathers. And we had no sex education in schools.

Parents remarked that social inhibitions of their day concerning sex before marriage, lost female virginity and pregnancy before marriage, began to change from the 1960s with the availability of contraceptive pills for women. They noted with some relief that today's young people were better informed about sex and contraceptives even though the prevalence of STDs was a cause of anxiety. Many parents said that they encouraged open and frank discussions with their children about sex, and accepted or condoned sexual relationships among high school students. Parents also counselled their sons and daughters to develop a sense of responsibility, advising them against marrying and having children at an early age, encouraging them to keep their options open. As one mother commented:

---

[2] A measure of the increased 'danger' of concern to parents was the doubling of recorded crime in New Zealand. In 1978 there were around 2.5 million crimes known to police while in 1992 there were around 5 million crimes known to police (Pratt 1994: 216).

> At that age [seventeen] there's lots of options… because most of them [young people] aren't thinking that they have to hurry [to] quickly settle down and have a family… [If my son or daughter said they wanted to get married] I'd just about die of shock… Both of them… have said to me repeatedly: "I don't want to have kids yet. I don't want to get married."

Students understood life experience as risk-taking and exploring the 'outside world' in order to gain knowledge and become responsible. To some, learning about life meant making mistakes, while a few thought that *only* by making mistakes could a person know anything. Students' claims that maturity followed from experience clashed with the expectation of some parents that young people should be guided by parental advice alone. Protective barriers thrown around students by parents were often regarded as obstacles to the kind of learning required for coping one day as an adult. They preferred partial freedoms for life experiences that would ultimately lead to adult independence:

> By giving me my own freedom… she [i.e. mother] doesn't tell me what to do. She suggests things, but I don't have to do them. I don't have a curfew. I don't get grounded. I look after my own money [and] my own financial situation... I usually get myself about… It's like teaching life skills… If you learn to be dependent on your parents when you're younger, then when you go out in the world you just will fall down and crash… You just don't have that ability to stand on your own feet.

In order to the gain the experience necessary to become an adult, most students deemed it essential to leave home and become financially independent[3]:

> You have to start thinking about real things… [and] be practical and have the experience… [I] have all the ideals. [But] it's putting them into practice that really makes you an adult.

A few students, however, dismissed the relevance of life experience for attaining adulthood, since a younger person could have more experience than someone older, 'even more than someone that's thirty.' One concluded that the end point of experience was the achievement of individuality:

> I don't think it [life experience] makes you more of an adult… It just probably makes you... more different… [with] different outlooks… By the time you're eighteen or something... you've learnt who you actually are hopefully… I think you develop on that.

Most students, however, thought life experience was essential for becoming adult and 'making really good decisions about things':

---

[3] See Chapters 4 and 5.

You['ve] got to have freedom. You['ve] got to experience things… You['ve] got to undertake the problems of adults... You['ve] got to pay rent and look after yourself.

In sum, students used the term 'life experience' to indicate release into the 'world outside', freed from the bounds of school and parental authority. 'Life experience' also signalled knowledge gained through such experiences. For the majority of young people and parents alike, life experience was a prerequisite to adulthood, teaching young adults how to make viable choices and decisions in order to be competent and mature. In desiring to 'experience life' first hand, however, young people challenged the protective, counselling role of parents whose rules and expectations were considered restrictive, inhibiting transitions to autonomous independence.

3.1.3. Responsibility

Students viewed adult responsibility as a finite shift from being answerable to others to being answerable to self, described through comments such as: 'I take responsibility for my actions', or: 'I am responsible enough to look out for myself.' Self-responsibility also meant: 'Making sure you don't go to the pack.'

Concepts of self-responsibility encompassed several of life's domains, including 'personal hygiene' and 'being able to know what's healthy and keeping fit'. These concerns ranged from the avoidance of junk food and excessive indulgence in, as one student put it, 'sex and alcohol and both of them at the same time and... oh, yeah I guess I'd say drugs'. General wellbeing also meant taking responsibility for those aspects of personal appearance required for adult social acceptance: 'Keeping yourself looking tidy… grooming yourself… [and] wearing things which look... recognisable… as clothes.' These aspects of self-responsibility overlapped with concerns for self-definition and a chosen self-image.

An important aspect of adult self-responsibility was the ability to make independent decisions, free from the control and authority of others, and deal with 'all the different consequences' (Bellah et al.1985:23-24). Taking control of one's own life and destiny involved flatting[4] away from parents, or embarking on tertiary study. Self-responsibility meant deciding 'what you're going to do' and 'the direction where you want your life to

---

[4] 'Flatting' is a colloquialism meaning to rent and live in a house or apartment, usually with one or more other single people of either gender as a household.

go', and 'knowing what you want out of life and how to get it.' These visions of an adult future based on independent decisions implied adopting an independent lifestyle.

Financial autonomy was considered another important aspect of adult responsibility and self-reliance. In discussing financial responsibility students mentioned the ability to save and take judicious care of money, meet financial commitments and pay for accommodation. Only in dire circumstances would students ask family members for financial support, even while living at home:

> If I don't have money for something then [that is] totally my problem... I could ask for some, but I don't think I would because I think that it's my responsibility... But if it was something huge, like something really important to me... then… my parents would probably help me out.

Inexperience and novel situations sometimes made for unease about the responsibilities of approaching adulthood. One student recounted the anxiety she felt when boundaries were removed, and the relief at having met the standards of responsibility her parents expected of her:

> When I went away over the holidays I was quite… worried… Just being able to… drink all night, and… sleep on the beach if I wanted to… and being able to do things that I wouldn't be allowed to do normally. But... nothing like that happened… My parents would've been really proud... So I was really quite happy with myself about that. There was [sic]… thirteen of us girls but we met up with a whole bunch of guys from Auckland, and they… moved into our tent, and everything… was just, like, mixed.

Because of associated apprehensions, responsibility for financial and other matters was sometimes regarded as the 'down side' of approaching adulthood, as were legal aspects of responsible adulthood:

> When you're an adult you have to take responsibility… A year ago I could have done anything, even something illegal… It would go on my record but it would be… wiped off when I was eighteen... When you're an adult… you don't have that sort of security… Everything you do can be… brought up later.

A few students extended their concept of self-responsibility to responsibility toward others, or even for others. Being responsible 'to' others usually implied that one's actions should not impinge on others in a negative way. Students spoke of 'not endangering anyone's life', or not upsetting others by entering their space: 'You have to respect other people's... privacy and their views.' Responsibility 'to' others meant balancing behavioural options.

When someone acted foolishly or dangerously, there was a recognised limit to how much a person might interfere:

> It's really hard to tell someone, like a mate [not to do something dangerous]… if they want to do it. You can tell them what you think about it, but you can't really stop them. They have to make their own decision [and be] responsible for themselves.

A non-interfering responsibility to others is what most students had in mind through comments such as: 'You have to be able to relate with others well, [and] in a… proper way: in an adult kind of way.'

Some students associated responsibility with a respect from others that confirmed a sense of achieved adulthood:

> The majority [i.e. major thing] that makes you an adult is the respect you get from everyone… for being responsible… The respect I get from other people is more of an... adult respect. But at home it's got to be improved… It might happen… if I… settle down with a job and start being proper, and working myself financially and everything.

Correlations between adult status, responsibility and mutual respect (Lukes 1973:125) were hinted at by another student:

> I… don't think it [being adult] is entirely to do with you... It's to do with what other people think of you as well.

In addition to respect, one student mentioned trust as a quality that accompanied his responsibilities as team coach at school:

> They give me the keys to the gym. They trust me so I'm responsible for [them]… I… let everyone in [and] I lock up [and] put all the gear away.

Occasionally 'self-responsibility' included responsibility 'for' others. In some cases, the 'others' were animals. 'Other' people for whom responsibility was felt were referred to tangentially, perhaps through tasks performed on their behalf such as for family members: 'I've got a lot of responsibility at home. They know that I'm a responsible person. I do the housework.' A few students were responsible for others through babysitting, an experience which one student claimed made her feel 'more adult'. Alternatively, student perceptions of adult responsibilities for others were hypothetical: 'If you've got kids… [it means] looking after them ... If the wife has to go out somewhere [you must] babysit for her and so on.'

One student described various phases in a person's overall development, noting that responsibility for young children would occur in a later phase. In this case, independence preceded responsibility 'for' someone else, while self-responsibility indicated arrival into adulthood:

> I think you need to take responsibility for yourself... I think that's what becoming adult means. It means... taking responsibility for yourself a hundred percent… Being reliant on somebody… in my mind [is the] childhood stage, like being reliant on your parents… [You] then becom[e] independent. But then actually being responsible for somebody [else], I guess that's the next step from independence.

Self-responsibility, then, along with respect 'for' others was how young people conceived of responsibility as a marker of adulthood. Although students were sometimes divided over whether responsibility was more important than independence, it is clear from the above that the two went hand in hand. In the words of one student:

> I think they [i.e. independence and responsibility] go together… Completely… You can't have independence without responsibility... Otherwise you're just going to… completely flop whatever you do.

To a degree, parental conceptions of responsibility concurred with those of students. Parents, for instance, associated responsibility with self-accountability, the ability to make decisions and solve problems, and 'not blame others' for mistakes. They also included the kind of practical experience that enabled a person to 'look after' him or herself. Yet, unlike students, ten parents associated responsibility with 'accountability to others' through decisions made and actions taken, including legal responsibilities for children.

3.1.4. Independence
Students referred to independence in a number of ways and easily described its parameters. As one said: '[Being independent means] being able to survive on your own, being able to feed yourself, clothe yourself, pay the bills, have a roof over your head, [and] hav[e] a job.' And another student said of 'being independent': 'That's what I think a good adult is.' According to students, knowing how to be independent was acquired through 'trial and error', often with the help of parents who encouraged their young adult children who possessed 'some sort of intelligence' and who 'grasped things well' into taking sole responsibility for their lives.

Talk about independence was easier than its practice, however, as notions of independence ranged from the ideal and emotional to the material. School students who acquired a sense of emotional independence while still at home easily imagined they were almost adult, while ignoring issues of income and accommodation:

> [Being adult means] complete independence… You're completely in control of your own life. Your Mum can't say, "No, you can't go out," you know, "can't do this, can't do that," because you're an adult taking care of yourself. I think ... it just comes when you turn eighteen. When you leave school you just become an adult… Maybe it's different in each person's case. I think for me it will be when I leave school.

Some students who claimed they were already 'quite independent' were often merely confident that they could act independently, if and when put to the test. One student, for instance, who was still dependent on parents for food and shelter but 'felt' independent, did not doubt she would manage if asked to leave home. She would 'probably crash at a friend's house… hunt for jobs… [and] probably start looking for cheap flats'. Failing that, she would 'bludge off other people'. Independence for these students was equated with freedom from parental controls.

Some students imagined independence as the removal of condescending attitudes: '[As an adult] you don't get patronised. I mean that really sucks.' Others saw it as the removal of interference from others:

> I think basically… [independence means] standing on your own two feet, being able to stand up for yourself... [and] finding your own entertainment [i.e. pleasure].

Independence was also co-linked with freedom in a manner already described with reference to life experience. However, whereas students desired life experience in order to achieve independence, independence was associated with an achieved freedom to enjoy life. Often this view of independence was associated with 'some mode of [private] transport and... [a] supply of income [i.e. a job]', and hence was identified with material attributes and consumerism.

Independence as 'freedom to do what you want' involved anticipation of activities classed as being 'adult'. One student associated independence with: 'being able to do… fun… adult things… I love the whole idea of… being adult and going to a cafe and drinking coffee and having discussions.' Another was 'looking forward to all the privileges' of being adult:

> Pubs... [and] get[ting] into R18s [movies for those over 18 years].

Another imagined being adult as a university student in a flat in Auckland:

> Just to… have a bit of freedom and feel like an adult and… do what I want… [I could] work for my living and… not have to depend on them [my parents] all the time and not have to tell them where I'm going… Just not having to consult anyone and just being able to do impulsive things.

Independence was associated with self-sufficiency and self-reliance (Bellah et al.1985:55-56). Ideas of independence as freedom to make decisions (Lukes 1973:127-130) incorporated the same notions of self-centredness and self-responsibility previously mentioned. Although independent persons were portrayed as autonomous and morally self-responsible ('accepting the consequences' for 'your own decisions about everything'), students assumed that, when independent, they would have no responsibilities for others, including parents and other kin, a matter they considered 'quite important'.

Many day-to-day activities about which students desired to make their own decisions required negotiation with parents. These included times of access to the family phone, duration of calls, when and where students could socialise with friends at night and for how long, transport arrangements for social or sporting events, permission to drive the family car, and informing parents of their whereabouts. Students wanted more freedom to make decisions in order to learn how to be independent, arguing that coping with day-to-day problems would prepare them for making major decisions concerning their futures (Feldman and Elliott 1993). They saw it as a question of choice and control:

> [Choice is] just how everything works. Your whole entire life is a series of choices… all the time... As long as you can do that [i.e. make choices] you can to some extent control where your life is going… I think you've got to be in control.

Students often discovered that they were not always in control of the decisions they made. They therefore expressed a longing for experience and maturity to be wisely independent. One student described his confusion when ending a two-year relationship with his girlfriend:

> I'm hoping that I'm going to make a right decision… I can't really make up my mind. I think it'd do both her and I a lot of good… I sat for ages in the last two days, trying to make the right decisions and I don't know if that's responsible or not.

The inadequacy he felt was then compared to the future state of clarity he anticipated:

> [Maturity will come] when I've got my head screwed on a bit more… I know it's there but I just don't know how to use it at the moment. Not yet, but I'm slowly learning.

Students said that if parents made decisions about matters they considered their own, they felt their control had been usurped. When, for instance, a student's desire to leave school had been ignored, she felt bewildered yet resigned:

> I actually really wanted to leave school at the end of last year… I would've gone to varsity… I think at a certain point you can make your own decisions about when you've had enough of it… [My parents] didn't seem to respond… Mum was like, "You'll stay and do Seventh Form won't you?" And I was like, "Oh, suppose so"… This is just how it works.

During transition years toward independence, boundaries of control constantly changed. Some parents emphasised the need to value and esteem their children while giving them space to learn independence. They pointed to ethical traits such as trust and honesty, while allowing their children the freedom to try things out, encouraging them at the same time to speak out and question established ideas. By building constructive relations with their children and raising their consciousness, parents hoped to instil ideas of responsibility and good judgement. Other parents spoke of providing emotional and practical support, such as attending their children's sport matches, and providing the 'resources' to help them make appropriate decisions. Many saw the need to provide their children with 'an environment' that promoted the learning of rights and responsibilities, or 'a framework' allowing them to make choices. Some parents were willing to serve as a 'fall back', or a safety net in the event that their children met with problems. Nevertheless, most parents held firmly to the idea that each individual was responsible for the choices he/she made: 'You can only advise, that's all you can do… I can give them what I think, then it's up to them.' Or: 'They'll make their own… choices, and… [you hope] they can make their own rational judgements, and not screw up too much.'

Not only did parents expect their children to become independently responsible for their decisions and lives: they encouraged them to begin doing so from an early age. Parental attitudes that anticipated and encouraged independence were correspondingly met with their children's expectations that they could and should make decisions for themselves. Several parents mentioned the young age at which children began to assume control:

> My eight year old… is now in a situation where he will… by the time he's ten… start making choices [in such a way] that either of the parents may not have any control over [what he does or thinks]… That's the situation with M [his sixteen year old son].

Parents were quite negative toward attitudes they considered might encourage dependency. As one mother said:

> I think the whole exercise of helping your kids is helping them to become more and more independent… I don't believe that it's my job to make decisions for my children and I think that the younger that they can begin to make their decisions the better... I certainly don't see it as... the role of parents to try and create dependency.

Believing that children should be encouraged in the freedom of choice, parents concurred with the expression: 'It's her [or his] life.' As one parent observed: 'She's getting more mature and she'll do what she does, you know, whatever that is. She'll have to [take responsibility for her own actions] because there'll be no-one else there to [do it]… That's life.' Another parent expressed the general consensus that parents were not finally answerable for the actions of their young:

> If a child achieve[s] something, that is their achievement not their parents' achievement. And if a child bombs out and turns out badly… they can't blame the parents for the bad things they've done.

Few sanctions were available to parents to forestall or prevent decisions their young adult children made that verged away from parental hopes. Religious sanctions, by and large, had disappeared, as had social sanctions of shame. One mother, who anticipated that her daughter would gain tertiary qualifications, nevertheless enumerated possible choices her daughter could make in the future without causing shame:

> She could drop out and go and live in the bush… But she would still be who she is, and I think she's a neat person… And it's her life… I trust her to make choices that are appropriate for her… I'm not worried that she'll do something that'll ashame me or anything like that… because I'm not that concerned about what people think.

One student, in speaking of her mother, expressed the same sentiment:

> The way she's brought me and my brother up is that, "It's… your own life. And if you want to stuff it up then… so be it… if that's what you want to do. But if you… want to actually make something of your life then… I'll support you… It's… your life. You can do what you want."

Leaving home and having a job were regarded by most students as the ultimate signs of achieved adulthood. For most students, financial independence marked the divide between, on the one hand, financial dependence on parents and living at home (the two being correlated as living in a dependent state) and, on the other hand, autonomous independence and adulthood. Adulthood was so closely identified with financial independence that most students considered it crucial to have 'your own job' for the transition. As one student

remarked: 'It's important for getting there. I mean… you can't be a full adult [if you're still dependent].'

While wanting adult privileges, many students found the prospect of becoming financially independent daunting:

> I want to be a kid. I don't want to have to start thinking about huge things like student loans and money… Money's the big one.

One student regretted losing the financial security attached to childhood. Asked whether he was looking forward to becoming an adult, he replied:

> Not really… [I will] have to pay bills… pay for food and stuff. You know, pay out money… The cool thing I reckon about [being] a kid [is that] you get free everything really.

Students were also aware that young adults were not always successful in the wider world, as was the case for one student's older brother:

> He's still living at home. He's… totally dependent on Mum and Dad… He… lives from week to week on his pay… [He] hasn't saved anything [and] can't save. [He] gets [paid]… two hundred or three hundred bucks a week. That's gone… within the weekend. He'll never have anything.

As school ended, young people became responsible for paying board at home or supporting themselves in a communal flat. Students approved this attitude. As one student aiming to move to a flat at nineteen or twenty said: 'Next year I have to pay board [to my parents]. [At] eighteen, we pay forty bucks… That's fair… At eighteen you should be [independent].' Students planning a subsistence lifestyle flatting said they would take on part-time jobs or survive on loans. Associations between financial independence and adulthood became more tenuous in cases where tertiary students who, while classifying themselves as adults, were partially supported or financially indebted to their parents. A few students, however, accepted financial assistance from parents without a sense of obligation: 'I'm pretty independent of [responsibilities to parents and kin]… They [however] can contribute, for sure.'

The question whether adulthood *required* a person to leave home was debated among students. Most saw leaving home as the touchstone of adulthood:

> [Being an adult] means not relying on your parents to support you any more… If I was still living here [at home]… two years from now, I don't think I could call myself an adult.

Others were more equivocal. The issue concerned tertiary students who were not financially independent, presenting a contradiction of being adult and not having a career:

> I guess you'd be still considered an adult [as a tertiary student in your twenties]… I think [the age of] twenty is probably when everyone thinks you're an adult… But—oh it's kind of different, because you're studying for… your career or whatever… It's hard to explain… I'm not sure [if you would be an adult].

Students were more certain that having a job and a means of transport qualified a person as independent and adult while living at home, provided there was 'a decent understanding with your parents':

> [It means having] an agreement of what time you're going out and what time you're coming home and as long as they know where you're going to be, roughly, [it's fine].

Co-residence with parents, however, was always regarded as a temporary measure. Students considered it important to be permanently away from their parents' home, if not at the end of school then certainly within the following five years. People who remained living at home failed to 'grow up' and become properly adult:

> I know someone who's still living with his Mum and he's fifty five… He has no freedom… He's under her wing all the time. He hasn't been out… or without her… at all… He's just like an extra arm on her… It's not healthy. You've got to have your own… space.

Despite variations in attitude over accepting the need to become financially independent as school ended, and over delaying leaving home in order to gain further qualifications, financial independence was considered fundamental to self-responsibility, maturity, and personal freedom.

In sum, students at high school recognised the need for financial and material independence in order to live the separate life they identified with being independent and adult. They desired emotional independence from their parents and control of their own lives by becoming self-sufficient and self-reliant, making their own choices and decisions. These sentiments echoed parents' ideas that independence meant being self-reliant and capable of managing one's own affairs. When referring to an independent person parents used phrases such as 'an autonomous person and someone running [his or] her own life'. Only occasionally would a parent say that being independent did not preclude teamwork or some degree of interdependence, or exclude the ability to ask for help or accept financial backup or assistance from the State.

As young people approached adulthood, they and their parents were attuned to cultural expectations for autonomy and independence in adulthood. These qualities implied living separately from parents and assuming self-responsibility, while freedom in decision-making and self-reliance implied a focus on the self over and above responsibility for others. Experience in life was said to instil maturity and good judgement as qualities that would enhance the independent self and extend a person's understanding of self and others. As adulthood approached, issues of leaving home, choosing a career, needing money, and travelling became symptomatic of independence. Each underscored the open-ended nature of life stretching out as school routines ended.

3.2. SHIZUOKA: QUALITIES AND PERSONHOOD

In Wellington, young men and women alike were encouraged to develop into autonomous independent adults with qualities of maturity and self-responsibility gained through life experience. In Shizuoka, young people were expected to develop and identify as men and women with distinct gendered qualities as well as shared ones. This section explores qualities deemed significant in the maturation of the person in Shizuoka.

As will be discussed in Chapter 4, connotations of independence in Shizuoka were very different from those of autonomous independence in Wellington. Moreover, independence in Shizuoka was valued only in so far as its attributes could co-exist with qualities integral to a young person's identity as part of a social group, such as a domestic group, work group, school group and so on. A social group was privileged over and above the individual person by providing its members with their sense of identity.

Scholars point out that, in Japan, an identity dependent on relations with others does not imply that the self is completely subordinated to the group, as suggested for example by Benedict (1989). In every distinct context, as Kawashima (1967:263) has noted, a person is a 'discrete entity' who is given his or her 'own status and value'. The 'self', however, is seen as contingent and in a relative position, rather than as an essential subject in a stable and central position (Berque 1992), as in New Zealand. Rosenberger (1992:13) characterises individuals with no essential subjectivity as people 'shifting among modes of experience—sometimes spontaneously expressing inner opinions and unique characteristics in intimate relations, and sometimes disciplining themselves to enliven more formal, hierarchical group life. Japanese self emerges as neither entirely collective nor completely individualistic.' This manner of being, first encountered through the home, is refined through pre-schools where children are socialised into the art of *kejime* (the knowledge and ability to shift easily back and forth between *omote* and *ura*) as part of the 'process of growing up and becoming a person' (Tobin 1992:24-26).

Another point made in the literature is that a person's identity as primarily group-related is acknowledged from pre-school age. As Hendry (1984:116-117) explains:

> Ultimately it is not a matter of co-operating with the group or being individualistic, as Befu
> sees the Western view representing things, it is rather co-operation or being left out, being
> happy like everyone else or being laughed at, a choice between compliance and ostracism. [I]t

is a matter of being one of the group or nothing at all. In the end it's not really a choice. It's the way of the world.

M.White (1987:27) goes so far as to say that in Japan there is 'no conflict between the goals of self-fulfilment and the goals of social integration'. In discussing the significance of formal education, M.White (1987:11, 13, 27-29, 33-34, 47, 111) details how 'becoming a person' in Japan is thought to be a national concern, and how, through all grades of school, learning is considered to be a moral activity where self-fulfilment and social integration are encouraged to merge, a position found to be the case in Shizuoka.

In Shizuoka, as elsewhere in Japan, young men and women were expected to learn how to become a 'self-in-relation' to others. Such knowledge was gained by adopting valued qualities, many of which had a sense of moral obligation derived from Buddhist or neo-Confucian thought.

3.2.1. Interrelations between qualities, gender, and personhood

In Shizuoka, high school students, parents and teachers were all asked in questionnaires and interviews to select three qualities they thought appropriate for defining how a man and woman ought to be. In their responses, qualities contributing to a person's relations with others outrated or complemented those that emphasised the individual. Also, qualities selected in relation to a man or woman tended to fall into two distinct gender sets. The degree to which high school students had learned to appreciate gender distinctions is illustrated in Table 1.[5] The first six of the ten qualities that students selected as being appropriate for men and women are listed below, from the most favoured (1) to the least favoured (6):

Qualities appropriate for men:	Qualities appropriate for women:
1. responsible	1. dutiful
2. competitive, hard working	2. gentle and obedient
3. tough, vital	3. thoughtful
4. can enjoy life	4. can enjoy life
5. leadership qualities	5. popular among friends
6. independent	6. responsible

---

[5] The questionnaire format was adapted from Andreoni and Fujimori (1998:73)

Some student selections were role specific. For instance, being competitive, hard working, tough and vital reflected the work environments in which men, and hence fathers of high school students, were placed. Similarly, being dutiful, gentle, and thoughtful were qualities associated with wives and mothers. These qualities are discussed in Chapter 5.2. The remaining qualities, some universal and some gender specific, strongly influenced young people in Shizuoka, creating assumptions and attitudes that differed from those of their Wellington counterparts.

The selection of qualities by parents and teachers participating in questionnaires were not identical, yet there was some overlap (Tables 2, 3 and 4). Parents and teachers were asked to select from lists of ten qualities those they considered important for children to learn. Note that two of the four least favoured qualities in teachers' responses, namely, success and leadership, were not emphasised in schools where harmony rather than open competitiveness was encouraged. Although over half (64%) the parents said that they would choose identical qualities for boys and girls, a higher proportion of parents from Shizuoka High School did so than parents from other schools. Table 4 indicates that, overall, qualities selected by parents with sons were almost identical to qualities selected by parents with daughters. The main difference was that, at the lower end of the scale, parents preferred responsibility for girls in place of capability for boys. Table 4 sets out the six most preferred qualities selected by teachers and parents to highlight the major distinctions between them. Almost all parents (90%) were determined that their sons and daughters would reach an understanding of important values, although parents were evenly divided as to whether they hoped their own values would be sustained or considered that change was inevitable. This discrepancy partly reflected the degree to which parents did or did not adhere to concepts of discipline, discussed below.

Meanings associated with some qualities identified by or thought important to respondents, or the value placed on them, differed from similarly named concepts in Wellington. In descriptions that follow, I clarify the different meanings ascribed to responsibility, leadership, judgement, challenging spirit, empathy, honesty and harmony (the remaining terms in the tables are self explanatory). At the same time, I elaborate the significance of these qualities for self and personhood in Shizuoka. Descriptions of harmony are accompanied by a discussion of the concept of the individual. The chapter concludes with a discussion of concepts self and identity.

Table 1. SQ49: What kind of a person do you think a woman should be, and what kind of a person should a man be? (*Choose 3*) [Numbers in square brackets indicate the order of responses from most favoured to least favoured]				
Qualities in order presented in questionnaire	Preferred qualities for a woman	% of total responses	Preferred qualities for a man	% of total responses
1. gentle and obedient	[1] dutiful	20.72	[1] responsible	19.59
2. independent	[2] gentle and obedient	14.19	[2] competitive, hard working	15.77
3. competitive, hard working	[3] thoughtful	13.74	[3] tough, vital	13.74
4. with leadership qualities	[4] can enjoy life	12.16	[4] can enjoy life	13.29
5. popular among friends	[5] popular among friends	10.81	[5] with leader-ship qualities	9.68
6. thoughtful	[6] responsible	10.59	[6] independent	6.75
7. responsible	[7] tough, vital	4.05	[7] popular among friends	6.31
8. tough, vital	[8] competitive, hard working	3.83	[8] dutiful	5.41
9. dutiful	[9] independent	2.25	[9] thoughtful	2.93
10. can enjoy life	[10] with leader-ship qualities	1.13	[10] gentle and obedient	0.45
	no reply	6.53	no reply	6.08

Between schools there was some variation in the order of the first six selected qualities, but not in the qualities selected.

Table 2. TQ11 What *three* qualities from the following list would you rate as the most important for your students to learn? [Numbers in square brackets indicate the order of responses from most favoured to least favoured]		
Qualities in order presented in the questionnaire	Qualities in order rated by teachers	% of total responses
1. obedience	[1] responsibility	22.78
2. responsibility	[2] challenging spirit	17.78
3. challenging spirit	[3] judgement	15.00
4. capability	[4] empathy	11.12
5. empathy	=[5] honesty	10.56
6. leadership	=[5] harmony	10.56
7. honesty	[7] capability	8.34
8. harmony	[8] success	1.67
9. success	[9] leadership	0.56
10. judgement	[10] obedience	0.12
	no reply	0.00

Table 3. PQ44 Which of the following qualities do you consider the most important to try to pass on to your sons and daughters? (*Choose three*) [Numbers in square brackets indicate the order of responses from most favoured to least favoured]		
Qualities in order presented in the questionnaire	Qualities in order rated by parents	% of total responses
1. obedience	[1] harmony	27.22
2. harmony	[2] honesty	17.50
3. leadership	[3] challenging spirit	15.83
4. capability	[4] leadership	12.77
5. responsibility	[5] judgement	10.83
6. success	[6] capability	5.00
7. honesty	[7] responsibility	3.61
8. judgement	[8] obedience	1.66
9. empathy	[9] empathy	0.55
10. challenging spirit	[10] success	0.27
	no reply	5.00

Qualities favoured by teachers	Qualities favoured by all parents	Qualities favoured by parents with sons	Qualities favoured by parents with daughters	Qualities favoured by parents with sons and daughters
responsibility	harmony	harmony	harmony	harmony
challenging spirit	honesty	challenging spirit	honesty	judgement (=2)
judgement	challenging spirit	honesty	challenging spirit	leadership (=2)
empathy	leadership	leadership	judgement	challenging spirit (=3)
honesty	judgement	judgement (=5)	leadership	honesty (=3)
harmony	capability	capability (=5)	responsibility	capability

Table 4. The six qualities most favoured for young people to learn
(Qualities are listed in order of preference)

(i) Being responsible

Young people told me that responsibility was a desirable quality in Shizuoka, while parents I interviewed considered it a quality they would like their children to acquire. Further, responsibility headed the list of qualities that teachers thought important for students to learn. According to my informants there were two sides to the idea of responsibility. On the one hand, responsibility implied fulfilling one's duty in relation to specific tasks at work, and to persons, such as to parents in their declining years, or to a wife. In the case of graduate students, fulfilling one's duty to self and studies included obligations to parents to pass exams and be careful with money as parents had cared for them in the past and were often financially supporting their studies. On the other hand, responsibility implied doing things properly so as not to burden or trouble others. A self-responsible person avoided situations that could cause inconvenience, sadness, or the betrayal of trust to another, each of which would require an apology or correction. Although some concepts of self-responsibility in Shizuoka might appear to overlap with those in Wellington, underlying motivations were different. In Wellington, responsibility to others, such as a reluctance to interfere and impinge on another's private space, was based on respect for another's self-sufficiency and independence. In Shizuoka, motivations for self-responsibility were based on a fear of causing embarrassment to, or being thought discourteous or selfish by, others.

In Shizuoka, another aspect of responsibility was performing a good deed for someone without being asked. Such acts could be resented because of the obligation to reciprocate. A person could, however, be induced to act by hoping the recipient might mention the good deed to others. Favours could go back and forth between donor and recipient until they became manageable, at which time honorific and humble forms of language changed to casual forms to mark the newly formed relationship. By not returning the favour a recipient caused anxiety to the donor, who worried that s/he would be talked about in a negative way.

Voluntary 'good deeds' did not equate with acts of kindness to another, as in Wellington. The driving motive was to show a positive assertion of the self, one that released positive energy within a cultural form of potential reciprocity. When, for instance, a neighbour organised to drive my husband and me to a distant shopping centre for items not locally available, nothing was said of a side plan to visit an old village on the Tokaido road and the Hiroshige Ando museum. These visits occurred almost as an afterthought although they were designed to show us more of the local area. Our appropriate cultural response (one that we learned over time in similar circumstances) was to admire the deed and express appreciation and respect while, at the same time, feeling humbled and indebted (this combination of emotions is *ninjo*).

Stepping forward to take on some responsibility, however, was generally avoided. To determine who would be responsible for community service jobs, for instance, people frequently resorted to games such as *janken* ('scissors-paper-rock' game). Equally, people avoided speaking out. People's reluctance to speak their minds, or finish sentences in general conversation, was explained by one informant as unwillingness to be held accountable for ideas or thoughts that others might construe as disruptive to harmony. Although caring about other people and putting others first were thought important virtues, people needed to watch out for what others thought about them. Young children were constantly reminded to act correctly in front of others so that no one would talk negatively about them and bring dishonour to the family name. Children learned that their own self-esteem was based on other people's perceptions of them. As one informant explained, children were taught not to speak out to prevent gossip, which proliferated as people were unable to discuss personal feelings to resolve problems. As gossipers remained polite to a gossiped-about person face to face, people had to guess what others really thought about

them, which led to anxiety and fear. Direct speech was therefore restricted when discussing others:

> In the Japanese culture generally everything goes behind the door and so everything is hidden and no one says anything directly. Gossip goes around everywhere and the whole scene is about you and behind you. You're the last to know what's going on... I see [communicate with] some old women in the neighbourhood, and they want to complain about their daughters-in-law. [One old woman] talks about things but then she often says just a verb - doesn't say the object. Or she says the object and doesn't say the rest. Or she just says the subject. Or she says, "Yes… and dot dot dot" And I don't quite get what she's trying to say, so then I have to say, "Excuse me, what are you saying?" But then she feels so uncomfortable having to say things so explicitly, because then it becomes true and she becomes responsible. Her words! ... Without saying everything explicitly she's not held responsible. [If I supply what she's maybe saying] I can always go back and say, "Well I didn't quite understand but just guessed," so then no one can be responsible.

Just as not speaking out was often a form of self-protection, providing brief answers to questions was also a sign of politeness, as the translator of some interviews conducted for me in Japanese pointed out. Where some interview questions had been answered with a simple 'yes', I was assured that this did not necessarily imply of a lack of interest. A brief answer was a sign that the person was a 'good' Japanese speaker whereas full sentences and longer answers could convey that the person was over-assertive and impolite.

Due to a reluctance to 'speak out', a person could rarely make a stand for any particular orientation or attitude unless s/he were willing to risk being different from others, a risk few wanted to take. Conversations proceeded warily in part-sentences, where guesswork as to what the other person implied led to further part-statements, as speakers did not want to compromise themselves through full expression. In one example, confusion occurred at the start of a phone call by a university person to a city council employee. Caller: 'Oh, this is N and I'm calling from the university.' Recipient (who did not hear the caller's name): 'Excuse me, but…' The caller, uncertain as to what needed excusing, remained silent, and the recipient repeated, 'Excuse me, but…' twice more. Here, the recipient was asking for the caller's name but did not want to say so for fear of displaying inattention or ignorance. I was told it was possible to lose the thread of conversations since other people's values, and what others thought important, became more significant than whatever the speaker considered important or meaningful. The progression of hinted part-statements also

occurred when people discussed problems or possible plans of action. These discussions—unlike those in English that 'follow the line of reasoning'—were typically circular, 'going around and around until all points of view are presented' with no felt need to 'come to the point' as all views surrounded it (Condon and Kurata 1974:78; see also Moeran 1984:259). Such a process, known as *nemawashi* ('digging around the roots'), elicits perspectives from all present (M.White 1987:17-18).

The need to be responsible for what one says, and avoid mistakes, were identified with the virtue of maintaining silence since, according to an old Buddhist proverb: 'The mouth is the front-gate of all misfortune'[6] (Hearn 1971:182). Reluctance to speak out had also created a preference for what is oblique, and a strong distaste for analytical or logical consistency (Singer 1973:50; Doi 1988:29-33; Moeran 1985:198; Ben-Ari 1990:145, 153, 158n.11). Nevertheless, Kosaka (1967:256) wrote that, although 'the Japanese has deemed strong self-assertion ugly… the virtue of non-self-assertiveness that was once respected is now either inappropriate or insufficient for modern society.'

In Shizuoka, as elsewhere in Japan, values related to 'speaking out' were changing, but this change was not generation specific or widespread. Nor was there consensus on whether 'speaking out' was thought more or less responsible. In a science faculty at one university, for instance, a junior scientist was appointed as Head of Department over a senior candidate as the latter was considered 'too quiet'. In metaphors attuned to Olympic games of the time I was told: 'Silence used to be golden but now is only bronze', and that: 'To speak is golden: it means survival.' The need for change appeared to be more urgent in science (where models from the United Kingdom and United States were being followed) than in some other disciplines. Yet staff complained that today's science students were more reticent and lethargic than their counterparts a generation ago. In a second case, a young woman employed by the Yamaha Company said that 'speaking up' was permitted in the Nagoya office but not in the office in Shizuoka. She indicated that regional variations and the larger size of Nagoya city might have accounted for these differences: 'It just depends on the place and the people and who runs the office' as to whether 'speaking up' is accepted or considered inappropriate and 'too outspoken'.

---

[6] *Kuchi wa wazawai no kado.*

Parents were evenly divided over whether high school students were more willing to 'speak up' than students of their own generation at the same age. Teachers were also divided over whether this generation of high school students was more open about their ideas and opinions than others in the past ten years. Slightly more teachers thought that students were less open than those who thought students were more open, although Shizuoka High School students were thought to have been more open than students in other schools.[7] A (non-Japanese) teacher I interviewed at one participating school said that it was nearly impossible to achieve any classroom discussion as students disliked answering questions for fear of directing attention to themselves. This teacher managed to achieve class participation only through negative incentives. For example, he asked the students to stand in a circle around the room with a show of hands to answer questions. The last student standing was asked to sing a song. The desire to be inconspicuous was associated with the reluctance to put oneself over and above others for reasons of modesty and the need to keep relations harmonious. Keeping a low profile might also have avoided being targeted and bullied.

Students also received mixed messages about speaking out from staff members. One graduate student said that the emphasis, especially in high schools, was on students 'knowing the text' rather than initiating class discussions. On the other hand, several people said that students were taught to value what they identified as the 'Western model' of speaking out in moral education classes (where precepts of the Buddhist classics were presented in stories for discussion). In other classes with the same teacher, however, students who attempted to speak up were told to 'Shut your mouth and listen to the older person'. It was explained that although teachers mentally accepted the merit of 'speaking out', their reaction against it 'comes from the heart'.[8] As one said:

> Teachers are not used to that [our speaking out]. They're used to the… traditional system and the way of respect... When the students speak up, as they were taught to, the teachers don't like it and put them down: 'hammer the nail sticking out'. So there's great confusion among young people.

---

[7] Shizuoka High School had a high reputation for student motivation and academic performance.

[8] Informants clarified for me that the act of thinking was normally understood to take place in the heart (*kokoro*). *Kangaeru*, 'to think' or 'to have the idea', was used to refer to thought when it meant to consider, or when it involved calculation or was mathematical. This kind of thinking was believed to take place in the head.

In this instance, the expression 'hammer the nail sticking out' refers to seniors demanding conformity among juniors. At other times, and unlike the New Zealand 'tall poppy' syndrome where peers attempt to regulate equality among themselves, 'hammer the nail sticking out' is associated with peers' efforts to achieve group harmony.

In contrast to the situation in Shizuoka, young adults in Wellington were encouraged to express their views, as indicated by the manner in which young people were willing and able to participate and freely express their opinions in the YFP interviews. Likewise, parents in Wellington were outspoken during the interviews. A culture that encouraged open exchange was further apparent by the manner in which young people and their parents were willing to discuss personal concerns with young unknown interviewers.[9] In Shizuoka such social exchange required the need to maintain distance, care over what was said, and codes of respect.

(ii) Leadership
High school students in Shizuoka identified leadership qualities with men. Nevertheless, some parents thought their daughters should learn leadership (see Table 4). A person who became a leader was greatly admired because leadership qualities were difficult to attain and attempts to attain leadership were perceived as a threat. Since looking 'not so confident' was the key to harmony, if a man tried to become the leader of a group by looking confident, being assertive, and finishing his sentences, he would be looked down on, or put down, because a positive self-image was considered snobbish and socially unacceptable. A clear thinking man whom others respected would attain leadership only by holding to a sense of modesty. Further, he would be able to articulate thoughts and lead a group only for as long as he refrained from appearing confident and assertive. Informants referred to the saying: 'A hawk must hide his talons.' They pointed out that a potential leader in an office, for example, had to begin by putting himself down in the humblest forms of the Japanese language. He needed to balance capability with modesty and observe polite forms of respect language to all, even office cleaners, in order to maintain his position and following. Once attained, a person's leadership was valued. A leader's influence did not come, as in Wellington, through telling others what to do and dictating a course of events: it stemmed from his (often indirect) suggestions, and the willingness of others to hear, respect, and follow his opinion.

---

[9] Interviewers in Wellington were aged between the mid-twenties and thirty.

(iii) Judgement

Judgement involved how to relate correctly to others. Thus, good judgement in Shizuoka referred to the ability to conduct oneself well, whereas in Wellington it meant knowing from experience how to calculate and evaluate risks. In Wellington, students and parents elaborated judgement in terms of maturity gained in part from making mistakes, while in Shizuoka judgement meant the proper application of codes of conduct to avoid mistakes.

Informants in Shizuoka described good judgement as competence in speaking and acting correctly and effectively. It implied knowing when and how much to speak, when to be silent, and how to properly show respect to others. It also implied the ability to do all these things as if by instinct and with ease. In naming three difficult things about being *otona*, high school students included attributes bound up with the possession of good judgement. They named, for example, showing resolve and not revealing weak points; avoiding problems and mistakes; observing manners and endurance; not acting immaturely; being more responsible; and thinking, acting and speaking properly. Young interviewees in their twenties—most of whom considered they were not yet '*otona*'—agreed that good judgement or its attributes came with mental and emotional maturity, which included the ability to act so as not to upset another person or cause others to doubt your ability to act appropriately, and reaching 'my parents' thinking level'.

(iv) Challenging Spirit

According to informants, motivation was the key to understanding a challenging spirit. It meant responding in a challenging way to people's opinions or situations that questioned a person's capabilities. One young woman explained that a person was usually encouraged through negative feedback, or by being put down. Rather than receiving praise at work, a person would be told: 'You didn't fill that in properly', or: 'That's not a very good summary. Do it again', or: 'You forgot to do this'. Self-motivation, a necessary and admired quality, was thereby stimulated. Often a person about to sit an exam, be tested in a sports activity, or perform in a drum festival would tie a band around the head to symbolise that s/he was willing to meet the challenge. Challenges of various kinds throughout a person's life would be met by a similar attitude. More than half (58%) the teachers who responded to questionnaires agreed that students today were less willing to cooperate with teachers, and had less of a sense of duty to achieve and do well than other

students known in the past ten years. These attitudes could explain the teachers' high rating of a challenging spirit. Most parents also valued a challenging spirit.

(v) Empathy

Empathy was fourth highest in the qualities that teachers' preferred students to learn, but was rated very low by parents. Graduate students pointed out that normally empathy was not respected or valued as it ran counter to parental attitudes toward discipline. One informant who taught young children said that parents did not usually empathise when a child was experiencing some difficulty, and would certainly not do so in public. As an example she cited a mother's apparent indifference to her ten-year-old child's crying in a classroom where something had caused the child to feel frightened. Indeed, the mother told her child to stop looking sad and to put on an extra smile and make herself look happy to be like everyone else. According to this informant, a parent's first reaction would be to discipline the child, believing the child must learn to become strong and bear hardship. This attitude was in tune with the Buddhist idiom that suffering or endurance would always precede happiness: to want happiness without suffering was considered greedy or selfish. A young woman with overseas experience pointed out that empathy was quite foreign to notions of harmony. People in a group striving for harmony were said to be more afraid of making incorrect comments than in searching for empathetic common ground. On the other hand, Hendry (1986:88) mentions that empathy was valued in kindergartens to avoid 'the causing of trouble or discord in relations with others [and is thus] regarded as good in the sense of aiding and incorporating ideals of moral development'. In the Shizuokan questionnaires, the choice of empathy as a preferred quality by high school teachers was probably desired for similar reasons. There was also a need to promote mutual appreciation among students as a safeguard against recent escalations of bullying in schools where victims were randomly targeted. Among parents, on the other hand, empathy's low rating related to a need to teach their children the ability to cope well in the wider (public) environment.

(vi) Obedience

In questionnaires, both teachers and parents rated obedience as less significant than the other qualities, perhaps because the focus was primarily on children of high school age. Nevertheless, informants mentioned obedience in other contexts.[10] M.White (1987:27-28)

---

[10] See Chapter 3.2.2. and Chapter 4.2.5.

includes obedience among those qualities valued by Japanese in nurturing a child. M.White's term for 'obedience' (*sunao,* also glossed as 'compliant') is similar to that used in the Shizuokan questionnaire[11] and is categorised as a positive outlook that is 'open-minded', 'truthful' and 'co-operative'. She points out that negative connotations of 'obedience' identified by English language speakers, such as submission to an authority, occur only when a child is thought to be in need of correction. One parent described *sunao* to me as a way of fostering understanding through openness, with the result that a son or daughter with no experience would listen to the experienced parent knowing that the parent 'speaks sense' and would accept the advice offered without question. Such an attitude differed from the emphasis placed by many Wellington students and parents on the need for a person to gain his or her own knowledge through personal experience.

(vii) Honesty

Honesty rated as an important quality in both parent and teacher responses, although it had more support from parents than teachers. It was also considered important by interviewees in their twenties. Although I was told that honesty included the idea of keeping a promise, in Shizuoka connotations of honesty in their entirety differed from those in Wellington, where notions of honesty and individual integrity were linked. Cultural connotations of honesty among English speakers in Wellington normally designated a moral quality that integrated truth to others with truth to self. A Japanese informant who had spent some time in the United States told me: 'It ['honesty' as understood in English language usage] is sort of unheard of here because harmony, or keeping the peace on the surface, is so much more important.' In interviews, graduate students said that, when they were with people who were older (even by a year), they would often agree with what was spoken out of respect, while 'in the heart' they disagreed. One informant in his sixties told me a Confucian expression, *Washite douzezu,* explaining that it had become a part of Japanese thought with the meaning: 'Keep harmony with others but keep your spirit and do not compromise it.' When I asked others about this expression, one woman said it was an expression used by older men, meaning something along the lines of: 'I/you can still belong to the group even if I/you don't agree with something they believe in.' Younger informants, who had never heard the saying before, said: 'Actually in Japan people compromise'; and: 'We tend to consent too much and agree, especially with the boss.'

---

[11] The questionnaire used the character for *jujun* as in *obedient=docile*.

The sense of honesty that was 'sort of unheard of' in Shizuoka alluded to how, in the West, a lapse in honesty resulted in a sense of guilt affecting a person's sense of self-integrity and/or relationships with others. This understanding of honesty was not one that my Shizuokan informants had grown up with. The differences in understanding between Wellington and Shizuokan views were consistent with differences between a person as an autonomous individual and a person as a relational self. As Doi (1981:48-49) points out, whereas the sense of guilt is an inner problem for a Westerner, in Japan guilt 'shows itself most sharply when an individual suspects that his action will result in betraying the group to which he belongs'. Doi adds that, in Japan, betrayal can lead to a person being cast out from the group, as all members of the group suffer the same sense of disgrace as the betrayer. The offender would be remorseful for the betrayal and required to apologise, even though an apology may or may not redeem him/her. Thus group identity, although essential, is also quite fragile. Similarly, Hendry (1984:111, 116) and M.White (1987:42, 46) mention that, from early childhood, people in Japan learn that being different from others means rejection and alienation, and that loners are suspect. Fearing alienation, people therefore dislike acting independently, or without consideration for members of their group. Doi (1981:54) goes so far as to say that actions betraying a group are deemed 'treacherous'.

Even so, graduate students in Shizuoka indicated that group loyalty did not completely stop a person from acting independently. Self-interest could over-ride group loyalty, just as any independent action by a member could fracture the sense of identity other group members had developed through the group. At one university, for example, the successive departure by two graduate students who separately decided to drop their post-graduate studies for personal interests was construed by teachers and fellow students in the group as a betrayal of loyalty and commitment. On each occasion the members of the group experienced a sense of broken trust or 'dishonesty'. Ties between those who had left and those who remained were completely severed. In this context, M.White's (1987:17) comment is instructive:

> [T]he distinction that Western societies make between 'social' and 'personal' morality is rarely made in Japan: a moral dilemma is almost always regarded as a social or interpersonal problem, not one to which prescriptive or proscriptive abstractions can apply.

The moral interconnection between the personal and the social noted in concepts of honesty is further emphasised through the quality of harmony, discussed below. First, however, the socialisation of children and young people is considered in relation to the transference of valued qualities.

3.2.2. The question of discipline

Knowledge of valued qualities, and good judgement in how to observe them properly, were skills learned through 'being disciplined' (*shitsuke*) in moral training, that is, training in etiquette and correct conduct instilled from early childhood. Hendry (1984:103-104; 1986:12-14) draws a useful distinction between *shitsuke*, as 'moulding' and 'growing up a child' in the desired way, and *kitaeru*, as 'discipline' in the sense of 'forging' and 'hardening into shape'. People I spoke with associated all these concepts with *shitsuke,* saying 'someone was or was not shitsuke-d', or that 'shitsuke had been done to a person'.

Shizuokan parents expressed some ambivalence about the idea of discipline. Some reactions were similar to those described by Hendry (1986:71-72) who notes that mention of *shitsuke* embarrassed parents, who confessed that they did not discipline their children, or suggested that children learned 'naturally'. In Shizuoka, however, the idea of discipline appealed to some parents who distinguished between the exercise of strict discipline and the teaching of reason, and the balance between the two. One father, for instance, who in self-conscious confusion remarked that *shitsuke* was 'very old-fashioned' subsequently proved himself a firm disciplinarian of his young daughter. On the other hand, a mother of a high school son and daughter told me that her training of her children had been 'a complete failure'. She yielded to their requests for candies at a young age, after which they reached a stage when they could no longer be *sunao* ('obedient'). She said the lack of respect they showed her as a mother (the son rarely spoke to her while the daughter spoke to the mother as if to a friend, provoking the mother's anger) demonstrated how training at an early age was very important and she hoped that a few years at university would change their thinking for the better.

A weakened sense of self-discipline in younger generations was of some concern to both young and old: there was no generational divide on the issue. Members of the younger generations were upset by incidents that showed a lack of knowledge of proper ways, even when these related to lesser offences of etiquette. A young working woman in her mid-twenties regretted that some of her friends had not been properly taught basic decorum.

Her example was her friends' public application of face make-up on train stations, which she found deeply offensive. Similarly, a graduate student was appalled when, travelling on a train, she overheard an unguarded discussion between two unknown younger women about love hotels. She was further upset that the conversation was overheard by a male stranger. The content of the conversation did not upset or embarrass her as much as the public context of the conversation.

Several people pointed out that parents of today's younger generation were born just after World War II. As children of parents who, in their struggle to survive the first decade of postwar reconstruction found their values challenged, many of today's parents themselves lacked the experience and knowledge of some values associated with *shitsuke* to pass on to their own children. In questionnaire responses, most parents (76%) said they changed their styles of parenting to meet the needs of their children, or to compensate for time spent at work and on outside activities (7%). Almost none said they attempted to reproduce how they themselves were raised. However, a third of the parents agreed, while half disagreed, that becoming *otona* involved practicing the traditional values associated with *shitsuke*.

Discipline was the responsibility not only of parents but also of people who were socially senior, such as teachers, and those above junior workers in the workplace. One concern linked by parents and others to a perceived failure of discipline was an increase in bullying and the drift of young people into crime. Slips away from traditional values in the younger generation, along with incidents of petty crime, were generally seen as leading toward a lifestyle of casual employment. A casual lifestyle was regarded by many as a failure, not because a person had failed to matriculate from high school or qualify for a career, but because casual lifestyles were thought to lack valued qualities, including a challenging spirit, responsibility, and judgement. Besides implying an unwillingness to persist through difficulties and work hard in the socially approved manner, a casual lifestyle was also considered economically precarious. To many parents, casual work symbolised an alternative but lower status option for their student children that could also involve loss of family face.

Most parents in Shizuoka wanted their children to learn to 'fit into' Japanese ways. There was no valued quality in Shizuoka, as in Wellington, of autonomous independence permitting sons and daughters to freely diverge from their parents' outlook. Unlike parents in Wellington, who wanted their children to find their own way, be responsible and

account for themselves, parents in Shizuoka wanted their children to learn values of group identity and harmony and to be responsible mainly in relation to others, even though imparting these qualities proved challenging for many Shizuokan parents.

3.2.3. Harmony and the individual

Of all the qualities considered important for young people to learn, harmony was especially significant. The relation between concepts of harmony and 'the individual' has received attention from Western anthropologists. Hendry (1984:104-105, 113-114), for example, agrees with Befu (1980) that ideologies of 'Western individualism and Japanese groupism' have made it appear, erroneously, that in Japan the existence of 'the individual' and 'group harmony' are mutually exucsive. Befu argues that in all societies the individual does not disappear into the group but consciously submits to co-operation, and hence 'the individual' and 'group harmony' always co-exist. Some anthropologists (e.g. Moeran 1984) have also noted, and tried to account for, an emergent individualism in Japan. Nevertheless, notions of the individual in Japan lack the 'centred' self found in concepts of the individual in the West.

In Shizuoka, university students were hard pressed to explain the meaning of harmony (*wa*). They agreed that the practice of harmony was very important, and that harmony inevitably referred to social groups and not the individual, since 'one person alone cannot have *wa*'. However, they articulated ideas about harmony and the individual only by discussing group conformity. One student named, as a positive aspect of conformity, 'the sense of being in a group with everyone', though according to another informant who had experienced life abroad, group conformity could be extreme:

> Harmony is a positive value in Japan. People think everyone always has to be the same to fit in the same circle. People watch for difference and any difference is hammered up or down. For example, appearance, the way you speak, how smart you are - you can be too smart or not smart enough. In school you are praised if you do well, but if you don't do well you are looked down on. People must stay within what is considered the normal band, otherwise they are regarded as being strange [a negative trait], and the range of acceptance lies between 47 and 53 in a count of 100. If you are beyond the normal range you are pushed out of the circle. One current fad is for high school girls to wear loose socks. They [the students] glue the socks to the legs to keep them at a certain height. This fad is called 'showing individuality', but really it is not. One popular person shifts the level, or an esteemed group shifts, and the rest follow.

University students were perhaps less restricted in what they did than people raising families or those at school or work. When describing group allegiances, almost all said they would, without much sense of guilt, be able to refuse an invitation to join a party of friends at night, or could attend for part of the time only, as long as they apologised sincerely and had legitimate reason, such as needing to complete some work or having to be up early the next day. One student took it for granted that the custom of making amends to restore acceptance[12] would make up for any mistake, or for something that was regretted. At the same time, students said they would feel guilty for refusing to attend a function when a boss had made the invitation, or could not refuse, even when believing 'it is not good to value conformity too much'. In another hypothetical scenario most students agreed that, if someone were to decline the group's invitation, they would assume that 'there was no other way' (it couldn't be helped). One student would not discuss conformity without its first being defined. When finally it was defined ('to get along with others'), he refused to discuss theoretical situations, commenting: 'That only weakens my judgement. Unless I am really in that situation, my thinking will not work at its fullest extent.' Another student said that to speak in the abstract about an 'ability to conform' did not say much. He disliked it when company representatives 'blindly believed' affirmative answers of prospective employees concerning their ability to maintain harmony. In his view, the real test came only after a person entered the work place.

According to students, group conflict could be resolved through discussion. One said: 'Each of us will talk about many situations and choose the best answer among them.' Another said:

> I will think about it and [if I] still think that my opinion is right, then I would insist on it… If I regretfully think that the other person's opinion is right, then I would bend.[13]

Trying to conform and keep harmony, however, proved difficult for a young woman in her mid-twenties working in a TV company. When I asked how she negotiated harmonious group relationships while retaining her own convictions, she confessed it was problematic. At university and especially at high school, she used to tell her friends that she would never compromise her 'own way' by falling in with a group opinion if she did not agree with it. In her estimation, 70% of her age group—young men as well as young women—

---

[12] *umeawase*: 'to fill up [the holes] and put together'

[13] I was told that the idea of 'to bend' was for a person to 'fold down' his opinions and 'take in' the other person's opinions, or to let the other person have his way.

preferred to function in groups, as she did, where opinions were negotiated. In group relationships among company members at work, however, she often had to compromise her own thoughts or feelings by bending to seniors. To relieve stress, she took up the art of the tea ceremony,[14] through which she altered her perspective. She now believed harmony to be part of 'the Japanese character' and 'the most important thing' in maintaining a good relationship with another person.

According to young people in employment, although a person should decide whether or not to go along with the group, a person would sometimes agree to something 'for the time being' in order to 'keep the peace in that environment just at that moment'. Later, the person would say that 'the environment forced me to that position'. A person usually participated in several groups. It was possible, therefore, that in one group a person felt compelled to comply with others in a way that compromised him/her with members of another group. When a person in a given group was discovered acting in ways that were not accepted by the group, and if s/he were challenged about it, s/he would have to leave that group.

Although harmony was highly valued, people were generally aware that attempts to foster it might have negative consequences, one of which was the need to repress personal opinions and ideas. A young woman returnee from the United States mentioned that, because people withheld their thinking from others, the result was 'a kind of pretence'. She added that in such situations: 'Harmony's almost always fake… But it's not a game, it's everybody's life.' The need to strive for harmony also created problems in situations where there was competition between people. In discussing the problem of maintaining harmony among teaching staff at schools, a middle-aged woman said: 'Everybody knows it [there are problems], despite the emphasis placed on being a group.' She pointed out that if, for example, a teacher who taught music or physical education did things well, but differently, students might like it, but other teachers and parents whose children were not in that class might not. In such a case harmony was disrupted.

The clearest articulation of what was implied by harmony was made by an older man in consultation with his wife. He suggested a need to 'kill part of your own thinking' in order to be socially at ease. Initially he said he was 'a little bit different from others', not caring

---

[14] For the social and spiritual significance of *chado* (the tea ceremony) see B.Mori (1996:117-134).

about harmony or whether he had 'bad relationships' with his colleagues ('I simply don't care'). His wife reminded him, however, that although they had raised their children—now all over 18 years—to value independence, they had also taught them 'the skill of harmony' until it became 'automatic, almost an instinct', because it was very important. They both agreed that if a person could become accustomed to 'letting something [an opinion or an idea] die' for the sake of harmony, s/he will 'be comfortable', whereas a person who insisted on his or her own independence is 'sure to be uncomfortable'. Another informant pointed out that as (Western) independence contradicted the need for co-dependence and the need to adjust to others in a group, it was considered selfish.

Kejime, or the ability to draw appropriate boundaries between 'insiders' and 'outsiders', was very significant in enabling harmony. As one informant pointed out: 'What is private to us is very private so we don't really share all the truth. It takes time to consider someone an insider.' Language use immediately clarified where people stood in relation to each other and relegated relations to a comfortable or manageable zone. *Tatemae*, or 'the façade', or 'surface frame of reality' within which a group of people managed their social relationships, was also a means of setting boundaries. One high school student from China who had lived in Shizuoka since the age of ten stressed to me the value of understanding and keeping up all *tatemae* relationships:

> In Japan it is important to know *tatemae*. *Honne* [truth/ inner feeling] relationships are very rare, so other relationships with people are important or you get left out. You have to keep 'face'. If there is a party and you don't want to go, you go anyway and make an excuse to leave early, or you are not included again.

In this context, Doi's (1988:152-4) comment on harmony is instructive. In each situation a person constructs an outside (*omote*) to protect the inside (*ura*) of self, and can take the standpoint of either the *omote* or the *ura* of self while ignoring the other standpoint completely. Doi suggests that although this may appear contradictory to a non-Japanese, it is how the Japanese handle ambivalence without 'the urge to eliminate ambivalence for a higher integrity'. According to Doi, people in Japan prefer to minimise contradictions by avoiding as much as possible the need to show the *ura* (inside) to others. They have therefore idealised harmony (*wa*) as a social concept:

> The Japanese love to speak of providing for people's *wa* [harmony], which is an expression of the ideal. But it is extremely difficult to achieve *wa*. It is difficult enough [to achieve]

between two people; it is virtually impossible when there is a large group. Still, it is imperative to do something to create an atmosphere of *wa,* and so we set up general principles and, under the supreme command of *wa,* agree on them as the public *omote* [outside form]. In fact, this is the true form of *tatemae.* (Doi 1988:153-4)

Informants told me that *tatemae* protected group harmony, pointing out that if a person failed to conform to the spirit of *wa* by being over-assertive, or too independent, others became antagonistic toward him or her. Many informants of all ages said that it was often impossible for them to speak out in a group for fear of destroying *wa*. Others mentioned distancing themselves from returnees from abroad who, through expressions of independent thought or action, were viewed as being unacceptably 'aggressive'. The 'duty of modesty' and, especially for women, the quality of being dutiful, was an important counter to self-assertion. The extent to which the need for modesty and an identification with a role affected the creation of a public face was revealed in one interview with the mother of two senior high school students. Unsure of any strong identity ('I have never thought about it… Now I think I am a housewife'), she had been confined to the home through responsibilities to care for husband's parents, with tennis her only outside activity. Undaunted, she had undertaken and completed a Masters degree extramurally. More recently she had resumed part-time teaching and, if pushed, would confess she was a teacher. For the rest:

> Generally I hide. I never say I finished my M.A. I rarely tell my friends. It's not necessary… It's a kind of *kenjo no mitoku* [duty of modesty], don't you know? … If I say, "I can do this thing, I can do that thing," I'm afraid the people [would] hate me.

She thought her husband was equally modest. In her opinion modesty was as important in men as it is in women.

Attitudes ranged from those showing support for conventional modesty to those where 'speaking out' and being assertive were favoured. Each case depended on the situation, gender, and age of those present. Yet, even though one informant categorised the present period as 'a time of change right now when younger people might sense that individuality is important', sociocultural constraints prevented the emergence of any concept of an autonomous individual as it was understood in Wellington.

3.2.4. Issues of self and identity

One obstacle to understanding Shizuokan perspectives was that concepts described in English as 'independence' or 'individuality' carried quite different connotations when used by Japanese speakers.[15] There were no equivalent terms in Japanese for 'identify', 'I.D.' or 'identity' precisely because there was no concept of an autonomous individual. A friend who interviewed a number of young adults in Japanese on my behalf had a hard time both understanding and explaining what these terms meant.

In my conversations and interviews dealing with a person's identity, respondents mostly equated the idea of identity with 'being Japanese'. Some graduate students, whose actions conformed with standard cultural values, denied that 'being Japanese' was greatly significant ('the world is opening up'). In support, they mentioned their own 'international' outlook as familiarity with science fiction, American and British movies, and pop music such as U2 and Simon and Garfunkel. Other students, however, took the view that the 'soul of what is Japanese is very old', citing such practices as the tea ceremony, karate, *kabuki* (a form of theatre) and *kendo* (traditional fencing). Others thought 'being Japanese' meant being born in Japan of parents who were Japanese. A few said they had never thought about identity, as they were concerned only with their work.

In answering interview questions and in general conversation, informants in Shizuoka rarely offered evaluative abstract or general comments or examples. By contrast, Wellington interviewees frequently made generalised evaluations, such as: 'a lot of boys are slackers', and: 'in a lot of single parent families… things have worked out for the best', and: 'most people can [easily] buy alcohol'. Unless they had been overseas, informants in Shizuoka usually provided answers by detailing specific instances. To illustrate an answer or point, informants often began with a phrase such as, 'In my case…' followed with a known occurrence. Such particularism echoed the precise placement of each person in each social context, and linguistic discouragement of generalisation. In discussions of self-identity, informants in Wellington used general abstract phrases. They spoke in terms of 'sorting out who you are', of 'constructing your own personality', the ability to 'reflect on yourself', of 'constructing and reconstructing yourself', and 'being yourself'. Such comments indicated a concept of self-identity that marked a person out as an individual, one that was unfamiliar to Japanese informants. Their abstract nature,

---

[15] Independence is discussed in Chapter 4.

however, glossed all people as 'individuals' in common one with the other, yet each phrase was unable to provide any explicit content that marked a person's specific individuality. In one sense, therefore, each person in Shizuoka could be more aware than a Wellington person of his/her separate identity.

When questioned about self-identity as opposed to an identity as 'Japanese', however, people had trouble conceiving of a 'self'. When the Japanese interviewer asked undergraduate and graduate students whether they had ever described themselves in a written CV, most agreed that they had. They even pointed out that while descriptions in their CVs may have been exact, these were not necessarily accurate or complete. Expanding from this basic concept of a 'self' in a CV to a discussion of self-perceptions, however, proved exceedingly difficult. Some students admitted to omitting positive characteristics from their CV, with only one student naming such a characteristic ('strong will power'). In one early interview the Japanese interviewer had persevered, but drew a blank, by asking: 'What do you recognise or, what should I say, what "identifies" [the word 'identifies' was in English] you?' She then experimented with how to proceed. Students were asked, for instance, how they would describe themselves to someone else who did not know them. Apart from one specific reply from the student who had mentioned strong willpower ('I stick to my plans and work hard at all things'), answers were general and modest. One student's idea of how he would go about self-description to another person was:

> Well, the ordinary way… Some small conversation will do, right? As assumed [as people would normally expect], [I will] explain my hometown etc… where I come from, what kind of things I have done. Something like these. With feelings like just starting a conversation [by feeling the way into a conversation] with that person, I think it is best if that person could feel the kind of person I am.

Others students said they would talk about, 'what I have experienced in the past', or 'the positive outcome of what I have been doing'. Another said that she would say she was a student at a certain university, and perhaps mention her favourite author, Haruki Murakami, 'for he is well known but a little different from other authors, so maybe they [would] understand what I think a little'. One student, however, said that for another person to have an idea of who he was: 'The only way is to see [get to know] me in the long run'; while yet another thought: 'Myself is the only thing that knows all about myself in myself', adding: 'That is a strange question. Or I cannot answer… As I said [before],

actions are to make the real me meet what others perceive me as.'[16] When young adults with jobs were asked similar questions, they answered that they would give their names, the company they worked for, and the town they came from. Answers from young unmarried men or women never included information on their family, as such information belonged to a person's 'inside'.

These self-descriptions to others tended to exemplify what people spent time doing or reading. Only one person characterised himself with reference to a trait or quality ('strong will power'). No respondents appeared to have any ability or desire to objectify themselves as subjects. Although such responses might have appeared vague, they reflected the inability to socially centre a shifting self-in-relation, along with an appreciation of values that preserved a sense of modesty and respect.

3.3. CONCLUDING REMARKS

My aim in this chapter has been to contribute to an anthropology of personhood by fleshing out the attributes of personhood/adulthood in New Zealand and Japan. The chapter sets out comparative descriptions of the 'cognitive component of personhood' respectively held by young people and their parents in Wellington and Shizuoka and which, as Giddens (1991:53) notes, is prerequisite for a person's being a reflexive actor. Apart from indicating differing cultural orientations associated with modernity, these descriptions clarify that, in each society, values were clustered and linked by different webs of meaning. Respective values and attributes for each society suggest that attitudes in Shizuoka placed a greater emphasis on a person's connectivity with others than did those in Wellington.

As young people in Wellington approached adulthood, they and their parents focussed on their self-development toward maturity and self-responsibility. Young adults were encouraged to seek independence in ways that upheld their moral right to assert themselves, and to know and develop themselves as independent individuals while respecting the rights of others to do the same. In Shizuoka, by contrast, young men and women were encouraged to develop some qualities that were gender identified, such as modesty in women and tough vitality in men, and all were expected to learn skills directed

---

[16] The Japanese translator was bewildered by this description, saying: 'When the interviewee starts talking about recognition of himself, nothing made sense to me. I listened to this part several times, and translated word for word.'

towards a morality of harmonious relations with others that fostered modesty and respect. These skills included understanding and practising attributes associated with responsibility, judgement, a challenging sprit, and 'honesty' in the sense of not betraying loyalty to one's group. Whereas growth toward maturity in Wellington implied the conscious construction of an individual self-identity, in Shizuoka the social orientation of young people demanded a conscious construction of a self-in-relation with others.

The concept of self and personhood expressed by students and parents in Wellington reflects the autonomous individuated self that is associated with the dichotomous individualism:centrism characterisation of Western:non-Western selves. Parents and students in Wellington mostly conflated awareness of self with cultural conceptions of self. That is, awareness of the need to be 'true to oneself', 'find oneself' etc. presupposed the existence of an independent autonomous self. As Gullestad (1996:30) points out, when the concept of 'being oneself' is rhetorically central (as in Wellington interviews), not only is the 'centre' perceived as existing within the individual, but also 'the social anchoring of the individual becomes conceptually and ideologically less visible'. In Wellington interviews, the interdependence and connectivity of students with relevant others, such as with parents and siblings, friends and teachers at school (see also Chapter 4), and friends and others beyond home and school (e.g. a theatre group, nightclubbing friends, and friends at a beach and house parties), were unmarked as interdependent relations since concepts emphasisng negotiated and contractual agreements with significant others overshadowed the social base of these relationships. Furthermore, the interdependent nature of people's relations in situations that were quite possibly motivated by caring attitudes (e.g. a person's living with an ageing mother) were assessed in terms of a lack of independence and negatively judged. As Greenhouse (1992:239) notes, 'individual discourses define personhood as one's ability to resist surrendering one's interests to those of others'.

The concept of autonomous individualism of course predates late C20th New Zealand politics and is not altogether subsumed to libertarian thought. Gilligan's (1982:17) observation, that 'the qualities deemed necessary for adulthood—the capacity for autonomous thinking, clear decision-making, and responsible action—are those associated with masculinity', however, is echoed by New Zealand scholars who query libertarian values. Jesson et al. (1988:17) note that qualities and freedoms assumed by libertarians to

be universal are those identified with males, in particular with male heads of households. They point out, as does Gilligan (1982:164-165), that a focus on self-interest and rights is ultimately non-nurturing and obscures the ethic of care associated with responsibility. Likewise, Armstrong (1994:127) points out that 'the libertarian right's vision of the individual is not compelling… people do not work and live in families, whanau, communities… *as individuals, they work together*' (original italics).

In the Wellington interviews, neither male nor female students and parents—many of whom distanced themselves from libertarian views—questioned the validity of the concept of autonomous individualism which, as will be seen (Chapters 4 and 5), was the 'cognitive component of personhood' against or with which they formulated their lives. The 1970's shift in American women's self-perceptions, from a morality of selflessness and self-sacrifice to one embracing the interests and legitimacy of the self, is associated by Gilligan (1982:19,149) with women's adoption of the notion of rights. An emphasis on individual rights places the self above others, thereby stressing separation rather than connection and the individual rather than relatedness with another/others. This shift, together with attitudinal shifts already discussed—namely, from ideas of 'being of use' to 'being oneself' that occurred with a relational move in child-parent relations from 'obedience' to 'negotiation' (Gullestad 1996)—also occurred in New Zealand, and New Zealand women began to identify themselves alongside men with the concept of an individual and negotiating self associated with rights (Park ed.1991).

In Japan, valued ascriptions of gender differences and the public affirmation of respect have not been obscured by notions of individual rights.[17] Moreover, despite postwar constitutional changes and uneven social reconstruction, concepts of responsibility that acknowledge debt to others and uphold respect for seniority and the need to manage proper relations with others encourage the retention of *sunao* ('obedience') as a valued trait in the rearing of children. In Shizuoka, *sunao* and authority were not closely aligned whereas, in Gullestad's account, obedience and authority are closely aligned. As M.White and LeVine (1986:58) point out, *sunao* does not mean giving up the self, as does obedience in the West (including New Zealand). Rather, through *sunao* the self is enhanced and appropriately expressed by working with others. There is less conflict, therefore, between the idea of the

---

[17] In Shizuoka, less than half (47%) the parents agreed that their children were more focussed on rights than on responsibilities. According to one informant with overseas experience, 'human rights' and 'equality' were new concepts about which people were in any case very confused ('they don't get it').

actualising individual and *sunao* in Japan than in the idea of the actualising individual and obedience in New Zealand.

In sociocultural analyses of Japan, the 'centricism' or 'relational' aspect of the individualism:centricism characterisation of the Western:non-Western self is associated with representations of the Japanese self which deny an integrated, solid or subjective self (e.g. Benedict 1989; Ohnuki-Tierney 1987,1993), or suggest that the self exists only in relations with, or is centred in relations with, others (e.g. Doi 1981,1988; Nakane 1970). However, only when no account is taken of the complexities of the *tatemae:honne* dualisms which, in Japan, are consciously subscribed to and which influence public and private representations of self, and when no account is taken of the importance of striving to achieve harmony in relations with others, do these representations appear to greatly contradict Western perceptions of the self. Benedict, for instance, cannot reconcile Western concepts of integrity with the Japanese public/outer/formal:private/inner/informal paradox of *tatemae:honne* whereas Ohnuki-Tierney, who is sensitive to the implications of *tatemae:honne*, focusses on the need for continually shifting perspectives as people interrelate. Doi's and Nakane's descriptions are of *public* realisations of self with others and do not deny the awareness of a motivated or calculating self.

A common idea that Japanese selves 'are merged into a shared communal identity' through empathy (see Lindholm 1997:405) can also result from a failure to consider the significance of *tatemae:honne* dualisms and the ideal of harmony. In Shizuoka, informants clarified that harmony was never a given, nor did it imply an empathetic merging of identities. Attempts to achieve harmony were governed by the fear of making mistakes and concerns to set aside or hide unacceptable motives and emotions, all of which indicate an active subjectivity and self-awareness. Subjective awareness and agency were essential for managing relationships. They were required, for instance, in using appropriate linguistic boundary placements (*kejime*), in making judgements over how to perform well, and in calculating the risks of offending others and losing group allegiances (e.g. whether to attend a function, or continue with a degree course). They were also necessary for knowingly concealing achievements for modesty (e.g. the acquisition of a higher degree in later life), in compromising the self for group acceptance, and in recognising that individual circumstances were specific to that individual alone.

In refuting notions of a Japanese 'sociocentric' self that lacks self-awareness, Shimizu (2000) argues that the private experiences of three teenagers[18] reveal a dynamic relation between elements of both an individualist and sociocentric orientation. In my view, Shimizu's study illustrates the teenagers' socialization into a better understanding of *tatemae:honne* forms of social interaction. Shimizu's analysis leading to his (2000:209) contention that 'self-awareness transcends culturally constructed selves' is, however, questionable, since he substitutes *honne* constructions of self for a transcendent self-awareness.[19] I accept, however, that in Japan a *dialogue* exists between a person's self-aware self and culturally constructed forms of self since, as mentioned above, subjective self-awareness is essential for managing the demarcation between *tatemae* and *honne* in relations with others.

As will be seen, these different perceptions of self/person in Wellington and Shizuoka significantly influenced young people's outlook and choices and their orientations toward the future.

---

[18] The three adolescents comprising this study were selectively (not randomly) chosen and attended a junior and senior Christian high school in Japan locally regarded as an 'Americanized school'.

[19] Shimizu bases his argument and analysis on concepts derived from Heidegger and Tillich along with Western philosophical assumptions that are not necessarily universal. Further, his adoption of Tillich's concept of choice toward the 'courage to be' is taken out of context. Shimizu bypasses what is Tillich's (1963:41,49,175,181) Christian existentialist central argument that 'courage to be' implies taking a stand against non-being (death/anxiety) through the agency of a higher power (God).

CHAPTER 4

INTERRELATIONS BETWEEN SCHOOLS, COMMUNITY AND THE

MATURATION OF YOUNG PEOPLE

In both Wellington and Shizuoka, young peoples' maturation was shaped by community attitudes and values, which affected the decisions and choices young people made. This chapter explores how personhood and maturation were played out in certain social contexts. In particular I will focus on secondary schooling, part-time work and family life. A major interest concerns how choice, freedom and independence were differently understood and enacted in Wellington and Shizuoka.

In their senior high school years, young people began making transitional changes toward life beyond high school. Institutionalised systems of education, consumerism, peer cultures, and a concern with future employment were common to young people in both societies. Many areas of choice appeared identical. These included choices involving school subjects and future careers, part-time work outside of school hours, and the spending of time and money. These similarities were, however, superficial in that the Wellington and Shizuoka communities were each shaping young people toward different types of full 'persons'. In these two societies, therefore, the world of school, part-work and money was experienced and lived in different ways, each of which exemplifies a different way of being modern.

Young people in Wellington were expected to become responsible individuals as autonomous adults. These ideas guided young people's transitional development in their senior high school years. Parents, teachers and young people adjusted to them in ways that emphasised and encouraged student growth in self-responsibility and independence and steadily reduced hierarchised relationships between students and teachers. Student engagement in part-time work outside school hours supported concepts of young people's becoming self-choosing independent adults in an egalitarian society.

In Shizuoka, relations between teachers, parents and students were based on values of hierarchy, harmony, and respect. Parents were closely identified with their children's schools, and schools were responsible for ethical as well as educational aspects of students' lives. Students were encouraged to become responsibly independent in ways that

blended with valued norms. An exploration of notions of individualism, independence and freedom in Shizuoka illustrates how communities in Wellington and Shizuoka were engaged in producing different kinds of independent persons.

While choice, freedom and independence were common themes in both societies, these concepts meant different things to young people and their parents in Wellington and Shizuoka. Although certain scholars (e.g. Gellner 1986; Ivy 1995; B.White 2004; Sakurai 2004) argue for a convergence towards a common modernity where individualist values of freedom and choice reign, my research suggests that independence and choice must be understood in terms of quite different cultural logics and structures of social relationships. These differences are set out below.

4.1. WELLINGTON: INTERRELATIONS BETWEEN SCHOOLS, COMMUNITY AND THE MATURATION OF YOUNG PEOPLE

In the 1990s, social changes within the New Zealand society affected senior high school students' and their parents' attitudes to education and employment choices. In response to globalising market forces, industrial bases had begun to move offshore, altering employment patterns within New Zealand. The pool of labouring jobs available dwindled in size and variation, while employment openings in service industries and information technologies, for which a tertiary education was essential, increased. Further, an active women's movement promoted women's higher educational achievement and better paid career employment, undermining the value of women's nurturing roles in the home. At the same time, educational policies were being restructured toward a more broadly based National Certificate of Educational Achievement (NCEA) to better accommodate Maori and Pacific Islander interests, while neo-rightist 'user pays' directives capped funding for tertiary institutes and introduced higher fees to cover the shortfall. Students and parents were adjusting to the need for most young people to attend and finance tertiary courses as a gateway toward a better future. These trends continued into the C21st (Higgins 2002; Vaughan 2003).

At that time, as now, in accordance with the 'Principles' laid out by the Ministry of Education, the New Zealand Curriculum for schools 'encourages students to become

independent'. The 'Principles' also stipulate that the Curriculum 'will foster… attitudes that will empower students to take increasing responsibility for their own learning'.[1]

When YFP student interviews were carried out, a core syllabus of linked subjects in junior and senior high school years, with minimal choices, was accredited by public national examinations in the third and fifth year of high school (Forms 5 and 7 respectively). Students in Forms 5 and 7 were externally examined at the year's end with minimal input from internal assessments. Form 6 was internally assessed throughout the year, and end of year marks were scaled up or down between classes and between schools.[2] Students could repeat individual courses between Forms 5, 6 and 7 if they had not passed the relevant subject. At the time of the YFP research, the leaving school age was raised from sixteen to seventeen years. Few students left school before completing Form 6, which provided the minimum requirements for securing a reasonable full-time job. A student could, with excellent grades, proceed to a university after Form 6, or with general passes could proceed to a Polytech. Normally students wishing to attend university were required to complete Form 7 (Bursary), while students unsure of their futures, or planning to attend a Polytech, could remain at school but take fewer Form 7 subjects. New Zealand high schools require no entrance examinations and are minimally ranked.[3]

Interviewed students were in Form 6 or commencing Form 7. A few students were repeating some fifth form subjects.

4.1.1. Maturation through senior levels of high school

Interviewees in all four high schools saw the move from junior into senior levels as the crossing of a notable divide: 'Everyone kind of grew up a bit when we stepped from fifth form to sixth form. It's a good step.' With no end-of-year external examination, sixth formers spread their outside activities more evenly across the year than in 5th (and later 7th)

---

[1] www. tki.org.nz/r/governance/nzcf/principles_e.php

[2] Indigenous terms applied to form levels 5,6 and 7 were 'School Certificate', 'University Entrance' (or 'U.E.') and 'Bursary'. The NCEA introduced a syllabus with maximum optimal choices requiring internal assessment and external examinations for the equivalent of Forms 5, 6 and 7.

[3] Ranking occurred according to parental wealth and status or religious affiliation in what were once private schools (now re-categorised into the state system), ethnic factors in Maori language-based schools, and gender factors in single-sex schools. During the past ten years schools have been assessed and ranked to determine state levels of funding for each school, effectively typing schools into more recognisable ethnic and socioeconomic categories than in the past. Within the past three years universities have been nationally assessed on the basis of performance. There are no university entrance examinations over and above school matriculation qualifications.

forms. Seniors regarded themselves as more mature and almost adult, and recognised that most teachers shared the same view: 'When you hit the age of fifteen or sixteen, they [teachers] think of you more as an adult than a child.' My aim in this section is to explore the ways in which schools (and parents) assist young people through the maturation process toward adulthood and autonomy.

(i) Assuming responsibilities for schoolwork

Students entering the senior years noted a reduction in teacher controls over schoolwork, while detentions formerly received for uncompleted work became a thing of the past. Senior students appreciated that success with schoolwork depended on their own initiatives and were aware of the consequences of letting work slide. Some sixth form students, however, preferred to pursue other activities, describing the ease with which schoolwork could lose out to other interests:

> Usually [after lunch I] go to a lot of free spells... Either [I] go swimming or I go to… touch [rugby] trainings, [or] cricket trainings. Or I go to my girlfriend's until about six… After tea [I] just watch TV really… I'm going to have to start studying again... [But] everyone's going, "Come out with us," you know… I'm only passing two or three subjects out of six this year… I usually bribe them [my parents] into thinking that I'm doing all my work and that I'm passing.

A Bursary student entering seventh form was conscious that the social habits of her sixth form year needed to change:

> Homework is the main thing that I want to do more of… I'm really bad at saying no to things… [but] I've got to do it… [I'll] just do my [part-time] work, and Youth Choir, and School Choir, and ISCF [Inter-school Christian Fellowship] and that'll be all… [I'll] have to try and not do extra things as well as that.

Reduced teacher controls did not imply teacher indifference. Students pointed out that: 'They [the teachers] look out for you… They want you to pass.' At Wellington High, promoting self-responsibility and independence was school policy and self-motivation was essential for achieving success. Academically inclined students appreciated this emphasis as an incentive to learn self-reliance:

> It gets a bit too relaxed with the teachers occasionally… Basically you've got to be able to work yourself… [It is] good preparation I think for university, because [at university] you're doing a lot of assignments… as well as exams.

Senior school also implied a shift from parental monitoring of homework to student responsibilities and initiatives. Students opted to study in their own rooms where

homework was easily avoided. Students often admitted to 'slacking'[4] and of making efforts to work only for forthcoming tests or on material that was internally assessed. Most students agreed that their parents never asked about homework, or if they did, that they rarely checked on what was required. Only two students said they would have liked their parents to show more concern, and only two mentioned that they appreciated their mothers' interest in their work.

Students claimed that parents were rarely able to limit outside interests that interfered with schoolwork, such as part-time work or sport, while only two parents said they took a strong stand against part-time work on this basis. Teachers, students and parents alike took the view that senior students would take responsibility for their own academic success and that in matters of schoolwork senior students should become independent and responsible.

(ii) Assuming responsibilities for school and class attendance
In senior years students were expected to become more responsible for school and class attendance. However, school policies concerning attendance differed markedly. At Wellington College, attendance rules for seniors barely changed from those applied to juniors. Seventh Formers were privileged only in that they could leave school grounds at lunchtime. Absence from classes without permission was still punishable. At Wellington High, by contrast, responsibility for class attendance was entirely given over to senior students. Students who skipped classes ran the risk of failing courses:

> [Teachers] usually ask for a note [for an absence] and if you don't [have] one it's an 'unexplained absence'… If you… get more than thirteen unexplained absences you forfeit the course… My friend got seventeen… It [happens] with the dropouts… They try to enforce you being in class but they really have no control over it.

Only if a student's schoolwork lapsed were the parents notified. By being granted this freedom, Wellington High students did not inevitably become more casual about attendance. Significantly, students valued the opportunities for self-discipline.

Wellington Girls' and Wainuiomata College took a middle line concerning school attendance. As at Wellington College, privileges were not granted until 7th Form. Also, attendance was required in courses in which students were enrolled. Students at Wellington Girls', however, enjoyed a greater freedom than students at Wainuiomata

---

[4] 'Slacking' implied 'having a casual attitude'.

College, as seventh formers explained: 'You can leave any time you want during the day as long as you make all your classes.' And again: 'You can write your own notes [for class non-attendance].'[5] Students at Wainuiomata College were allowed to leave school only when they had free periods[6] and only after they had obtained signed permission notes, an approach that some students said decreased temptations to stay away. Other Wainuiomata students, however, resented the need to produce a note to explain absences. An eighteen-year-old exchange student from Finland, whose sentiments were echoed by other students wanting more self-responsibility, expressed the latter attitude:

> In Finland… when you become eighteen… you can sign your absences yourself and you're… responsible [for] yourself… I just couldn't stand… that if I miss a spell I should have to bring a note [saying] where I've been. Because I haven't been wagging[7]—I would have had a flute lesson or the choir or something. So I never brought a note and they didn't like it… They would say… "Well, it's procedure." I just…[said], "Well, I'm not bringing one"… It was just something I had… to [do]… to prove that I am responsible.

Despite variations between schools, all students agreed that attendance rules for seniors or seventh formers were more relaxed than rules for juniors and saw them as a sign of their growing maturity.

(iii) The liberties of mufti

With the exception of Wellington College (whose seventh formers wore items of uniform distinguishing them from lower forms), schools allowed final-year students to wear ordinary clothes in place of uniforms. Wellington High students wore ordinary clothes throughout high school. Senior students saw in these changes recognition of their individuality, sense of self-responsibility and independence, and sense of maturity. They also noted improved teacher-students relations:

> In Seventh Form… teachers actually… relate to you. They… treat you like real people… Out of uniform they [students] are suddenly… not these little girls.

---

[5] Other privileges noted for seniors at Wellington Girls' were the use of a common room, the use of school lifts. Form time was twice weekly instead of daily. At Wellington College, seniors no longer had to line up outside classrooms, could talk in class, and seventh formers could leave school at lunchtime. At Wellington High, seniors had a study.

[6] A 'free spell' or 'free period' was granted to any student not enrolled in, and therefore not required to attend, a specific class.

[7] To 'wag' meant to choose to miss some classes or stay away from school.

Ordinary clothes freed students from associations made between school uniforms and children: 'You don't have to walk down the street and be classified as… a school kid.' The sense of elevation into being young adults who felt more equal to other adults was daily appreciated when students merged with the wider public. One student referred to the public's expectation that, on a crowded bus, students would give up their seats to adults:

> I won't miss having to stand up on buses that's for sure... That's one of the benefits about being in mufti this year, because they [the public] don't know [you are still at school].

Senior students welcomed the opportunity for individual self-assertion through the way they dressed: 'With… uniforms… you can't express yourselves through clothing.' Seventh formers chose to wear clothes they felt most comfortable about, as did all Wellington High students:

> You really get to discover your own style… You just wear what you want everyday and it's just really casual.

Students also welcomed being able to express themselves through current fashions such as 'piercings… and long hair and… dyed hair, saying that: [It is] freer… It's pretty good.'

By dispensing with uniforms, students became vulnerable to distinctions of wealth and/or ethnicity reflected through dress codes. A student at Wainuiomata College, who resisted pressure to align himself with an ethnic group, noted the ethnic identities and associated problems among his peers:

> To me everyone's different… [But there's a lot of pressure to conform]... In this school… if you're white, you have to be a skinhead. That's really how it goes. Almost all the sixth formers now… [have] shaved their heads and tried to be bogans or something… [If you are different, you are] thought of as a dork, a geek, [or] gay... I've got heaps of people after me… just because I don't hang round with them… Mainly skinheads and homeys.[8]

Wainuiomata was a small community and geographically isolated, hence long associations between students in local primary and intermediate schools eased ethnic tension while at high school:

> You don't get all these groups [at school]… [because] everybody knows everybody… They've all grown up together.

---

[8] Groups identified themselves with Maori or Pacific Islanders, or were seen as 'neo-Nazis'. Students in the Wainuiomata community named ethnically charged groups 'homeys', 'skinheads' and 'bogans'. 'Homeys' were said to be Polynesian identified, 'skinheads' were labelled 'white supremists', and 'bogans' were 'white trash' [of lower socioeconomic status].

Students at Wellington High tolerated social group formations,[9] saying of other schools: 'There's a lot of racism there and you don't see it at our school.' Wellington High students stressed, however, that each high school had its own ambience and was known for its character. One student, for instance, characterised Wellington High school by commenting: 'Quite a few of the old hippies… send their kids [here]… [Or] the more open minded parents… [more] left wing [parents do]', while another described it as 'non-religious, co-educational, multi-ethnic… quite laid back and… quite cruisy [there is a friendly staff].' Students at Wellington High claimed that separate group identities at their school created few problems and that not all students identified with groups, especially in the senior years (Bradford Brown 1993:178-179).

Students were not questioned on how they understood the relation between 'self' and group associations. Their comments, however, suggest that participation in groups on the basis of ethnicity may have been for reasons of solidarity, while participation in other groups was based on common interest. In either case, however, the suggestion is that group participation was voluntary and, in that identification with any group was seen to be an act of choice, group participation did not negate a person's sense of, or search for, individual autonomy.

One student, noting that groups tended to form according to different types of peer identities causing some friction, commented:

> Maybe [there is] a little bit [of conflict]… I couldn't fit myself into one [group]… A lot of... my close friends… [are] out of school… [And] I've got… close friends that I… spend time with at school … [where] I spend time with individuals or a couple of people, but not groups.

Growth as an individual with a developing self-identity enabled this student to completely dissociate herself from groups. Her awareness of 'typed' identities was sharpened by participation in a polytech student's photo shoot in which she dressed appropriately to represent different group types:

> It was… a collage of me… It was really interesting seeing me in all these different clothes… I just looked completely convincing in each one… But I don't… think I was any of them… I even had a bogan dress on with white boots… that looked completely convincing… I was shocked. It was… a lace tie-dye dress with a… triangle up the front, with a little lace up bodice… It was… hideous.

---

[9] Groups named at Wellington High included 'homeys', 'absolute homeys', 'bogans', 'scabies', 'dungeons and dragons', op shop clothes types, designer clothes types, 'surfies' and 'skaters'.

At schools where ordinary clothes were permitted, students felt less programmed by school authorities and freer to discover their own sense of responsibility and directions.

(iv) Changes in student-teacher relations

In relinquishing some controls over classes and individuals, many teachers attempted to meet senior students on a new social level by accepting them as young adults who desired more control over their lives. Teachers trod a narrow line between adopting more relaxed relations with students, and meeting their own responsibilities as sources of authority.

Changes in teacher-student relations noted by students suggest that teacher authority was muted through mutual but conditional respect: 'They [teachers] treat you… how we treat them… If we treat them with respect [and] maturity… they'll treat us back [the same way]. If we… get smart to them, they won't respect us.' Other comments suggested a levelling in relations: '[I] work hard… so they treat me quite fairly… They don't look down on me.' Students also noticed a reduced emphasis on outward discipline and a stronger emphasis on openness and encouragement: 'They [teachers] are just caring… They want to teach you… When you're a senior, the teachers treat you like… an adult… They don't really punish you.' One student noted that teachers became more considerate: 'They [teachers] treat you totally different… They're really nice to you.' If seniors were interested in a subject and wanting to learn, teachers were more willing to give of their time: 'Some teachers… make a special effort to [do more]… if you're talented.' Additional teacher interest in the work of some students nevertheless had its limits: 'Most of the teachers will go out of their way to help you… [But] since they've got heaps[10] of pupils, there's no… big time for them to have a special involvement with you.'

Students consciously attributed changes in student-teacher relations to their own growth toward adulthood: 'You [are]… more open to them [teachers], [you] talk to them better, [and you are] more mature as well.' Students also noted the effects of their wearing mufti on student-teacher relations: 'The teachers respect us more… And they treat us… more as equals than they did in the past.' At the same time, these changes were taken to represent the general equalising of relations that occurred as people 'became' adults:

> When you get older you get more equal… It wouldn't be just… teaching and learning… You could actually… talk with the teacher… in a different way.

---

[10] 'Heaps' means 'a great number'.

Improved communication indicated a new dimension of acceptance where exchanges between students and teachers could occur on several levels: 'You can… have a good conversation that's not to do with the subject [taught].' The ability to meet teachers on a conversational level was frequently cited as one phenomenon differentiating senior and junior students.

In describing their relations with teachers, some students used the terms 'friends' or 'friendly' to indicate a more approachable attitude than in earlier years. Use of these terms, however, was always qualified: 'Teachers are sort of quite friendly'; and: 'They [teachers] are… friendly… and joke but they just don't… go overboard with it'. 'Friendliness' indicated one level of compatibility and equality between students and teachers: 'I get along with most of them.' On the other hand, students were suspicious of, and quick to condemn, those teachers whose ideas of friendliness overstepped institutional bounds. They criticised teachers as 'being nosey' if, under the pretext of 'being friendly', they showed undue interest in student's lives: 'Trying to be all friends with the students… makes everyone totally disrespect the teacher'; and: 'It annoys me when they [teachers] do that… It doesn't work because they're just supposed to be teaching and they… try to be real friendly… They shouldn't do it.'

Student-teacher friendliness was always bounded by the hierarchical nature of the teaching institution. Students were therefore never completely able to meet teachers on an equal footing. At Wellington High students could address teachers by their first names, yet one student who did so[11] noted: 'There's always that teacher student thing. You can't… get away from it really… You're instantly in it.' Rather than seeking more equality, some students resigned themselves to hierarchised relations. Some even excused teacher indifference on those grounds:

> [Teachers] are like [a]… separate species… They're too stressed, too underpaid, [they've] got too many problems... What you see of them is really minimal… They tell you to be quiet, they tell you to do this that and the other, and to do your homework… But you don't really see them as real people.

Whether appreciative of being 'more equal' with teachers, or resigned to being 'not really equal because they [teachers] are teaching you', all senior students resented being thought

---

[11] Two other students said they used first names but only when teachers introduced themselves that way. First name use was outlawed as a form of address to teachers at the other high schools. Six of nine students said they used first names for sports coaches.

of as 'kids' or 'children'. These terms and their accompanying attitudes were considered demeaning and were roundly condemned: 'One teacher at school… talks to everyone like they're eight years old… She's really rude and patronising and everybody hates her'; and: '[Teachers] should at least listen a little bit… Some teachers… [think we're] children… I just ignore them.' The more authority the teacher exercised, the greater the resentment: 'Our Principal said to us, "Hello kids," at assembly… It didn't go down well at all.'

Equally important in senior student-teacher relations was a teacher's teaching ability and handling of classes. Benchmarks for respect of teachers, without which students claimed no learning could take place, were the teachers' knowledge of their subject and their ability to 'get the point across' and create interest to 'keep you tuned in and motivated'. Student respect for teachers also depended on the teachers' ability to control classes. Students wanting to succeed often held a contractual idea of student-teacher roles:

> It's basically… student-teacherish. I do whatever they [teachers] say… If they have expectations I meet them… I have expectations as well, of course, of how I should be taught… [and of] whether they are good at teaching… I have the right to… make sure they taught properly and taught everything I should need to know… [I] accept that they know more than us, [and that] they have worked to be where they are… They're there for us and they should be treated accordingly.

By their senior years students had discarded an identity as school children subject to authoritarian and hierarchical control. They subscribed as young adults to cultural notions of an egalitarian adulthood, claiming the right to respectful and profitable relations with teachers at school.

(v) Choices and the future

Many senior students felt that they had outgrown high school: 'You're still there with kids… (aged) thirteen and fourteen… You're still in the same group as them.' To many, the remaining school year(s) ahead appeared unattractive. As one said: 'I've been there for four years already and there's going to be no surprises. It's going to be just the same… except harder.' As there was no consistency in the way staff regarded or treated students, students seeking recognition as young adults were left coping with swinging emotions:

> At school… teachers are telling you off… And you feel so little… Next period you might be talking to a woman… about next year and moving out of home… And you think… "I am quite old."

Very few senior students said they 'liked' school. Those who did chiefly enjoyed friendships with groups of students, or appreciated just a few classes. In the main, when senior students discussed their perceptions of school they spoke more of endurance, switching almost mechanically to discuss overriding pressure to obtain 'qualifications' for the future.[12]

Students found that having to select optional subjects in their senior years meant having to contemplate the future. They commented: 'The future is where everyone looks really, all the time. Everything we're doing now… is for the future'; and: 'There's been pressure since… [the] beginning of fifth form about what you were going to do for the rest of your life… You think, "I'm fifteen, I don't want to be deciding now."' In line with socio-cultural views that destinies were individually forged and social roles were mostly free of gender ascriptions, one student reflected:

> The options are so wide… The whole world is their [a student's] oyster… There's so much to do in this world… Where do you start? … It's a hard call.

In some schools students were required to talk about their options with career advisors, listing their long-term goals before selecting courses. When reasons for taking up courses shifted from desire to obligation, students resented the change: 'I don't… think you learn much if you are doing something because you think you should, rather than you want to.' In senior student vocabularies, notions of 'should', 'needing' and 'requiring' merged with those of 'the future':

> Once you get to seniors, you're… planning ahead… [People start to say]…"I have to… go to this class so that I can get my qualification."

Responsibility for decisions over school courses lay squarely with the students. Parents played a minimal advisory role, supporting a student's decisions because they approved the student's choices or because they left choices to the student. Rarely did parents try to impose their will over senior students and, when they did, their attempts often backfired.[13]

---

[12]'Gaining qualifications' meant gaining passes in subjects that provided better prospects for employment or entry to tertiary institutes etc. Technically they were awards indicating levels of achievement rather than qualifications.

[13] Six instances were mentioned in the interviews. In two cases, one or both parents insisted that a son wanting to join the police academy or the armed forces should first prepare for a university degree. One son complied. The other refused. Of the remaining cases, one father insisted his son take six subjects in sixth form, but left the subject choice to the student. In two cases, although parents insisted that a student continue

Although some students sought or took parental advice, they remained convinced that they were in charge of their own choices and lives: 'I decide them [the subjects] and then tell them [parents]… If I'm a bit unsure I'll ask them about it'; or: 'They just give me suggestions but… it's mainly my decision'; or: 'They have a hand in that… [but] it is still my choice.'

Students said they had 'some idea' of possible future jobs or careers, however tentative. Overlapping areas of interest for male and female students included careers in science, dentistry, design, the arts, sport related occupations and the police force. Female students alone specified an interest in careers in medicine, psychology, law and commerce, languages and journalism. Male students alone named a possible future in engineering, building, the army or airforce, and train driving. Only the latter group suggested gender-linked choices belonging to an older tradition.

Just as a student's social life could undermine the focus and discipline demanded by study, so also taking up part-time jobs together with the social rewards that flowed from them (as discussed below) added extra demands on a student's time. Equally, as senior years became more challenging, they could also become more tedious and monotonous and school appear too confining. Students complained: 'I'm just getting bored', and: 'I can't wait to leave school.' Students avoided aspects of school they no longer found acceptable. They abandoned classes they disliked for alternative school activities: 'I do as many sports activities as I can, [to] get out of class as much as I can.' Most frequently, however, students 'wagged' classes or school due to dislike of teachers and subjects, or because a subject no longer appeared relevant. Personal interests often outweighed concerns over school attendance: '[If] something comes out… like a new Korn album [14]… you just wag school… for the last two spells.' Students also wagged classes to free themselves from a sense of institutional entrapment: 'It's a big system, school, and you've got to try and beat the system.'

Many students completed the final years of school only because their futures depended on it. Connections students made between education and qualifications, jobs, and further training, rather than with interests and inspiration, caused students to become 'more

---

with German, one student skipped the classes. And one mother insisted that her daughter take music (which the daughter failed) rather than the economic course the daughter wanted to do.

[14] Korn was a popular band on CDs.

responsible', 'knuckle down' and 'make the most of it', or to work at subjects they found irrelevant. Parents said they encouraged their children to persevere, agreeing that success implied gaining qualifications for a job or career leading to financial independence and status.[15] Many mentioned that, if their children desired to leave school early, they would explore their reasons and try to dissuade them, hoping that their children would commence, if not complete, tertiary studies and then 'take responsibility for themselves'.[16]

The end of school was often seen by Wellington students as the ultimate shedding of childhood and as a sign of 'becoming adult'. Many transitions toward adulthood began during the senior years at school, including the development of attitudes encouraging equal competition between young men and women toward gaining careers and jobs. Authoritarian and hierarchical teacher-student relations often moved toward mutual respect and the future practice of egalitarian relations in adulthood. The learning of self-discipline and responsibility in senior years aided a person's growth in maturity, as did the practice of endurance. And an emphasis on individual responsibility encouraged a spirit of independence such that, by the end of high school, students already bore traits of those qualities they recognised as being 'adult'.

4.1.2. Maturation through part-time work

(i) A purchase on freedom and independence
Student transitions from a structured world of family and school into free-choosing independent adults were aided by participation in part-time work, which removed the need to rely absolutely on spending money acquired from parents with its associations of dependence, gratitude and/or indebtedness.

The incidence (83.8%) of high school students working part-time after school, at weekends, or during holidays was sufficiently high to be regarded as a common social practice. At the time of being interviewed, only six students had no part-time job and, of these, three had formerly had jobs while one was seeking part-time work. Students sought employment as assistants in shops, supermarkets, and fast-food outlets, or as cleaners.

---

[15] Across New Zealand, girls were more likely than boys to remain at school, achieve qualifications, and go to tertiary institutes (Davey 1998).

[16] Between 1986 and 1991, unemployment levels among older teenagers trebled, forcing many onto welfare benefits (Davey 1994:55).

Other frequent sources of income were paper runs and babysitting.[17] Occasionally a student would find a job at the workplace of a parent or relative. Less frequently, students received a small sum for attending to family household chores although, in cases where parents paid an allowance, some students were expected to help with jobs at home in order to receive their allowance.

During school term, the hours worked by students in part-time jobs ranged from twenty-one hours per week to four hours per week, at rates that ranged between $8.50 (US$4.25) per hour before tax to $4 or $5 per hour for babysitting. Students working in a parent's firm or other 'under the table' jobs could avoid paying tax and thus earn more, as did one student earning $10 per hour as a cleaner. Students constantly assessed the amount of time they worked and the monetary value of their jobs and, when hearing of better paid opportunities, sought higher paid jobs.

Half the students (54%) received some form of allowance from their parents in addition to, or in one case in place of, earned income. The amounts received when averaged on a weekly basis ranged from $10 to $20 per week. Parent decisions to provide an allowance were not solely determined by their household income although, in lower income households and households with more dependent children, allowances were less common. Only in exceptional cases did students not receiving an allowance also not work part-time, merely asking parents for money as needed.[18] Most students with no form of allowance sought out jobs, or were prompted by parents to find jobs as did one mother who stopped her daughter's pocket money and located her a job at MacDonald's. Another student's babysitting job was her sole source of income:

> If I just wanted to stop earning my own money, she [mother] would say, "Well, you do understand that this means you will have nothing"… As much as she [mother] would want to contribute, she can't… I [do babysitting]… totally because of the money.

Students with substantial allowances, however, also sought jobs. One who received $50 pocket money per week worked an average of eight hours per week at MacDonald's to

---

[17] To 'babysit' means to look after one or more young children for a few hours while their parents are absent.

[18] These consisted of four students. Two had worked at jobs in the past, one prioritised sport, and one had inherited money invested on his behalf.

supplement her allowance. Another with $25 pocket money per week was motivated to seek a well-paying job after taking a holiday job.

Part-time jobs involved the interests of parents as well as students. A third of the students (30%) said that one or both parents had encouraged or told them to find a job, or found a job for them. Some parents (24%) encouraged students to save their allowance or part of their earnings for a specific target, such as a car, a cosmetic course, or a contribution to a superannuation fund. Often parents advocated part-time jobs to free themselves from their son or daughter's demands for spending money. As students said, parents 'wanted me to work because they're sick of me borrowing… [and] getting money off them all the time'.

There was no trend suggesting that only students lacking basic commodities desired jobs. The inability of a single parent to provide for all a student's needs could, however, make it necessary for a student to work, as could a change in family circumstances. One student began working twelve hours a week when his new stepfather stopped the allowance that his mother had previously provided. In another case, a student took a government Independent Youth Benefit after her parents separated. This student used the benefit money to flat with tertiary students while working part-time for 'personal luxuries'.

The possible generalisation that students from single parent backgrounds needed to work for lack of income was offset by instances where single mothers provided substantial allowances for their children from the father's alimony. Moreover, married parents in the highest income bracket also encouraged their sons and daughters to work or found jobs for them, at the same time reducing or cutting allowances. Students in high income households frequently mentioned that parent incomes went to mortgage repayments or superannuation funds with little to spare. In other cases, parents with higher incomes advocated part-time work for their children, believing the experience would teach them the value of money.

Parents favouring part-time jobs observed that, by earning their own money and learning its value, their children would realise that parents 'can't always nurture them [their children] at home', and that 'money just doesn't grow on a tree or come from the skies', and that parents could not always 'bail them out' from any predicament. As one parent said: 'They've got to understand we're not a bottomless pit… [If] they want something, they're going to have to do something about it.' Parents explained that through part-time

work their children could become more responsible, enjoy a semblance of financial independence, learn budgeting skills and time management, and arrive at an understanding of the 'real world'.

Not all parents wanted their sons or daughters to take on a job, believing it would interfere with study. Five students who found jobs on their own initiative mentioned parental apprehension that schoolwork and other commitments, such as music practice, would suffer. On the other hand, two students with part-time jobs also worried that job commitments interfered with study. One, a student with a paper run, tried to earn more by babysitting yet found the experience too exhausting. Another student commented:

> Last year… I was working four days a week [or] five days a week after school… It just burnt me out… If you're doing school you shouldn't be working a lot… Four hours a week is plenty for me.

Usually, however, students did not allow school commitments or extra sport or cultural activities to limit the hours they worked at part-time jobs. Students most actively engaged in extra-mural events were also those most active in seeking work and holding down part-time jobs for long hours. Moreover, students seeking jobs, or parents seeking jobs on their behalf, would often settle for whatever jobs would bring the best returns, putting up with shifts and flexible hours that often included some weekday afternoons or evenings as well as weekend hours.

Students admitted that part-time work was often arduous and long hours worked outside school hours were not always convenient, especially when work shifts occurred the night before a school test. Many students also agreed that their work became monotonous or dull, or complained that work left no time for friends after school, yet few students were prepared to relinquish their jobs.

Students provided a number of reasons for wanting part-time jobs. Some mentioned enjoying the challenge, or the chance to gauge future options: 'You notice what the real world's going to be like… [and] see the whole picture.' A few others said they worked for fun, or in the holidays to escape from younger siblings, or worked in order to save, or that they found a job because others had jobs. Most students, however, said that they worked for the money, perhaps because they had no allowance, or an insufficient allowance, but always to be able to buy what parents were unable or refused to buy for them. By working

part-time jobs, students learned not only the value of money, but also of their ability to provide for their own needs: 'They [the parents] won't get it [for me so] I'll buy it myself.'

With self-earned money students discovered the sense of independence that working for and possessing their own money could bring: 'That's the one thing that makes you independent… When you work for your money. When you get money.' Students were aware that self-earned money granted them an element of freedom from parental authority. When parents attempted to influence the way students used their money, they were often unsuccessful. Students withheld information or deflected questions about their spending, or ignored parents' advice about how to use it. Occasionally students admitted that parental concerns affected their spending, but only indirectly. One student imagined that her parents would interfere if she spent in disapproved areas, such as 'buying drugs or something'. Another student, who had free rein on his money, believed his parents would comment only if he spent it all on fast-food.

Students were reasonably sure of their reasons for wanting to earn money before seeking part-time work. Most wanted money in order to afford consumer items, entertainment and, lower on the list, to save:

> I'm still looking for it [a job] because I want to earn money. If I don't earn money, how am I supposed to go out to parties and things… [or] see a movie or something like that?… When I'm earning… [I'll spend my money on] label clothes… CD's, [a] decent tape player because I haven't got that good a one, probably a mini system or something. [I'll] probably buy a few computer games here and there [and I'll spend] a bit of it on foods, clothes, and… I'll probably save a bit as well every week.

Students would often say that parents paid for their school clothes while they themselves provided much or all of the rest. These purchases included clothes and accessories other than basic clothing, thus student monies provided for self-chosen personal fashion in which they felt comfortable and appropriate in the company of friends and new acquaintances. Consumer items required or desired by young people for their personal and social life therefore belonged in a category considered distinct from parent responsibilities, comprising items that parents thought that young people should pay for by themselves. Parents would not normally buy their sons and daughters cigarettes and alcohol, or pay for parties students frequently organised ('sometimes every single weekend [or] twice a week'), or dinners or nightclubs. Student spending on tapes, CDs, movies and computer

games afforded them access to the youth culture with which they identified, and through which they communicated among their peers.

As well as the above, students spent their own money on transport for social activities, thus providing themselves with mobility to explore life beyond the limits previously set by family, school life, and a pushbike. Even though few students had permanent access to a car and only two students owned a car, friends of student car owners, or of students holding licences with access to a car, contributed to petrol costs for shared rides. All students were of an age qualifying them to possess a licence, yet obtaining a licence or the use of a car, as well as having access to a car, often posed problems for students and parents. Some parents encouraged their son or daughter to learn to drive only when they tired of taking them to different destinations. Students who had access to cars likewise tired of driving others who were not members of their own family, just as they tired of conflicts over which family member should use the car. Moreover, some parents were reluctant for their son or daughter to use their cars. Often they refused to pay extra car insurance to cover young drivers, effectively discouraging their son or daughter from wanting to learn to drive. Other students had no desire to drive, despite parental encouragement. Students without access to cars paid for public transport, or walked.

Whatever forms of transport students paid for, when students travelled to places and events beyond activities associated with home or school they usually had to use their own money. They also knew that the ability to pay for their own transport and hold a driver's licence was essential for their freedom:

> People… my age do [own a car], but I don't… By the time you're seventeen you need your licence… It's a freedom thing… A lot of people are getting freedom from their whole living situation, to do what they want. And so a car goes with that… Even [if it's] just borrowing your parents' [car]… [and] being able to go places… In a sense it [access to a car] is freedom... Financially it's not… [so] there is [also] a big freedom to not having a car.

Most students spent their money to gain social entry to a life semi-independent from parental and school controls. As one student explained:

> Last year… I was working fulltime in the summer… You spend on food and alcohol… going out to the movies… entertainment… and things like clothes… I bought lots… I bought a snowboard and a surfboard and… stuff that was quite expensive. And [I] went down [to the South Island].

Only a third of the students were attempting to save money, largely because they had independently decided or agreed to do so. Many students were discouraged from saving by comparing how little they earned with the cost of a desired item:

> [There's] nothing that I can save up for in a hurry… The only thing that I'd be interested in getting would be over a thousand dollars, which takes half a year, and I [am] not interested in waiting that long… [I'd like] a stereo, or my own personal computer.

Although students were aware of the rising costs of tertiary education and the need to save for courses, most preferred to spend. The attitude of one student who chose to save for a holiday rather than for tertiary fees and related expenses was typical of many:

> I think the amount that I'd save [for Polytech] wouldn't really make much difference… I prefer to enjoy myself now instead of saving up for the future… I'll get a loan [for Polytech] and then get a good job and pay it back.

Students who were motivated to save had definite goals that they wanted to meet. One student was saving for a car, one for a motorbike or car, another for a drum kit, and two for holidays. Six students were saving, or trying to save, to offset the cost of tertiary studies which many parents were either unable or unwilling to meet.[19] Two of these students said they both spent and saved, while one mentioned that it was easier to save during school terms than during the holidays. Students who had successfully accumulated money tried not to spend it. Some students saving for tertiary education accepted that students should be responsible for paying costs: 'Basically everyone now has to pay for their own fees so… that's fair enough.' Others wanted to avoid debts from taking student loans:

> Nowadays…we need to get jobs if we're going to be students… We just need it [jobs]… to save up [and] have real money of your own and a bit more independence… I don't want to get a huge loan. It just scares me.

Students with part-time jobs were therefore in two minds about how to use their money. On the one hand, they felt that they needed to spend in order to explore new forms of social life and step away from parental controls and the confines of school life. On the other hand, they recognised the different responsibilities attached to saving versus accepting a loan for tertiary studies. By the time they began tertiary studies, or

---

[19] In the last decade of the twentieth century a government sponsored loan scheme for tertiary fees or living expenses became income tested on parents' salaries until students turned twenty-five years old. Effectively, parents were asked to assist in paying all or some costs of tertiary education. The alternative was to pass the cost onto their sons and daughters. Unless they paid their own way, students were made dependent on parents until well after they considered themselves adult. By taking a loan, they become indebted to the state.

commenced full time work, most students, however, would have tasted the freedom and independence that their own monies were able to provide.

(ii) Social aspects of part-time work

Part-time work placed students in work environments that expanded their social relations with other workers and the wider public. Through working part-time jobs, students became conscious that their sense of self was changing from one primarily defined through membership in a family group and school to one they considered 'more adult'.

Whatever their attitudes to jobs they found, or to the low pay they received, students enjoyed the actual experience of working, especially in environments where they worked with others. Typically, one student, who made pizza dough at a fast-food outlet, said:

> I normally just do dough and stuff, and answer phones… It's just the same thing over and over again. It gets boring… [But] at least at work I can get around and… talk to people.

Students discovered that, by working, they mixed with people who in normal circumstances they would never meet, whose ages usually ranged above their own, and with whom they developed social rapport as co-workers. Some students bracketed themselves with workers between eighteen and the early twenties, extending by association their self-perception as being 'nearly adult'. As one seventeen-year old said:

> They're adults… They're in their twenties. There's a range from eighteen, to like, twenty five and I consider them all sort of the same age because they all hang out together… It's kind of weird… We [my age group] can socialise with adults… I can talk to them… about the same things that I can talk to about with my friends.

Students describing their work environments often noted a strong sense of equality among workers—juniors and managers alike:

> [At] work everyone is… working together… You… talk just like you're all friends… It doesn't really matter how old you are… Even the Managers are down at our level… The Managers are just… shift Managers… [They're] people who… work alongside everyone else.

The students' concept of equality is similar to that described by Lukes (1973:131,133) as being centrally based on respect, which involves a person's treating others as (actually or potentially) autonomous and capable of self-development.

The social levelling that students experienced among workers was augmented by the use first names and informal terms of address: 'Where I work, I don't even know my boss R...'s last name, I just call her R.' A student working in a supermarket commented:

143

All the people at work are called by their first name. Most of them are adults… And they call me by my first name and I don't know their last names… There's this guy who's like, sixty… and I'm the youngest person there in the deli… There's a big wide range… of ages.

Students who worked in jobs at their parent's workplaces, or when babysitting, likewise used first names. Another student who worked as a secretary at the local bus company said she 'gossiped' with managers on a first name basis.

First name use among workers, as well as between employers and employees, created an atmosphere of social familiarity that de-hierarchised earlier student experiences of home and school. First name use elevated students toward adult status through inclusiveness among workers older than themselves, and equalised their relationships with others who were adult.[20] It reflected an egalitarian ideology that softened the realities of salary and status differentials among staff and promoted an imaginary equality and inclusion that students 'felt' to be real.

Many students commented that through having part-time jobs they 'felt' older or more adult:

I feel more adult at work… [by] being treated differently… and also [by] people not instantly knowing that you're young.

Another student felt more adult at work through his efforts to show independent initiative:

When I was working at New World [I felt more adult]. You kind of feel more: "Oh I've got a job"... You feel more independent because you do it yourself.

Another student said he felt more adult because, as a supermarket checkout operator, he related as an adult with customers of different age groups, while adult interaction with the parents of children a student babysat created an environment in which the student said she 'felt more adult'.

Work experience in part-time jobs provided students with knowledge of their social transitions from 'teenagers' or 'young adults' into 'adults'. The possession of money they earned created knowledge that independence and freedom from parental authority and family obligations were associated with an independent income. Participation in the work force also conveyed to students the idea that adulthood was associated with informality,

---

[20] Even though a simple address system, as among English speakers, may not necessarily make speakers perceive each other as equals, first name use indicates a sign of, or a desire for, more intimate relations than relations achieved through address by titles alone. The latter designate rank or occupation and, through an asymmetric use of names or address terms, often suggest power differentials (Wardhaugh 2002:267-268).

the use of first names and sociability, where a fundamental sense of equality prevailed among adults despite wage disparities.

4.2. SHIZUOKA: INTERRELATIONS BETWEEN SCHOOLS, COMMUNITY AND THE MATURATION OF YOUNG PEOPLE

We have seen that, in Wellington, young people's experience of senior years in high school, part-time work, family life, and preparations for the years ahead, led them toward an appreciation of themselves as being almost independent and almost adult. In Shizuoka, students were placed in a hierarchised society with a focus on respect and harmony, which considerably altered the way education and the senior years of high school, family life, part-time work and preparations for the years ahead were perceived and experienced. In the following section I will distinguish the experiences of students in Shizuoka from those in Wellington, and indicate the influence and impact of these experiences on young people in their maturation toward full personhood.   Since young people in Shizuoka, as in Wellington, equally aspired to becoming independent and competent in making choices, I aim to clarify the way young people and their parents in Shizuoka understood 'independence' and related concepts of privacy and freedom.

4.2.1. Issues of education, rank, hierarchy, and privacy

An exploration of the limitations placed by the Shizuoka Board of Education on research questions concerning the educational background and occupation of parents led to a number of insights described below. These concerned relations between schools, parents and the Board of Education, but also cultural factors affecting young people's maturation in Shizuoka. The latter included the way schooling could determine a person's social status and class, how a person's gender influenced his/her educational opportunities, how privacy and an ideology of harmony muted ethnic issues, and how educational practice and constitutional principles diverged. These factors contributed to the social outlook in which, as they matured, young people developed relationships and approached their future.

In Shizuoka, as elsewhere in Japan, government school policy implied equal access to educational opportunities. In theory, a standardised and uniform education system under the Ministry of Education (Monbusho) controlled school curricula and the approval of textbooks throughout the country. In practice, streaming into general and occupational government schools created an educational environment of ranked schools. This hierarchical system had a direct and sustained influence on young people in their development toward full personhood.

From pre-school years,[21] children entered a meritocratic educational system that ultimately placed the highest social security and economic rewards with a 'select corps of male permanent employees' who worked with large corporate organisations (Steinhoff 1994:35-37). Elite universities trained a limited number of young men for positions in privileged corporations and government management. Young men seeking good employment in subsidiary and contracting firms serving large corporate companies also needed to perform well at university. Employment in family businesses excepted, the alternative was for young men to work in contract jobs offering no career advancement or long-term economic or social security. Although women had begun to take up careers (including roles in management) beyond traditional female options of teaching and nursing, they received little encouragement to pursue permanent careers and, when they did so, competed largely with other women (Steinhoff 1994:35-37).

Throughout Japan, schools, colleges and universities were ranked according to perceptions of student abilities to make the top grade.[22] Teachers were ranked according to the schools they taught in, and students were ranked according to the schools they attended. In Shizuoka city it was well known that Shizuoka High School was Number One, and that throughout Shizuoka Prefecture public schools were ranked above private schools:

> In Tokyo… a private school… is better than public schools. But here in Shizuoka prefecture it's the opposite… And the social rank… goes according [to] the rank of the school, or what [it] is perceived [to be] in society.

In Shizuoka, as elsewhere in Japan, considerations of hierarchy and rank were significant factors when families calculated which high schools, tertiary colleges and universities their

---

[21] Some parents,at high cost, entered very young children into kindergartens or special classes to gain them competitive advantage. Except where regulated according to income, monthly kindergarten fees ranged from 15,000 –27,000 yen (NZ$300-540; US$150-270). Special classes nurtured creativity and the use of computer and cellular phone technology. Of the 44% of children aged 1-6 who stayed up past 10pm, 80% took classes in addition to nursery school or kindergarten, with the figure reaching 50% for 3-year olds.

[22] Japanese schools and universities were ranked and competed for the best reputation and name. The Ministry of Education set high school examinations for university entrance. These examinations were uniform across the nation. In addition, each university set its own entrance examination, choosing potential candidates according to their results from the school university examinations. Student placements at elite universities were heavily contested. University departments invited candidates with top results in the government university entrance examination to sit that particular university's entrance examination to compete for a place in the department's undergraduate course, thereby attempting to upgrade their own departmental reputations. In each of approximately 50 prefectures there were usually two government universities, one prefectural university, plus private universities.

children should aim for through entrance examinations. Students competed to enter high schools and tertiary institutes, and candidates would normally sit examinations for more than one high school and tertiary institute to optimise their choices. For the superior high schools and all universities, candidate numbers exceeded places available. If unsuccessful in gaining admittance to a university, students were forced to spend a year at a *juku* (a cram school providing supplementary courses during normal school hours) and re-sit entrance examinations. Since in daily and professional life the selection of high schools and universities influenced a person's public and private status, entrance to an appropriate institution was of paramount importance and required the balancing of a number of factors, including a person's marriage prospects. One mother, for instance, specified the qualities she would look for in her daughter's choice of husband:

> The school [university], and his work [and] his position. [Also] the health is the most important and the second is character, I always tell her.

Although all state schools were co-educational, gender as well as other factors influenced the selection of a state high school. In one family, for instance, where the choice made for son and daughter differed, both students in consultation with their parents nevertheless avoided the most competitive schools. Their mother commented:

> There are many schools and… there are levels. The top school, the second school… There's a rank. So, if [our son and daughter] enter a very high level they'll be very busy [i.e. have to endure great pressure to succeed]. But if we enter [them into] a normal high school, they can enjoy their lives.

Unlike in Wellington, few married women in Shizuoka could seriously contemplate a professional career while almost all young people anticipated married life. One (non-Japanese) high school teacher estimated that girls at occupational high schools paid only lip service to the idea of a future career, although girls at general high schools showed more determination. While most teachers denied a difference in attitude between male and female students toward study or professional aspirations, around 20% of teachers thought that male students showed a more competitive attitude than female students, and were more willing to struggle with difficult subjects. Just over a quarter of the teachers agreed that more male than female students hoped for a full-time profession through undertaking university courses.

It is clear that school students in Shizuoka were obliged to make life-determining choices at an earlier age than their Wellington counterparts, since horizons in Shizuoka were

narrowed by factors of gender, class, high school selection, and entrance examinations in ways that did not occur among students in Wellington. The ranking of schools recently introduced through educational reforms in New Zealand was comparatively negligible. Moreover, in New Zealand any person over twenty could take up university courses throughout life without formal qualifications, while those under twenty were required only to have matriculated from high school. Similar options were unavailable anywhere in Japan. Further, whereas in Shizuoka a person's high school ultimately determined his/her level of tertiary education and future social status, among the British/European population in Wellington social hierarchy was de-emphasised and depended less on educational achievement than on wealth and/or ethnicity.

Principles of equality and democracy outlined in Japan's postwar constitution included equal educational opportunity for all citizens,[23] while the government's promotion of Japan's 'middle mass' suggested that most people enjoyed middle class equality and opportunity. In practice hierarchy prevailed, while government guidelines for teaching methods and school curricula promoted conservative views.

In both Wellington and Shizuoka, schools taught academic knowledge and practical skills enabling students to move into higher education or enter the workforce. Their overall effect however was very different. Wellington schools focussed on academic achievement and encouraged the development of freethinking individuals who could function independently and contribute in an egalitarian society. In Shizuoka, the focus on academic achievement sorted people into different levels of social status and social place. Informants pointed out that a person's educational level would always impact on personal relations and on personhood, more so for those who had not attended tertiary institutions than those who had.

In Shizuoka, general conversations that included questions about, or merely referred obliquely to, levels of education could be construed as seeking background information about a family's social status and were resented as an invasion of privacy. One mother,

---

[23] Educational reforms proposed by SCAP Headquarters were enacted in the Fundamental Law of Education of March 1947. The preamble establishes that 'education… aims at the creation of culture, general and rich in individuality', while Article 3 establishes equal opportunities in education regardless of 'race, creed, sex, social status, economic position, or family origin'. Article 5 establishes that institutions will be coeducational. (Lu 1974: 207-208). For an overview of SCAP's proposed model of education see Rohlen 1983:63-76.

whose daughters attended Shizuoka High School, had moved to Shizuoka as a newly married young woman. She described conversations with local women with whom she had worked as public servants. The woman had mistakenly assumed that her co-workers in Shizuoka had attended a professional college as she had done. Her remarks to them had included comments such as, 'Oh, so you got married, did you, right after you graduated from university?' or, 'Oh, you started working after you graduated?' Their 'unpleasant, uncomfortable' replies indicated that she had overstepped some line: 'I made [a] mistake… After that I'm very, very careful about talking about educational background.' She explained how a 'quite conservative' outlook that placed less importance on educational rank among women was coupled with attitudes of embarrassment or resentment at references to educational achievement, which carried implications of a higher social rank.

Any specific attachment to a tertiary institution also indicated status, as shown through the common exchange of professional business cards containing such information. When reflecting on the Board's block on questions concerning parents' educational backgrounds, one informant suggested that my questions were not really problematic as parents were not asked to name the university s/he might have attended. The general knowledge that a person had acquired tertiary qualifications would not, in his view, have caused a dilemma.

By disallowing questions on parents' occupations and educational background, the Board acted to protect itself against criticism from parents. It also facilitated my research since parents may otherwise have refused to participate for reasons of privacy. On another level, information on parents' educational background and occupations would have revealed different social classes and rankings between government schools, contradicting the government's position of a 'middle mass' society. Further, the Board's function as mediator between individual schools, each of which was protective of its own status, meant shielding access to information that might have undermined a school's public image. On these separate levels privacy and class issues merged, as within each community family identities were linked to local schools that the Board was obliged to protect.

The Board's position on parents' occupations and educational backgrounds marked the significantly different attitudinal environments of Shizuoka and Wellington concerning educational institutions, educational achievement, social place and privacy. The YFP

questionnaires distributed to parents through schools had not only asked for and received information on parents' education, but had also requested and received information on parents' individual incomes. In contradistinction to the protective and formal constraints shown in Shizuoka, in the open, egalitarian environment of Wellington differences in education and occupation were thought relatively unimportant and access to and analyses of this type of information was accepted and encouraged. These cultural factors are illustrative of the differing social attitudes and constraints to which young people are exposed as they mature.

The Board's decision to repress information on nationalities also clearly related to issues of privacy. Japanese-born foreign nationals, notably Koreans and Chinese, as well as Burakumin and Ainu, were disadvantaged in matters of marriage, employment and social security yet, over some generations, a number had learned to 'pass' as mainstream Japanese. When I was told: 'In Japan it is better to assume that everyone is Japanese', the speaker was advocating concepts of harmony which enabled a glossing over of discriminatory realities. This attitude prevailed in schools. For instance, a non-Japanese teacher[24] had discussed in class the famous 'I had a dream' speech by Martin Luther King, asking students to write an essay on 'problem' issues. To her surprise, not one mentioned race or national identity. In reply to her query, the Japanese co-teacher remarked that these topics were not an issue in Japan. Asked more specifically about Koreans and Burakumin, the co-teacher commented: 'These things are best not stirred up.' Moreover, differences among school students were played down to minimise incidents of *ijime*, a kind of bullying discussed below.

When compared with the wider range of ethnicities in Wellington,[25] variation in Shizuoka was minor and people looked physically alike. Policies advocating a collective sense of belonging were more easily promoted than in Wellington, where ethnic variation was more pronounced. Whereas in Shizuoka ethnic variations were suppressed and regarded as problematic, in Wellington they were openly acknowledged. A person's identity was associated with choice and freedom of expression and senior high school students often

---

[24] This incident occurred in a government school that was not involved in the questionnaire survey.

[25] New Zealand citizens have migrated from a wide range of countries and regions, including the Pacific Islands, Australia, S.E.Asia, China, North America, Southern Africa and the Near East.

emphasised their ethnic distinctions or sympathies (e.g. through dress) as a mark of personal independence and individuality.[26]

Overall, in Shizuoka issues of rank, gender and national identity as well as formal constraints of privacy and harmony created parameters within which young people needed to negotiate their lives.

4.2.2. The nature and role of schools and their responsibilities

The educational emphasis in Shizuokan high schools differed according to whether schools were general or occupational high schools, or combined general and occupational high schools. However, unlike in Wellington, all schools also took formal responsibility for the moral development of students and mediated minor legal infringements committed by students.

Participating schools in Shizuoka city and the less prosperous rural town of Tenryu reflected regional distinctions that cut across two school types. The schools also differed in terms of academic aspiration and rank, which had bearing on some questionnaire responses. Shizuoka High School and Futamata High School were general high schools leading to universities. The former was in Shizuoka city and ranked more highly than Futamata High School, based in Tenryu. Shizuoka Agricultural High School and Tenryu Forestry High School were occupational high schools leading mainly to professional colleges. The former was in Shizuoka city and the latter in Tenryu.

Unlike in New Zealand, where factors other than academic performance, such as sporting prowess or decile levels, contributed to a school's public image, a school's public profile in Japan was determined by its academic success. There were some obvious distinctions between the participating schools reflecting different attitudes concerning educational ranking that affected individual strivings for improving or maintaining their social status. Over and above other teachers, teachers at Shizuoka High School thought that students regarded school as a place providing the chance to enter a high status university, while more parents at Shizuoka High School thought that attendance at a high status university

---

[26] See also Williams (undated) and Grenside (undated).

was necessary for their son/daughter's future status.[27] On the other hand, at both general high schools more parents than at the professional high schools agreed they would like their son/daughter to have a university education, while more parents at the professional high schools agreed they would like their son/daughter to attend a 2-year tertiary college.[28] However, a fair proportion of parents agreed that the length of their son/daughter's formal education was a matter for the son/daughter to decide.[29] Among the students, almost all students at Shizuoka High School (94.5%) and Futamata High School (95%) wanted to attend university. At the professional high schools, 8-11% of students wanted to attend university, 31-35% wanted to attend a tertiary college, while 40-45% wanted to seek immediate employment once they had matriculated from high school.

Despite differences in attitudes to educational ranking and status, answers to life-style questions revealed, with few exceptions, little variation between schools or else variations that fell only within a 12% range of difference. Tenryu Forestry High School students, however, spent considerably more time in family activities and pursuing outside interests than students in other schools. Responses also suggested that students at the general schools were more focussed on study than students attending occupational schools. Occupational school students watched more television (+30%) than students at general high schools, for instance, while more students at general high schools used their own space for homework, and more (22-25%) owned their own computers than students at occupational schools (14-11%).

Encouraging students to obtain nationally competitive academic results was in one sense irrelevant to the relationship between schools, families and students. All schools ultimately attempted to fulfil the same structural roles of being responsible for and

---

[27] Percentages of parents who thought that attendance at a university/tertiary college with a good reputation was necessary for a son/daughter's future status: Shizuoka High School 31%; Futamata High School 20%; Shizuoka Agricultural High School 6.25%; Tenryu Forestry High School 0%.

[28] Percentages of parents who would like their son/daughter to attend university:
Shizuoka High School 75%; Futamata High School 74%; Shizuoka Agricultural High School 12.5%; Tenryu Forestry High School 12%.
Percentages of parents who would like their son/daughter to attend a 2-year professional college:
Shizuoka High School 0%; Futamata High School 2.8%; Shizuoka Agricultural High School 31%; Tenryu Forestry High School 12%.

[29] Percentages of parents who agreed that their son/daughter should choose the length of their formal education:
Shizuoka High School 22%; Futamata High School 19%; Shizuoka Agricultural High School 28%; Tenryu Forestry High School 41%.

protective of students, and of mediating between each child, his or her family, and the future. Although working toward high grades was the agreed goal in schools where academic achievement was paramount, most (73%) teachers agreed that parents and teachers wanted students to do as well as possible. A number (20%) of teachers, however, indicated that parents expected teachers to take too much responsibility at high school for the future of their children.

In Shizuoka, a state school's protection of its enrolled students was associated with responsibilities that prefectural boards and parents expected of schools in general. These responsibilities far exceeded those expected of schools in Wellington. According to a teacher I interviewed: 'Schools are expected to control students' lives', whereas schools and teachers in Wellington consciously sought to relinquish much of their authority in senior high school years. A (non-Japanese) teacher in Shizuoka explained that for years parents had given over to schools the primary responsibility for their children's moral and social development from an early age. Moral education classes drew on Buddhist tales and Confucian classics, inculcating values of harmony and respect. Harmony was sought throughout each school through the *tatemae* of respect relationships, while harmony within each class was sought through student identification with the class group. In Wellington schools, teachers encouraged the morally defended values of self-responsibility and independence associated with adult autonomy, while denominational schools (primarily Christian) transmitted religious principles, although these were not mainstream values.[30] There was nothing in Wellington, however, comparable to Shizuokan schools' moral instruction whose content diffused into all areas of life. University and college students who had studied overseas were, for instance, often overwhelmed by the independence they encountered that resulted in a deep sense of alienation. One woman who studied for one year in an English university described how she missed group identification with fellow students there:

> I wanted to have a tie with them, and… stay [be in a group] with them… and eat with them, but they wanted to have their alone time [be solitary and independent]. I couldn't understand about that… [and was] sad and… lonely.

---

[30] Among Wellington student interviewees there were 7 Christians, 4 casual attendees of youth groups, 3 agnostics, 22 atheists, and 1 unknown. Most students said their parents had no religion. Among parent interviewees there were 9 Christians, 9 who had a Christian background and were nominally, 'loosely', or 'non-church –based' Christian, and 14 atheists.

Areas of students' lives that, in Wellington, were regarded as the responsibility of parents were often, in Shizuoka, the responsibility of schools. Whereas in Wellington teachers were responsible for student activities only at school and during school hours, in Shizuoka teachers sensed they were permanently on duty.[31] Restrictions placed around students had not been greatly revised through the years. Many were fixed by law, such as restrictions against drinking, smoking and driving, and by school regulations against students having part-time jobs. Yet, school control over student lives extended beyond these restrictions outside school hours, linking student and parent identities to specific schools. One seventeen year old who attended a private day high school for girls showed me a letter sent out to parents at the beginning of every vacation, listing twelve points that students had to observe during the holiday period. These included prohibitions against having a job, riding a motorbike or motor-scooter, riding in a friend's car, organising a party, staying overnight at a friend's house, smoking and drinking, taking drugs, going travelling with friends without the school's permission, staying out later than 9-10 p.m., wearing anything other than a school uniform on trips to the city, having a boyfriend without the parent's permission, and 'doing something' (having sex) with a boyfriend. On separate occasions, the student had been reported to school authorities for wearing plain clothes to the city during holidays, and for riding through the city as a passenger on a motorbike during the holidays. Although these rules were thought somewhat old fashioned and related to girls only, they portray the range of general responsibilities that schools were expected to bear on behalf of parents.

In the case of small legal infringements by students, teachers mediated between the law and parents. As explained by one teacher, when a teacher discovered that a student had broken a law by drinking, smoking, riding a motorbike or engaging in petty theft, the matter was not referred to the police. The teacher would reprimand the student who then had to write a formal apology with a promise not to re-offend. Depending on the student's attitude the matter might rest there, or be taken further by the teacher by notifying the homeroom teacher, who could then request the teachers' board group to take disciplinary action. In serious cases, a student might be suspended but remain responsible to the teacher and work at home, where s/he was still required to wear school uniform. This action served as a warning to the parents to take more responsibility for their son or

---

[31] For teacher out-of-school-hours monitoring of students see also Rohlen 1983:197-198 and M.White 1993:16.

daughter. If outsiders reported crimes committed by high school students to the police, the police dealt with the school authorities, who then notified the parents if the matter were serious. In order to protect the school name as well as the student and student's family from public exposure, most petty crimes committed by high school students remained internal concerns of the school and the school community. Only when serious crimes occurred did the information become public knowledge.

Legal ages restricting drinking, smoking, gambling, and marriage have been cited above,[32] as have ages restricting employment and licences to drive a car and ride a motorbike or motor scooter. Restrictions concerning employment and driving licences were not clear-cut. While high school students in Shizuoka were by age legally qualified to take a job, schools in Shizuoka, unlike schools in Wellington, prohibited enrolled students from doing so as jobs were thought to interfere with study and school activities. Likewise few parents encouraged their children to take jobs, not wanting them distracted from study or tempted to drop out of school. Parents whose children wanted to take on part-time jobs were required to write a letter requesting the school's permission and receive the school's formal approval. As will be seen, some students worked part-time. As regards transport, most high school students used public transport or rode pushbikes, the latter being favoured. It was illegal to ride motorbikes and high-powered scooters at high school age. Also licences were expensive.[33] As a result, few parents would buy a scooter or motorbike for their student children. Occasionally (but rarely) a school in a rural area would allow a student to ride a scooter or small motorbike to school if there were no other form of transport available. High school students were below the qualifying age for a car licence. Students rarely drove a car without a licence as penalties were severe, especially when caught driving after drinking alcohol.[34]

In Shizuoka, as in Wellington, problems connected with experimental smoking, drinking alcohol, and sexual activity occurred among some students as early as junior high school. Parents, high school students and graduate students told me that experimental drinking and

---

[32] Chapter 2.2.2.

[33] A licence for a larger scooter or motorbike was 115,000 - 200,000 yen (NZ$2,300 - 4,000; US$1,150 – US$2,000). A licence for a large bike or car was 200,000 - 300,000 yen (NZ$ 4,000 - 6,000; US$2,000 – US$3,000).

[34] An employed person caught driving after drinking alcohol lost his/her licence.

smoking by high school students were done in order to 'look cool' and impress peers. Some students smoked in secret ('a fence was necessary'), while others were free to smoke at home. High school boys who smoked publicly upstairs in a McDonald's restaurant quickly extinguished their cigarettes and disappeared if they spotted anyone on patrol.[35] Some families allowed underage students to drink alcohol at home or at house parties, either because they were unable to prevent it or because they wanted their children to know the effects of alcohol before reaching the legal drinking age. Student questionnaire responses suggested that two thirds of parents advised or negotiated with their children as to whether they could drink and smoke.

Students, teachers and parents collectively faced the need to conceal smoking and drinking activities from the police. Some schools were more favourably disposed toward the students' situation, as seen in the following extract from an interview with a mother whose daughters attended Shizuoka High School:

> When my elder daughter was at high school [there was not] much regulation, and they [the students] are quite free. They sometimes do… smoking and drinking… after the… cultural festival… or field day. Most of the class go to some place… [such as a] club, or… the riverbank… and they give… a party… Parents know that… And teachers know that... Once, the neighbourhood of the people living by the riverbank called the police and so after the party they got [caught]... They were taken to the… police office[station]… The vice-principal of the high school… was called at night.. [to] take them out… What the teachers said after everything was, "Why do you do it just beneath the *koban* [police sentry box]?" The *koban* is just by the riverbank… "Do it somewhere else!"… Teachers think those kind of party is important for the students, to get close to each other, and… [make] friends [to] help them to get over some tough high school days. So teachers understand.

While some parents were prepared to discuss with me their attitudes toward student smoking or drinking, no parent discussed information about sexual activity among high school children. Personal knowledge of or attitudes to sex were almost never mentioned or openly discussed. Students' attitudes to sex might have changed following on the legal availability (since 1999) of contraceptive pills through prescription. Access to the pill, according to one student, was easy: 'You just have to go to a hospital and ask a doctor for it.' A high school student, who told me she attended student parties, said that many high

---

[35] In compliance with the law against smoking until age twenty, the restaurant employed people to write down names of under-age offenders.

school students 'do sex' and that high school girls who became pregnant (about 5% by her estimate) had abortions. A graduate student said that the percentage of high school students who became pregnant was very small.

According to M.White (1993:155,170-189), young people not advancing to tertiary education begin sexual activity earlier than university- and college-oriented students, while by fifteen two thirds of Japanese girls are sexually aware in that they are 'sexually sophisticated if not always sexually experienced'. M.White maintains that high school students rarely date as couples or attempt to keep long-term relationships. While sexual activity *per se* is not discouraged, to preserve *tatemae*—including the social balance demanded by group friendships—sexual relations are kept strictly private and apart from public scrutiny. Moreover, borrowed English terms, such as 'boyfriend', 'girlfriend' etc. have altered Japanese meanings. A girl's having a boyfriend ('*boifurendo*') implies a close friendship with a boy with sexual innuendos, while having a lover ('*rabaa*' or '*koibito*') indicates a very close friend with fantisised, but not necessarily realised, sexual relations. 'Going steady' implies a *public* social tie with sexual overtones that both partners acknowledge (Rohlen 1983:288-289; M.White 1993:155-156). As steady relationships are negatively sanctioned by parents and teachers, most students' sexual experiences occur in brief liaisons.

School involvement in disciplinary action over petty crime meant that staff duties could become onerous. One teacher mentioned having to go to school on Sundays to deal with instances of petty theft. As classes were held on Saturday mornings and school outings often took place on weekends, a teacher's free time was limited. Extra duties were therefore resented. Schools were, however, expected to throw a protective barrier between students and the law in areas where guardianship was bestowed on teachers. Parents expected teachers to fill this role and complained against the teachers and school if the school did not meet its responsibilities.

Overall, unlike schools in Wellington, Shizuoka high schools were expected to teach and transmit codes of morality. They were deeply involved with disciplining students' social lives to a degree far beyond that in Wellington schools. While students in both societies complained about rules, teacher attitudes and institutionalised education, students in Wellington, unlike students in Shizuoka, experienced some independent choice and freedom in wearing mufti and assuming responsibility for use of free spells or school

attendance. Also, outside school hours, Wellington students were legally permitted to drive a car or ride a motorbike, and were free to take up part-time work. In Shizuoka, however, as young people matured, school discipline impacted on their lives both inside and outside of school hours.

4.2.3. Schools, independence and choice

Superficially, students' lives in Shizuoka and choices they were required to make resembled those of students in Wellington. In reality, sociocultural ascriptions of rank and gender in Shizuoka and maturation through time cast student lives into a different framework. In Shizuoka a person's maturation implied a person's gradual transformations while attending to his/her social connections as one part of the whole social fabric of life rather than, as in Wellington, becoming a whole autonomous individual.

Ideas of choice, independence and individualism were significant concepts in the maturation of young people in Shizuoka and Wellington. In Shizuoka and Wellington, however, the terms 'individual/individualism' and 'independence' did not mean the same thing. Thus, comments made in Shizuoka advocating 'more individualism' among young people, or suggesting that contemporary students were 'more independent' than students in former years, carried different connotations from similar comments among Wellingtonians. The 'individual' in Shizuoka did not, as in Wellington, imply the idea of an 'independent self'. Nor, as in Wellington, did 'independence' convey ideas of individual separateness or autonomy, or involve strong self assertion which, as noted, was associated with selfishness and an unwillingness to adjust to others. In Shizuoka, showing independence as an individual implied showing competence in qualities associated with *otona*, such as responsibility, judgement and a challenging spirit, as well as intellectual independence and emotional control (see below). Ideally, 'being independent' in Shizuoka was akin to having self-assurance in knowing how to relate to others, as described by Allison (1996a:139):

> This 'independence' (*jiritsu*) is not the ability or inclination to chart one's own course and act
> without the help of others, but rather the ability to internalise certain habits of self-maintenance
> that are expected of students. [The advocacy of independence] means the development of
> patterns, skills and attitudes that enable the child to adopt and perform successfully the labours
> of school (and later, work).

Most high school students in Shizuoka strove for success in schoolwork and examinations, competing for placements at tertiary institutions whose rank affected their futures. Success in examinations was attributed to self-application in study, rather than innate ability or genuine interest, and was seen as a mark of a person's strength of character. By comparison, success in Wellington was measured less by successful competition in examinations than by an individual's focus on his/her innate abilities and the development of the self.

Parents and teachers in Shizuoka noted undercurrents of student anxiety and anger against the pressures of schoolwork in preparation for school matriculation and university entrance examinations. In senior years students became exhausted, worked well into the night, and had no time to play sport or relax. One university student described the usual pattern of high school and university life:

> At high school, students work to achieve their first aim, to enter a university or college. Later at university or college, they work in their final undergraduate year, or as graduate students, toward a good job. Between these times [in early undergraduate years] they… play and explore… They have no goals, only those set by society.

Junior high school years were associated with youth 'problems'. By senior high school, the competitive system and social attitudes prevented serious students from pursuing the extracurricular activities that, in Wellington, were enjoyed by students and socially approved as a mark of their independent autonomy. The majority of Shizuokan students were therefore more confined in their social contacts, social activities and life experience, than high school students in Wellington.

For lack of time, few students chose to take up sporting or cultural activities beyond compulsory participation in school clubs. Senior students who regularly played the most popular sports—soccer, volley ball, baseball, skiing or snowboarding, swimming, and track and field—amounted to 2-6% for each sport, while less than a third chose to play each sport occasionally. The number of students choosing to participate in cultural activities was also comparatively low, most taking music (31%) while waiving other options, with the exception of calligraphy (7%).

As mentioned, school policies did not let students work part-time jobs outside school hours without written permission. Rohlen (1983:197) notes that teachers may veto part-time

work and vacation jobs through fears that contact with older men or gangsters could potentially lead to teen pregnancies, prostitution and crime. Students in Shizuoka nevertheless took part-time jobs and the majority of students (76%) said the decision whether to work part-time was their own. While it is difficult to accurately assess the numbers who worked, they were much lower than in Wellington. In questionnaire answers, 68% of students denied having a job while 25% affirmed having jobs. Responses indicated a far higher percentage of part-time workers at Shizuoka Agricultural High School than at other schools, perhaps because this school was in the city where jobs were more available, and students at this school, many of whom did not plan to enter a university, were less pressured with study. Just below half (43%) of Shizuoka Agricultural High School students had weekly or fortnightly paid jobs, while other schools had none to two students each in these categories. However, 16% of Shizuoka High School students did not reply to this question, while in other schools only one each did not reply. Thus responses were irregular. Furthermore, only a few students (8%) claimed to have weekly contact with employers, suggesting that jobs were intermittent, while the vast majority of parents (90%) denied that their high school children had regular part-time jobs. Since graduate students admitted that, when they were at high school, students took part-time jobs without permission, a proportion of the 25% of students who said they had jobs could have fallen into this category.

Although, as in Wellington, Shizuokan students said they worked 'for the money', their experiences of part-time work did not, as in Wellington, lead to a more autonomous identity through egalitarian, casual relations with older fellow workers and some employers. Nor did they associate self-earned money and the work environment with 'becoming adult'. According to M.White (1993:67-70), Japanese school students working part-time represents a need in families for extra income rather than student desires for increased independence. She further points out that most families, even when on restricted incomes, give disproportionately to provide their children with sufficient pocket money, peer-approved clothing and other trends in a society where 'market forces rule a child's social acceptability'.

Shizuokan student relations with employers and fellow workers involved social distancing, polite conversation and hierarchised relations. Nevertheless, as in Wellington, some Shizuokan parents saw adjustments to the 'adult' world through part-time work as

beneficial to students as long as it did not interfere with study since, as one informant explained, young people 'develop the ability to quickly catch onto things… and calm down when they start working'.

The lifestyles of most high school students in Shizuoka were centred on school, study, family and friends. Parents and the schools their high school children attended were generally mutually supportive. Over two thirds of parents agreed that school activities were important occasions for keeping families together. Furthermore, most (65%) students positively valued school, while 24% said school was 'OK'. Teachers were the most significant non-family category of 'grown-ups' with whom students had contact. A high percentage of teachers (76%) claimed that students confided in them about personal problems and sought advice, suggesting that teachers had the trust of a considerable number of students. Even though teachers (77%) were involved in club activities where students were able to approach them more informally, distance was always maintained through respect relations.

The out-of-school time students spent with friends was often curtailed through pressures of homework and study. A relatively high percentage (70%) of parents agreed that their children needed encouragement to spend more time on school activities and homework, yet most parents (78%) indicated that their children needed encouragement to spend more time with friends. Among student responses, 'going out with friends' was the activity most highly favoured, yet occurred far less frequently than among students in Wellington. When questioned about activities pursued with friends, and how often, students said they organised activities among themselves monthly rather than weekly. Students therefore spent less time with friends than parents would like, yet activities with friends were highly valued. In descending order of enjoyment, activities with friends were shopping, eating at MacDonald's, watching videos, playing computer games, and going to the movies or karaoke bars. Informal contact between friends at each other's homes was not included in the list of possible responses. Students seldom entertained friends in their rooms, however, with only a fifth (18%) agreeing they did so a few times a month or even less.

Almost all Shizuokan students (93%) received pocket money, usually once a fortnight or once a month.[36] Four parents named the amount given, which varied between 3,000 and 10,000 yen (NZ$60 and NZ$200; US$30 and US$100). Some students received a clothing allowance at different times, while other money was given by parents for meals, club-related activities, buying books once a year, stationery, and shopping trips, or else bus fares, snacks, hobbies and social expenses. Parents and grandparents traditionally gave money at New Year, and most did so for birthdays. The actual amount of income students received and spent did not appear excessive[37] and mostly came from parents and/or other relatives.

Students were in charge of their own money and most (81%) tried to save, while their spending patterns resembled those of Wellington students. Items that students bought in descending order of priority and importance, were CDs and tapes, gifts, movies, junk food, CD players, make up, meals, clothes, film and photos, and bus/train fares. Parents bought these items for their children in the reverse order of priority. More teachers (86%) than parents (61%) agreed that students had more access to money than they did in the past, and most parents (70%) thought peer and TV influences over students spending were stronger than their own influence. Almost half the parents agreed that their children's spending reflected values different from their own and created in them a measure of apprehension.

Although study limited students' out-of-school social contacts with friends, most students owned a cell phone and kept in touch with friends through text messaging. Also, according to teachers, other peer related activities such as computer games and movies interfered with study except among students aiming to enter higher ranked universities. Peer influences therefore contested general expectations that students would necessarily place a high priority on study. As M.White (1993:166) notes:

> For most Japanese children, priorities are set by family and school, and the remaining unchartered territory is claimed by friends, the media, consumer activities, and goals tying teens simultaneously to friendship and the market.

---

[36] This compares with 54% of Wellington students who still received some form of small allowance. Six students (16.2%) in Wellington received a weekly allowance averaging $5 - $15 per week (total average $9.75). Three students (8.1%) received a clothing allowance averaging $10 - $30 per week (total average $19.00). Twelve students received pocket money averaging $5 - $60 per week (total average $23).

[37] In 2000-2001, the cost of living in Shizuoka was above twice that in Wellington. Comparative items in New Zealand dollars were a $10 CD in Wellington for $30 in Shizuoka, a basic $2 hamburger in Wellington for $6 in Shizuoka, and a $2 soft drink from a dispensing machine for $6 in Shizuoka. Clothing was over twice the cost of clothing in Wellington.

Students' attention to homework and study varied in relation to their choices for the future. High school students had some idea of the type of future work they desired. Students at all schools claimed that they had decided their subjects, although 34% of parents said a compromise decision had been made. Substantially fewer parents of students at city schools claimed input into these decisions than their counterparts in rural schools. Parent attitudes to future careers for daughters varied in relation to the schools their children attended. More parents at general schools supported the idea of careers for girls, especially those at Shizuoka High School, although careers for boys were considered more important than careers for girls.

A number of occupational fields desired by high school students appeared relatively free from gender bias. In reality, as men dominated many of these fields, fewer women were able to persist with a full time career and compete for these jobs. The theoretically 'gender-neutral' occupational fields desired by high school students included psychology, counselling, social and welfare work, teaching, the civil service, and the arts, most of which required a university degree. On the other hand, girls were attracted to home economics, food processing and medically related occupations, while boys preferred law, computing, and areas related to architecture, building, manufacturing, and sports. More of the gender-identified courses were taught at professional colleges (polytechs) than universities, and were preferred by more students from occupational schools than students from general schools, who preferred to attend a university. In contrast to career choices in Wellington, where student choices were not compromised by gendered roles, many career choices selected by Shizuokan girls doubled with home interests, suggesting a cautious or realistic appraisal of their future.

Schoolwork and study involved a much tighter configuration of study, examinations and future prospects than in Wellington, where students focussed more on self-development toward independent autonomy. Concepts of independence in Shizuoka supported growth in competence and self-assurance in academic and social life. However, among students with no ambition to enter a highly ranked university or tertiary college, choices to participate in part-time work and more peer group activities outside school hours appeared reasonable. A lessened respect toward seniors, less cooperation with teachers, and more willingness to speak up could suggest a swing toward more assertiveness. Teacher responses indicated a greater tendency in the last ten years for students in general schools

to act independently and with greater confidence than students in occupational schools. Two thirds of teachers also thought that in the last ten years students had become less willing to work together as a class group, while the same number said they encouraged students to form their own opinions rather than transmit prescribed orientations.

Although most (63%) parents indicated that today's high school students were no more independent of parents than those of their own generation, some regarded a desire for more freedom and independence as age-dependent and 'natural'. As one mother said:

> Everybody has that feeling when they're very young… Probably they want to decide by themselves so no advice is necessary for them. They want to be quite independent [intellectually] and… that's a quite natural thing.

To this degree many parents tolerated or endured attitudes and values that they disagreed with in the expectation and hope that conventional patterns would reassert as young people grew older.

4.2.4. Choice and change

High school students in Shizuoka faced social pressures common to large-scale industrial societies. These pressures arose from fairly rigid divisions of labour, economic recession, globalisation, consumerism and social mobility. Meritocratic-based educational institutions functioning according to codes of seniority, rank, respect and harmony, and advocating student self-discipline, channelled student expectations and horizons at a relatively early age. Where students were unable or unwilling to adjust to expectations, or where student attitudes and behaviours were considered unacceptable, the authority of schools whose responsibility it was to impart social and moral values was called into question. Extreme cases of rebellion or maladjustment were held up as a moral rebuke to, and major transgressions against, codes of harmony and respect, suggesting a breakdown in the social order. Media articles covering these and other social issues presented images of social disintegration, while some parents typed the entire high school generation as *uchu-jin* ('creatures of outer space'), *isei-jin* ('aliens') or *gaikoku-jin* ('foreigners'). Since, in Japan, generational or cohort labelling has suggested generation gaps through time, these terms form part of a line of similar epithets including, for instance, *kyojinrui* (the 'old *Homo sapiens*') for those born between 1947 and 1950; *ichigozoku* ('strawberry group' or 'fifteen year olds') for those born between 1961 and 1981; and *shinjinrui* (the 'new *Homo sapiens*' or the 'new breed') for the youth of the 1980s.

In Shizuoka, more often than not, parents thought that differences between the generations were not hard to bridge and traditional values would eventually prevail. Parents were divided over whether younger generations in Japan were losing direction, and whether changes that were occurring were for the better. Of those who gave definite replies, a slight majority thought changes were for the better, although many were non-committal.

Changing attitudes most widely criticised by parents and teachers concerned the lessened respect shown by juniors toward their seniors. Often these criticisms meant only that students sometimes ignored restrictions set by parents or teachers who monitored student behaviour. Parents compromising on their children's demands could also appear indifferent toward school values. Some critics argued that many students transferred their allegiance and respect to *juku* teachers who encouraged competitive attitudes, causing schoolteachers (who emphasised harmony) to lose their mandate over student discipline. When parents also failed in matters of discipline, students were said to be falling between the cracks.[38] I was told that parents who were not very successful in controlling their children would criticise the school for failing to maintain standards. If a parent overly criticised any one teacher, however, the family of that student could be harassed by the community.

Students of both sexes used fashion trends such as bleached hair, earrings and faddish clothes to assert a generational or group distinctiveness and their own identification with peers. As these images were also associated with school dropouts and rebellious behaviour, state schools and most private schools campaigned against them, requiring students to wear a compulsory uniform, remove earrings and, at the start of each term, revert to black hair. In schools where fashion or non-conformist trends occurred, many teachers and parents spoke openly against them. A teacher at a girls' high school in Shizuoka described dyed hair and earrings as signs of 'degeneration', while viewing the students' 'sitting on the floor and eating on the floor' as abhorrent and unhealthy,[39] and against accepted practices. Other teachers' and parents' attitudes were ambivalent. One mother I interviewed taught at an experimental school catering for students who had left or been expelled from regular schools. Similar schools were found in most large cities and offered students a second chance to qualify for tertiary studies. The school, run like a

---

[38] *The Japan Times*, 9 December 1999: *Japan's 'new children' a real problem.*

[39] For Japanese concepts of germs and space see Ohnuki-Tierney 1984:21-27.

university, had no uniform and students could freely come and go: 'It's very new and very unique. They are the top. I love it.' She described her own attitude toward breaches in traditional modesty and respect as 'going with the flow' ('I just go in front of the river. I don't refuse'). She did not, however, want her own high school son and daughter to enter the school, fearing that with peer pressure and group conformity they would 'become similar'.

Parents were generally unable to prevent young people's adoption of fashion trends. When, for instance, a fifteen year old son had his ear pierced and wore baggy clothes against his father's wishes, the mother took the son's side 'so he won't leave home'. According to graduate students, young people thought casual and individual dress styles 'looked cool'. Taking a new image was not considered an expression of a person's individuality and independence, as in Wellington, but as 'being modern'. Informants corrected my impression that young people were adopting 'Western' images, saying the casual look was uniquely 'modern Japanese'. They emphasised, however, that looking international (modern) on the outside did not imply 'being Westernised' on the inside, which was neither liked nor accepted, and that most young people would ultimately let go of casual pop images which were unacceptable in the work environment.

'International' influences were both encouraged and discouraged in Japan. Goodman (1990:170-173) refers to returnee children being privileged within the education system, where a set quota gave them access to most major and some minor universities without sitting entrance examinations. In some elite returnee schools a superficial 'internationalness' had become fashionable and rich parents were taking or sending their children overseas to qualify to enter them. Knowledge gained through wider experience was harnessed to serve national interests through re-education back in Japan. S.Mori (2004:163) suggests that young returnee recruitment to company positions might encourage more young people to study and graduate overseas, bypassing and thereby challenging the Japanese higher educational system that currently reproduces the Japanese social order.[40] On the other hand, many Japanese returning from overseas experienced problems re-integrating in society. One young Shizuokan woman, for instance, who had

---

[40] In 2000-2001 there were 46,810 Japanese students (most at universities with 11.8% in other educational institutions) in the United States of America (S.Mori 2004:169 fn.8). This figure equals 1.47% of the 3,135,392 tertiary students studying in Japan in roughly the same period (Facts and Figures of Japan 2000 edition).

lived in Europe and the United States, explained that returnees found it hard to fit in and 'be considered Japanese':

> If you look Japanese but yet act like a foreigner… they would see you as an outsider and they would never include you in that kind of harmony or group... It takes a long time to be accepted here if you're different… They expect me to be a Japanese, looking like Japanese, and speaking Japanese, being a Japanese citizen… And I'm not [like that anymore].

In Shizuoka, most families of men appointed to overseas positions remained at home to avoid problems associated with reintegration into Japan and ensure continuity in their children's development and education.

Parents generally disapproved of life-styles that did not reflect willingness to work hard and achieve goals. During the 'bubble economy' of the 1990s some young people chose freer lifestyles, living for their own interests in sport, or as singers or designers. As part of a new phenomenon referred to as a *furiitah* ('freeter'),[41] such a person would earn a living or supplement his income by taking any available part-time work, with no social insurance or social security. While some could be identified as dropouts, especially when working at unskilled jobs as waiters or at petrol stations, others were freeters by choice and worked at clerical or computer jobs, or other skilled work. Once the economy collapsed and jobs became scarce, the term 'freeter' altered in meaning to include people of all ages, some of whom were lifestylers but others who were unable to find regular jobs.

Mathews (2004:7,128,133) inconclusively debates whether young people become freeters by choice ('forsaking the career paths of their fathers') or by necessity (through failing to secure regular employment), and whether freeters are agents of change to the social order, or losers.[42] In 2000 and 2001 Japan was officially in recession. Redundancies created unemployment and, among households of low economic status where education no longer seemed a route out of poverty, young people were less keen to study hard. In Shizuoka,

---

[41] 'Freeter' is a term incorporating 'free' and 'Arbeiter'. 'Arbeiter' (*arubaito* - or *baito*) is derived from the German *Arbeiter* and is used to refer to a student who works part-time. *Pato* is the term for part-time workers, usually women/housewives, who receive some government support. *Pato* usually implies skilled or qualified workers, whereas *baito* jobs are unskilled.

[42] Mathews and B.White (2004:7) suggest that, of the 26.4 million young people aged 20-34 years, 3 million are freeters. Mathews later (2004:134n.6) gives the age range of freeters as 15-34 years. A conservative estimate would therefore put freeters at 10% of the 15-34 year age group. Mathews argues, however, that 27% of freeters ultimately want full-time employment, 16% hope to be supported by a spouse, and just 32% hope (unrealistically, according to Mathews) to be freelance professionals. Only the latter could be described as 'forsaking the career paths of their fathers' (or mothers), i.e. just 3.2% of young people.

older informants told me that compared with their own youth, younger generations were passive while some tended to drift. Young people choosing freeter lifestyles were often regarded as undisciplined or scholastic failures, associated with a loss of family esteem. There was little concept, as in Wellington, of gaining life experience through free choice, and most parents emphasised high school study as working toward a better future.

Having to succeed at school induced negativity in some students. Some graduates blamed parents for increasing pressures for student success:

> The position now is that parents want riches. They push their children to do many extra curricula [subjects] early on, especially language. Children really want to play. Children are so busy they rebel.

Other pressures burdened high school boys in particular who, aware of the competitive strain endured by company employees, sensed they were being pushed toward a way of life from which ultimately there would be no relief. Sporadic outbursts of violence by high school boys, much publicised in the media, were attributed by some parents to boys' anxieties over *karoshi* (death from overwork) that had become the reality for a number of hard-working family men.[43]

Parents and graduate students said pressure to do well at school was deflected into *ijime,* a form of student bullying that involved cell phone calls demanding large sums of money. Amounts requested could reach 50,000 yen (NZ$1,000; US$500). Threats of retribution if the money were not found sometimes led to suicide. Although most cases of *ijime* occurred at junior high school age, senior students were occasionally affected and in a few cases provoked to violent crime, including murder.[44] When I asked one mother whether young people who were rebellious were going through a growth phase and would become responsible in time, or whether society was undergoing radical change, the mother placed her anxieties in a wider social context. She touched on areas of social concern that were presented by the media as an interlinked web, including the overworked husband, the caring mother, and the need for educational reform.[45]

---

[43] See also *The Japan Times*, 30 May 2000. These issues are discussed in Chapter 5.

[44] When we first met, graduate students raised issues of youth crime, referring me to three recent shocking and highly publicised murders committed by 17 year old male students who were *ijime* victims.

[45] These issues are discussed in Chapter 5.

Media explanations of *ijime* crimes discussed with students ranged through students failing to qualify for a preferred high school, revenge against parental betrayal, the solitary reading of magazines and playing of video games, poor teaching methods in schools, to poorly coordinated investigations by school authorities and police into incidents of *ijime*.[46] The media also connected overworked and therefore absent fathers with juvenile crime. Without a father's influence and discipline, boys were said to lack the ability to cope with examinations or search for a job, and easily became violent.[47] Other articles referred to the 'school refusal' syndrome and a general increase in long-term truancy. The Minister for Education at the time[48] denounced the postwar education system as one that was leading Japanese students to cut classes because of false and imported values. In his view, students were refusing to attend school 'because of misplaced respect for [Western] individualism, misplaced freedom and children's rights to do whatever they want',[49] all of which were considered alien or foreign to Japanese ways.

Although juvenile crime in Japan was comparatively low,[50] graduates said it was important to understand the era in which they were living and regarded media explanations of these and other like incidents as inadequate. One young woman said that, although she would like to marry and have children, she sometimes wanted no children as she was not confident about raising and controlling them sufficiently well to avoid crime.

While rebelliousness, student crime and new phenomena such as freeter lifestyles affected only a minority of students, their social reality challenged values associated with principled and disciplined lives. Against attitudes construed as "Western-type' assertiveness of the self above others was the affirmation of an individualism whose inner direction was consonant with principles of harmony and respect.

---

[46] See *The Japan Times*, 18 May, 24 May, 30 May, 1 August, 8 August 2000; *Mainichi Daily News*, 8 August 2000; *The Daily Yomiuri*, 29 May 2000; NHK news, 7 August 2000.

[47] 'Fathers in the Shadows. Motherly love a hurdle for teens' in *The Japan Times*, May 2000; 'Fathers must do their duties' in *The Japan Times*, 11 July 2000.

[48] Nobutaka Machimura
[49] *The Japan Times*, 4 February 2001.

[50] Japan's juvenile crime rate in 1999 was lower than that of the U.K., Germany, France and the U.S.A. *Facts and Figures of Japan, 2000:* 85-87.

4.2.5. Financial and intellectual independence from parents

When discussing qualities associated with being 'grown up' (*otona*), a distinction was drawn between financial independence, intellectual independence and emotional control. These three categories were selected by high school students in all schools without exception (although in varied order) as the most important signs of being *otona*. The fourth category selected was either 'getting a job' or 'earning wages'. Almost no students considered that finishing their education, or forming a partnership and marriage, were important signs of being *otona*. And, in contrast to Wellington students for whom leaving home was an important mark of adulthood, only 0.9% of students in Shizuoka saw leaving home as a significant sign of being 'grown up' (see Table 5).

Table 5. SQ51 Important signs to high school students of a person's being 'grown up' (*otona*) (choose 3)

Criteria	Percentaged answers	Ranking of answers
Intellectual independence	26.80	1
Emotional control	23.87	3
Finishing your education	2.25	6
Leaving home	0.90	=8
Getting a job	9.23	4
Earning wages	9.01	5
Financial independence	25.23	2
Forming a partnership	0.68	9
Getting married	1.13	7
No reply	0.90	=8

It was common for working young men and women in Shizuoka to remain with their families before marriage, while some young couples lived in extended households after marriage (see Chapter 5). The kind of 'separating out' that occurred between parents and children in Wellington, where independence implied autonomy, did not feature in the maturation of young people in Shizuoka where neither physical separation nor intellectual and financial independence cancelled a young person's debt, obligation and respect for his/her parents. An emphasis on jobs and money, however, reflected male and female students' awareness that financial independence would provide them with a measure of freedom and a means to negotiate their futures.

There was no consensus among parents as to when they began to think of themselves as being 'adult' (*otona)* (See Table 6). Half the parents noted no clear distinction between childhood and *otona*. A third (31%) of the parents, however, began to think they were *otona* when they became a parent, a transition marker significant to only two Wellington parents. Around a quarter (27%) began thinking themselves *otona* when they had a job and financial independence. For 15% of parents, thoughts of being *otona* came with marriage, while 11% said such thoughts occurred when they showed empathy, harmony and responsibility. Only 3% said they began to think they were *otona* when they reached twenty. The majority of male parents began to think they were *otona* when they had a job and financial independence.

Table 6. PQ67: When Shizuoka parents began to think themselves adult (*otona*)			
Criteria	Percentaged answers	Male respondents	Female respondents
At 20 years	3.33	1	3
With a job and financial independence	27.50	7	26
At marriage	15.00	1	17
When you became a parent	31.67	1	37
When you showed empathy, harmony and responsibility	11.67	0	14
Other	2.50	1	2
No reply	8.33	1	9
Total	100	12	108

While young people in Shizuoka did not seek autonomy, they did seek intellectual independence from parents and emotional control although these transitions mostly occurred over many years. Parents tried to cultivate a certain intellectual independence in their children, but this independence was, unlike in Wellington, infused with respect and obligation. The father of a high school girl I interviewed, for instance, had fostered his children's development through *sunao* (the combination of docility and honesty), expecting them to respect and trust his opinions as he guided them toward independence. In more recent years he had secretly prepared vacations in Canada for his daughter to improve her English, encouraging her at the same time to believe she was acting on her own initiative. He further encouraged her to work part-time after school (with the school's permission) to pay for undergraduate courses in Canada. He believed that his approach allowed his children to 'go their own way'. Following the interview, however, he criticised the

daughter—who had returned from her part-time job and was working at the computer—for sending daily emails to a boyfriend in Canada, saying this was too frequent and should occur fortnightly. After a brief altercation, he described to all present the demeanour of a Japanese friend's American wife. He thought she was 'too independent' and 'not *sunao-na'* (docile and openly trusting) as a wife should be, commenting how her independence made him 'angry'. With reference to his daughter and *sunao* he added: 'This is a value women and wives should show. Not men.'

There was no clear distinction between a father's authority and a son or daughter's independence (knowing how properly to behave). In the above case, it was not clear to me whether the daughter should willingly adopt, as her own, the father's values, or whether she should assert herself independently (in the proper way) to seek harmony with the father. These grey areas were apparent in the situation of a twenty-five year old woman who was unrelated to the family but present at the same interview. During the woman's undergraduate years her father had paid for her to study at a university in England. Being currently employed as a television frontsperson in Shizuoka, she lived away from her Tokyo family. She phoned her parents daily to discuss all aspects of her life, including her friendships. Her two 'big problems' related to work harmony and the issue of independence since, unlike her younger sister who showed 'more strength of character', she was often uncertain. She had begun to wonder whether she was living her own life, or her father's idea of her own life:

> My father… maybe… has a dream [of] what I have to be… [But] he never say, "You should do that"… But… his eyes said, "You should have got to that university. You should be an announcer."… I want[ed] to be like that. I want[ed] to make their dream… But now… sometimes I think, "Is it my life?" Now I want to change my character. I have to decide everything for myself… but… I don't know how… to do [it].

In raising a family, another mother and her husband advised their daughters from their own experience to think about and consider the parents' opinion and make their own decisions. When I asked the mother how she would react if her daughters made choices that differed from those she would like, the mother replied: 'Fortunately I haven't had that kind of experience so far'. As with the TV frontsperson, her claim that one daughter had herself decided to work toward a profession turned out to have been the mother's 'dream' on behalf of her daughter.

They [the daughters] always say that, "I don't want to be like mother". Because… if something happens to my husband then my situation will be trampled off [51]… They want to get married. They want to have their own family but they… also want to work… They just don't want to work at some office… They just want to [have] some… professional career… [Also] if my elder daughter wants to marry… [and] I can't… approve… [then] I probably advise [against it]. That's why I advise her often to get some professional job. Then you can live by yourself. And sometimes you can feed your family also. So you have to be very independent. That's what I have been teaching… That's my purpose… That's my hope. That's my dream… [but] I can't… force them.

The independence spoken of here referred to professional qualifications and financial independence as a hedge against future uncertainties.

Young people in Shizuoka who made their own decisions did not think they were gaining autonomous independence, as in Wellington, nor did they desire it. In one case, the parents of a graduate student held no plans for her future. She explained that, since her parents' lives were 'so different' from her focus on science, they were indifferent to a university education and felt unable to advise her. At high school she had received no counsel from her parents yet longed for someone to tell her what to do. Her parents were financially supportive and she respected and valued them more than she was able to put into her limited English ('oh, much much much, very…'), but they forced her to make her own decisions unaided: 'Choose what you like (but) don't choose not correctly' [Choose what you like, but make correct choices]. She commented:

I think maybe my parents… [are] a little bit different from other families… [and] are not so concerned about their children. Maybe they think just [if] we feel happy it's very OK.

High school students generally valued their families and enjoyed being with them and participating in family activities. Growing into independence did not mean striving to break away from family participation, as in Wellington, where young people preferred autonomous, chosen social domains. In Shizuoka, less than 4% of students were negative about being with parents, sharing family meals, or going on family outings and holidays, and less than 6% did not much enjoy these activities. Within the home, students had some private space for themselves where they indulged in activities of their own choosing for relaxation and entertainment. By 12-15 years or earlier, most students had their own

---

[51] The mother, like most Japanese women with grown sons or daughters, followed a number of unpaid pursuits (called 'hobbies').

rooms, using them for doing homework and listening to music, a solitary activity for almost all students (91%). Almost half the students watched TV or videos in their rooms, and slightly fewer (up to 35%) played computer games. The relatively recent phenomenon of children occupying their own rooms could be linked to a more independent attitude in some high school students.

Independence did not mean that high school students sought to make their choices independently of parents. Less than a third of parents agreed that today's high school students showed more independence than in their own high school years, while almost two thirds disagreed. On the other hand, 76% of parents agreed that high school *girls* were making more choices and taking more initiatives than had previously been the case. A high percentage (94%) of students in Shizuoka asked parents for help in decision-making, and fewer than half (42%) wanted less parental involvement. As in Wellington, aspects of student socialising were issues that parents and their children negotiated together. These included the times that children would return home if they went out with friends, and the need for them to inform parents of their whereabouts when they went out with friends. The bulk of Shizuokan parents (84%) affirmed that they would not allow their high school son to stay overnight at the home of a girlfriend, or daughter at the home of a boyfriend, and approximately two thirds of parents would not allow their children to go to a party with friends unknown to the parents. These responses suggest that limitations placed on students in Shizuoka were stricter than those placed by many Wellington parents on students of the same age.

Parents and teachers said that the first real test of individual performance came when students took the entrance examination for high school at age fifteen or sixteen. The first time young people needed to make an independent decision (or when independence came up as an issue) was when they had to choose a career or wanted to leave home. Yet, as mentioned, 'leaving home' and 'becoming independent' were not synonymous. Several working women in their twenties or early thirties who lived with their parents thought of themselves as being financially and intellectually independent. I was told that for older sons or daughters it is 'an OK image to live at home', particularly for sons working in the family business.

When parents were asked where they would prefer their sons or daughters to live after completing high school, a small percentage (10%) wanted them to live in the parental home

permanently if possible, while a fifth (19.17%) wanted them to live at home until marriage. Most wanted their sons and daughters to live in an apartment at some stage after finishing high school, although school type and expectations over tertiary education affected responses. Most high school students responded favourably to the idea of living separately, either after high school finished or when they were in their twenties. In Shizuoka, living separately from parents did not, as in Wellington, imply flatting with others or living with a partner. Most students in Japan preferred to live in single apartments. Occasionally two students would have separate rooms in a two-room apartment, although an unmarried male and female student would not share the same apartment. Living separately from the family implied the chance for students to develop strength of character.

Most parents paid for all or most of their children's tertiary education costs which, except in cases of hardship, were considered a family responsibility.[52] Students took such support for granted as part of the cycle of duty and obligation. In questionnaire responses, over 30% of parents said they would always be responsible for their sons and daughters. These parents worked hard to support their children until they became financially independent. A further 20% of parents actively provided for their children until they had a job, while a few (8%) said they would do so until their children were married. On the other hand, around a quarter of the parents (27%) indicated the age of legal adulthood (twenty years) as the cut-off point for financial support. One father who raised his children to be independent said eighteen years, or the end of high school, marked the 'turning point' when he was no longer responsible for his children's decisions, and that four years later he would 'financially separate' from them.

University students who left home considered that their ties with parents were, if anything, stronger than before, and that relations with their parents had improved. Students conveyed great respect for parents: 'They are so important that I think I would not be here without my parents'; 'I have only one father and one mother… they are irreplaceable to me'; 'They are so important that I cannot answer'. Their sentiments were not simply because their parents had supported them financially. Indeed, some students in Shizuoka, as did

---

[52] National or prefectural university fees plus housing and living expenses for one year ranged from around NZ$64,000 (US$ 32,000) in Tokyo to around NZ$36,000 (US$18,000) in Shizuoka. Some graduate students took government loans, or loans from NGOs, to supplement what their parents could afford.

most in Wellington, thought parental financial support constrained their ability to make choices.

Working young men and women living at home who, at the same time, considered themselves financially and mentally independent likewise greatly valued their parents. Constraints imposed by living with parents were tolerated for as long as the arrangement proved workable. Some acknowledged the benefits of not needing to worry about cooking and other household tasks. One working woman in her late twenties advised me that, in student questionnaires, an option reading: 'You don't want to live separately from your family', should be included. Contrary to the situation in Wellington, she assumed that a high number of students would, like her, prefer to live at home. On the other hand, life with parents could prove stressful. A 32 year old working woman living at home, who described her parents as 'the important ones', confessed there were times she would prefer to live alone. The curfew imposed on her by her father, which she obeyed, was not the main problem although it limited her freedom. She desired to live separately to remove the need to maintain emotional control:

> [Naturally] because I am working, I'm trying not to show my concerns [troubles] on my face and in my attitude, trying to avoid worrying my parents when it's not necessary. [If] they sense [my troubles], they'd worry when I live with them.

In clear contrast to the Wellington situation, students in Shizuoka said that financial and intellectual independence from parents was 'only a beginning' toward becoming *otona*. Mutual obligations between the generations meant keeping family bonds and intellectual independence in balance. In Wellington, independence was associated with an autonomously independent 'self' which, having separated out from others, maintained relations with others by choice and mutual agreement. In Shizuoka, independence did not imply autonomy or apartness. Intellectual independence (involving 'the heart') implied the ability to exercise good judgement in trying to keep harmonious relations with others and managing this feat competently and with self-assurance. Financial independence and intellectual independence were both important signs of maturation toward full personhood. Independence, however, also involved being responsible in one's relations with others and the ability to maintain emotional control, the implications of which are discussed below.

4.2.6. Freedom, privacy and responsibility

Intellectual independence, emotional control and responsibility were measured against notions of freedom. The years between finishing high school and taking on responsibilities of work, marriage and family were considered 'more free' than other periods of life.

Aspects of their lives that graduate students valued as freedom included organising their activities and finances independently, and being 'freed from' family activities. Ideas of freedom were combined with a sense of privacy, conveyed to me by one student as 'mental freedom (pointing to the heart)':

> When I was living with my parents, maybe I was looked [watched] by my parents, particularly my mum. So I don't feel freedom for [from] her mind. But now my mum cannot look at [see] me so I feel freedom.

Freedom implied gaining space to learn emotional control, an important aspect of being responsible. One interviewee pointed out: 'In Japan, people are not supposed to talk of real—deep—emotions. It's actually tabu to talk about positive ones, and it's easier to show negative ones.' According to one young woman in her late twenties:

> When it comes to feeling—feeling especially—we won't say everything, you know. Especially love, or any positive feelings, are never expressed here.

She added, however, that some teenagers might convey a 'Valentine' type of sentiment, while another informant mentioned that email and text messaging signs enabled the expression of emotions that could not be spoken.

Knowing how to control emotion included knowing which circumstances permitted its expression. In established groups interaction was more spontaneous, while in groups at drinking parties, restaurants or karaoke bars people were less formal. As many emotions belonged to the personal and private realm, however, in questions about emotional topics graduate students would sometimes laugh[53] or lapse into silence. Controlling feelings and their expression was linked to keeping the *ura* part of self private, as well as keeping 'face'. The suppression of strong emotion was considered a virtue (Kishimoto 1967:116-119).

In formal interviews, university students were not forthcoming on personal matters. Students told me it was not uncommon for university students to have a girl- or boyfriend. These relationships were not easy to detect even when students worked closely together, as

---

[53] Nervous laughter was often used to hide something or to cover-up.

public displays of emotion or affection, particularly touching, were rare. Although undergraduates formed casual relationships, graduates often began searching for a marriage partner. Parents were usually not informed of any relationship until one developed into a potential marriage. At that point formal introductions were made to the parents.

Classes and clubs at university and college were sources of contact for new acquaintances which could be freely made and explored but these could not escape the social values expected from other group allegiances. Young working men and women organised group meetings among themselves, keeping relations within a similar age band:

> If one of my friends have a job as a doctor, for example, and I have a job at TV station… I can gather a partner [from the] TV station and she can gather a partner [from the] hospital—maybe doctor, maybe something—and we can have a party together.

The more structured aspect of young people's social lives in Shizuoka differed from that of young people in Wellington who could freely fraternise across wider age groups.

Ideas of what freedom implied differed according to a person's age and social status. One informant clarified that: 'Parents see freedom in children as 'going wild' and refuse to entertain the possibility of freedom for their children.' Since it was commonly believed that 'to say a thing is to make it happen', parents avoided speaking in ways that might result in their children's 'going wild' and spoke in terms of wanting their children to study. The idea of 'going wild' was linked to the expression 'to stretch out the wings' (*hane o nobasu*), a concept that more nearly equated with ideas of freedom in Wellington. It required anonymity in an environment geographically removed from family, where a person no longer represented the family:

> Young people feel that they [can be freer away from Shizuoka]… When you go into the different part of the world that your family's not… associated with… you can 'stretch out the wings'. You… don't have to worry about what others think about you because they don't know you, and they don't care... [You become like] migrant birds. But… if you are to build a house in a different place, then that's a different story. Because you'll be… actually living there and rais[ing] a family… So then the image comes on again [and you] fold your wings down again.

The sense of liberty experienced by 'stretching the wings' was temporary as the person ultimately returned home. The danger of 'going wild' was that a person's 'free' actions could become linked to and discredit the family, causing loss of 'face'.

Freedom was defined as privacy from family members, or separateness from the family identity. Privacy, rather than independence, was the feature that attracted students to living away from home. Privacy, however, did not equate with autonomous independence. Students affirmed the family as the 'inside' group with whom their identity, security, 'face' and rank were all intimately bound. The need to maintain the family's 'good image' tempered and counter-balanced young men and women's desire for freedom. Even when living away from home, young people were conscious that their actions reflected on their family especially, as was often the case, when a relative lived in the vicinity. The privacy and freedom sought by young men and women were balanced by the responsibilities associated with independence and the need to keep group harmony. Ideas of freedom and independence held by young people in Shizuoka contrasted with those understood by young people in Wellington for whom independence implied the right to self-determination and self-creation.

4.3. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In Wellington and Shizuoka, young people's maturation was shaped through school, community and parental involvement in producing independent and responsible persons. The focus in Wellington was on creating autonomous individuals concerned with the development of 'self' whereas in Shizuoka it was on creating persons capable of performing well individually and in their relationships with others.

In Wellington, senior high school students developed egalitarian attitudes through more levelled teacher-student relations, and in social relations in part-time jobs which provided them with a sense of being 'adult'. Egalitarian attitudes, which were expressed in community and school support for men's and women's equal employment opportunities, enabled student consideration of a wide choice of careers. Independent responsibility was fostered through student accountability for schoolwork and school attendance, part-time work and the earning and management of money and choices concerning its use. Part-time work was seen as a step toward financial independence, a sign of independent autonomy. Student participation in peer activities, paid for with their own earnings, encouraged individual separation from the world of family toward individual autonomy.

In Shizuoka, gendered roles and a meritocratic educational system supporting socioeconomic rank and status narrowed young people's options, and choices determining their future chances were made at an earlier age than in Wellington. Teachers encouraged

students to work hard to gain entry to tertiary institutes, taught codes of morality and were involved in the discipline of students' social lives beyond school hours. Students were encouraged to become independent, which implied acquiring the ability to exercise good judgement and knowledge of how to relate to others. Part-time work outside school hours was discouraged, yet chosen by some students who developed their handling of the respect relationships demanded in work environments. Parents in Shizuoka advocated principled and disciplined lives whereas parents in Wellington advocated experimental life-styles as matters of individual choice and life experience.

In Shizuoka, young people did not, as in Wellington, construe the end of high school as the shedding of childhood for adulthood. Nor was independence in Shizuoka associated, as in Wellington, with gaining autonomous adulthood at around the age of twenty and separating out from the family. In Shizuoka, becoming independent meant gaining financial independence and growing in intellectual independence and emotional control. Financial independence was highly valued and considered important for being *otona*, though not essential. Unlike the situation in Wellington, where tertiary students undertook part-time work to support themselves and/or supplement government loans in an attempt to be autonomously independent, most Shizuokan parents paid for their children's tertiary education. Some students financially dependent on parents were nevertheless intellectually independent. At the same time, some working young people in their twenties and living away from home were not intellectually independent. Again, financially and intellectually independent working young people who were still single often chose to remain living with their parents into their late twenties or early thirties, while some married couples chose to do so as well. Financial and intellectual independence were often considered 'only a beginning' toward becoming *otona*. Apartment life, which for unmarried young people was solitary, provided privacy and was regarded as a chance to develop strength of character. For tertiary students, privacy was the appealing aspect of living away from home, which was not seen, as in Wellington, as an avenue to autonomous independence. Living away from home provided Shizuokan students with temporary freedom from some family constraints yet, as family was the 'inside' group with whom identity, security, 'face' and rank were all intimately bound, individual freedom did not imply autonomous independence as in Wellington.

There are clear correlations between ideological motivations, the shaping of persons and personhood, and the form modernity assumes in any one society. In Wellington and Shizuoka, different moral imperatives linked to the imaginary and visionary and therefore ideological components of personhood affected parents' attitudes and choices regarding schoolwork and part-time work. Most parents in Wellington, for instance, reneged on making decisions regarding their children's futures, it being immoral to think or act on another's behalf while autonomy and self-sufficiency were recognized aims. In Shizuoka, where wrong choices could lead to insecurity and status loss, most parents considered it their moral duty to overtly or covertly guide their children's decisions to a degree far greater than parents in Wellington. Again, parents in Wellington actively encouraged their children's desire to work part-time, abiding by a morality of 'earning one's way through life'. In Shizuoka, in accordance with a morality of self-discipline and self-improvement, parents emphasised a focus on study toward a secure future and considered part-time work an unwelcome distraction. Young people in Shizuoka who might have queried their parents' influence (e.g. the TV frontsperson), or regretted their parents' inability to offer advice (e.g. the science graduate), nevertheless recognized the importance of social 'place'. In Shizuoka and Wellington, ideational moral imperatives ultimately diverged in relation to the significance or lack of significance accorded to markers of social identity and place.

The networks of relations in which persons in Wellington and Shizuoka exist and live their lives differ in kind and meaning. Choice, independence and freedom are valued aspects of personhood in each society yet the configurations of meaning associated with them differ, just as the forms of social relations in each society differ. Whereas in Shizuoka independence is linked with competence in a hierarchical society where harmony, respect and self-discipline are important, in Wellington independence is linked with being competent as an autonomous individual. In Wellington and Shizuoka personhood is expressed and enacted differently, in different but equally modern realms.

CHAPTER 5

FAMILY TIES, GENDER ISSUES AND INDEPENDENCE

In Wellington and Shizuoka, concepts of personhood influencing the maturation of young people interconnected with understandings of 'family', affecting choices young people made and their relations with others. In Wellington, where becoming an autonomous person involved 'separating out' from family, the need to recreate family was optional and required balancing autonomous independence with trust with others. As a nuclear unit, the family could take one of many forms and was predicated on mutual commitment and, at least ideally, roles that were minimally gendered. In Shizuoka, where almost all young people anticipated and desired marriage, gendered concepts of personhood were determined through marriage and family roles. Marriage united two families rather than two individuals, included ancestral spirits and, through reciprocal obligations, provided a person with social 'belonging' and 'place'.

Chapter 5 examines concepts of the family and their implications for young people in terms of social roles, a sense of 'belonging', and projections toward the future.

5.1. WELLINGTON: FAMILY TIES, GENDER ISSUES AND INDEPENDENCE

In a sociocultural environment protective of individual independence and choice and where people sought to control their own lives, 'family' was no longer associated with a secure sense of 'belonging' or permanence of 'place'. As has been described for Anglo-American societies, attachment in family systems comprising 'strong feeling and deep involvement… threaten[ed] individual autonomy' (Swidler 1980:36). Reliance on careers and jobs for economic independence and individual identity created dissatisfaction with roles entirely dedicated to raising children. Family ties, marriage and other domestic arrangements were seen as personal—sometimes temporary—matters of lifestyle choice. Young people no longer prioritised marriage as a mark of status and adulthood, nor was marriage seen as significant in the maturation of persons for whom autonomy and freedom of choice were principle values.

5.1.1. Concepts of 'family' as a domestic group

The European New Zealand family system was greatly influenced by English practices which, as argued by MacFarlane (1978:198), comprised an extremely individualist system,

'the simplest form of molecular structure', which predated and survived through industrialisation. The New Zealand late C19th-C20th structural division of labour among Europeans, in which male heads of households were employed in the public sphere while women were unpaid domestic carers in the private sphere of the home, had retrenched in early postwar years only to be challenged by women's gradual entry into the workforce as they sought greater choice and equity with men (Koopman-Boyden 1978; Bell and Adair 1985; Pearson and Thorns 1983:170-190; Park 1991:28-33). By the 1970s, women's rights activists began to press for legislation (the Equal Pay Act 1972, the Human Rights Commission Act 1977, the Parental Leave and Employment Protection Act 1987, the Employment Equity Act (repealed) 1990, and the Human Rights Act 1993) enabling women's more equitable access to employment, wages and salaries, and public status. At the same time, the 1976 Marital Properties Act eased divorce procedures, a domestic purpose benefit granted some recognition to solo parents, and legalised homosexuality (1986, 1993) opened the way to public recognition of gay and lesbian households. Although legislated changes did not, overall, greatly improve women's working conditions (Briar and Cheyne 1998)—which worsened under the Employment Contracts Act of 1991—they resulted in dramatic changes in household structures in one generation.

Born into a world where marriage had been the social norm and social expectation,[1] parents in Wellington often compared the rare occurrence of divorce and separation in their childhood days with the current social acceptance of solo, separated, reconstituted and *de facto* relationships.[2] A twice-married mother observed of her most recent separation:

> I can't think of one friend… when I was at school [whose] parents weren't together… When we got separated… [my daughter] said… there [were] only two in her class… [whose] parents were together… She said: "Don't worry about it… Why would it affect me?… Everybody's the same."

---

[1] Of 35 parent interviewees, the parents of only one had separated. They divorced once the children had left home.

[2] Of 35 parents, 17 were married, 2 re-married, 4 separated or divorced and living as solo parents or alone, and 12 in reconstituted or *de facto* relationships. In 2005 a new law recognised civil unions and same-sex unions.

Across New Zealand, between 1991 and 1996, divorcees increased by 22.4% males and 21.8% females (*New Zealand Official Year Book* 1998:114). In mid-1997, solo parents who were eligibal for government benefits numbered 107,629 (*New Zealand Official Year Book* 1998:144).

Just as types of family groups now varied, so also marriage was no longer seen by parents as a necessary future for daughters. The multiple choices their daughters faced stood in stark contrast to their own limited opportunities in the past, as one formerly married mother now in a *de facto* relationship expressed:

> Certainly [during] childhood [and] growing up… the expectation was marriage and children… I thought that… to get divorced… would be… the ultimate in personal and social failure… [Marriage would be]… when I was a grown up… in my twenties.

Another mother, now separated, made a similar point:

> Getting married was… one of the few options… available to me really… Either [that] or… continue… working and stay[ing] at home until I really was old enough to go flatting… maybe [at] about twenty… [My daughter has] a heap of options… She doesn't quite know which ones to choose… I certainly didn't have that at her age.

Often mothers found thinking about these contrasts mentally challenging. A divorced mother whose youngest child (a daughter) was seventeen said:

> I had two parents and my kids don't… By… the age my kids are now, I'd left home… I left home at seventeen. I got married at seventeen… I can't imagine me in their situations.[3]

Young people's identities as adults and full persons were not necessarily linked to marriage and family. Marriage was one life choice among many.

In Shizuoka, boundaries of who could and could not be members of 'family' were very distinct and socially highly significant. In Wellington, criteria parents cited for someone's inclusion or exclusion as a member of a family group often represented *ad hoc*, fluid arrangements associated with personal choice. Structurally, there were few uniformly held criteria other than the co-habitation of biological or surrogate parents and children.

Of twenty-seven parents discussing family, most (78%) understood 'family' to imply a nuclear group.[4] Each parent also included his or her own bilateral kin extending back at least one generation and from one to three removes to the side. The nuclear group comprised parents or step-parents who were married or in a 'stable' partnership, and children. A symbolic 'blood/marriage' foundation to the idea of family was similar to that

---

[3] The average age at marriage of male parent interviewees was 22 years, and of female parent interviewees 20 years. Nationwide in 1996, the average age for men marrying for the first time was 29.9 years and for women 27.1 years (*New Zealand Official Year Book* 1998:115).

[4] Nationwide in 1996, the I family household predominated at 63%, falling from 65.9% in 1991. Other household compositions were 1 family plus other people 6.2%, 2 or more families 2.5%, other multi-person households 5.2%, 1 person households 20.1%, and households not elsewhere classified 3% (*New Zealand Official Year Book* 1998:105).

portrayed by Schneider (1968) for the United States. Terms used to describe relations within the nuclear group were loosely applied. One male interviewee who considered himself 'married' was in a long-term *de facto* relationship. His partner and her two daughters from a previous marriage comprised what he described as his 'kit set' or 'ready-made' family. Only one parent from a nuclear group mentioned that children could be adopted as family, while two others allowed for fictive kin. Family members living outside the nuclear group were considered beyond day-to-day contact and responsibility. They were described as those who 'come in and out' of family, or as those outside the group and 'not important in the same way' but nevertheless significant. In only two cases did interviewees include the dead as members of the family. In the first instance the interviewee's reason was the frequency of contact between his grandmother and him and, in the second, that the dead were 'part of a memory bank of the family… or [of] the family tree'.

One variation on this theme, described by two parents, involved a larger nucleus comprised of siblings and their spouses together with their children in one large co-operative household under one roof, or as neighbours. In practice, however, the basic nuclear units were retained. In one case, the larger household of three sisters, their spouses and children proved unworkable and had recently disbanded. Although living as one household, each child had known his/her her parents as their own, while parents had been responsible for disciplining only their own children. In the other case, three sisters and their spouses lived close by each other to create a supportive network and share ownership of some material possessions.

Four parents rejected the idea of nuclear groups as described above. For one female interviewee, 'family' comprised her ex-husband, their son (who was flatting) and two teenage daughters, her partner and their young son, her parents, her grandmother, and her partner's parents. She included in 'family' all who had active and meaningful contacts 'even though it is stressful', and even though members were not living as one household. Other parents who rejected the nuclear concept spoke of groups or networks. A male respondent in a reconstituted family, who had no ties with extended kin—'largely [because of] geography'—focussed on those with whom he lived, as did his partner. He described 'family' in the following way:

[Family is] not… a mother and father and children and then extended… That's the old version… A family [is]… a group of people who live closely together and enjoy each other's company and choose to do things together. There must be some kind of relationship in some way… through marriage or biological connections… As a family now… we've got sort of mini units within the… family… There's… the two of us, then M (the son of his partner's and her ex-husband). He's definitely in a different position in the family now because he is getting ready… to leave the nest. But we have R's [his ex-wife's and his] two children as well, and they come and stay with us at times. We… sort of move in groups, but I consider us all to be the one family.

In one case a female interviewee who, when newly married, had joined what her daughter described as a 'hippie' community, now thought of 'family' as extended relationships and connections without any nucleus:

I've never felt… any great desire to… copy that nuclear family model… An extended family was healthier … They [her children] have got two half brothers and two half sisters and… numerous [others] because… their Dad had two relationships that produced children and I had one… Their Dad's been in a stable relationship… for… ten years or something… so his partner has been influential in their lives too. And then there's… all the relatives that live in Wellington… It doesn't matter what your family is… But… the more extended that it can be, and [the] more… support and… different people to relate to, the better… Although it started out the nuclear family we became part of a [hippie] community… From then on… you couldn't go back to… wanting to be a little unit.

One interviewee married with children included relatives in the concept of 'family' and also friends, as long as the latter lived close by and formed a common support network. In her case, 'family' evolved from a radical Christian group to which she was attracted while at university. After marriage, members of the group bought houses in the same street or neighbourhood and continued to meet regularly and operate as a form of collective. This larger 'family' group included fictive parents and siblings in an extending and diversifying network ('not… a static group') that was 'an important baseline for our parenting' and, as such, instructive for their young:

Within our network of friends… there are lesbian couples… [and a] gay couple, one of whom… died of AIDS… There are people who are solo parent families and there are people who are… in couple families… There's a diversity in our network that exposes them [our children] to an awful lot of different life choices.

187

When discussing concepts of 'family' a few parents queried the status of couples with no children, arguing that couples sought their primary identification through their childhood families rather than in a separate nucleus. Parents generally affirmed that couples at some point made a transition from their birth connections to identify with each other and networks of friends.

Three-generation households were uncommon. In only two cases were one or more grandparents part of a household. Three-generation households were also uncommon in the previous generation. Only one interviewee reported that a grandparent had lived with her parents and siblings for a prolonged period as she grew up. Although many grandparents kept in touch with their grandchildren and adult children, they were viewed as providers of care and gifts rather than as dependents in need of care. Most grandparents lived independently until entering a nursing home.[5]

The great variety of socially acceptable domestic arrangements strongly influenced attitudes in the younger generation who, as will be seen, were disinterested in marriage or long-term partnerships other than as matters of personal choice. For young people, full personhood involved the freedom to situate themselves in contractual arrangements made and continued through mutual agreement, should they so desire it. Within that framework, young people would structure their own concepts of belonging.

5.1.2. 'Being Family'

Ideas of 'being family' partly reflected whether interviewees saw family as possessing historical depth, or as primarily insular, nuclear and contingent. Of fourteen parents commenting on what created a sense of family, five thought that 'blood ties' and being part of a family tree created family connections, providing a boundary extending through time and distinguishing family from non-family friends. In their view, biological connections were pivotal for bringing people together and establishing support networks. Of the five, two thought that biological connections produced shared histories and memories that continued through the generations and, according to one, included family knowledge of physical resemblances and behavioural traits. She considered that, 'as an independent cell within the family tree', she had added 'another branch' to the tree/network. Biological ties

---

[5] In New Zealand, all people over the age of 65 years received a government benefit which assisted their financial independence. In 1996, superannuitants received between NZ$252 and NZ$379 per week before tax (*New Zealand Official Year Book* 1998:146).

also provided a sense of belonging and identity for parents in some reconstituting families who connected back to their own parents.

More commonly, however, interviewees thought that 'being family' involved experiential phenomena, relationships, and material concerns. By experiential phenomena they meant shared day-to-day involvement that created memories and bonds. They specified 'working together, playing together and… just doing everything together, and being supportive of one another… Just generally being there.' When emphasising the importance of family relationships, interviewees specified qualities of understanding and trust between family members as well as tolerance, acceptance and caring. One interviewee mentioned the importance of commitment and reassessment in marriage, while another in a reconstituted nuclear unit spoke of needing to 'work at maintaining the relationship'. As bonding qualities required interaction between family members, parents in one family complained that their daughter 'shuts herself in her room a lot' rather than 'associate with the rest of the family', thereby minimising the contacts that 'made' family. Few parents explicitly mentioned financial support as primarily responsible for the sense of 'being' family.

Personal ties in intimate family and partner relations, and the emotional satisfaction derived from them, were therefore contingent upon daily reaffirmations of commitment and mutual trust rather than duties and obligations associated with a formal institution. Giddens (1991:93-8) outlines a similar conditional base for marital, partner and friend relationships, suggesting that a 'balance of autonomy and mutual disclosure' and a correlation of personal agendas is required to build and maintain them.

5.1.3. Social change, gender equality and parent roles

Changes in family lifestyles in Wellington included an increase in the number of mothers who worked to supplement family incomes. Some parents commented on the negative affects of this change: 'A lot of parents aren't always at home with their kids… It's sad.' The work realm and a 'lifestyle enclave' (Bellah et al.1985:83) were, however, considered equally important as areas in which autonomous self-responsible persons could seek to express and develop themselves.

When considering their children's futures, many parents noted the changing roles of women, in particular women's increasing participation in the workforce and altered attitudes to women in paid work. Parents commented on how, when they were children

growing up, most women stopped working when they married to become fulltime housewives and mothers.[6] Their mothers had worked (usually as clerical assistants or teachers) only part-time after marriage, and only after their children were settled into primary or high school. Even then, some were considered out of line:

> My mother went back to work when I was twelve… People used to look down on me a bit…
> [and] make comments… My youngest brother was only five.

By contrast, contemporary young women contemplated one uninterrupted or several sequential careers over a lifetime, attitudes parents linked to changes that occurred rapidly after 1970. Parents, moreover, hoped that their own daughters would have permanent jobs and careers. While suggesting there was prejudice against women employees in large corporate organisations, parents nevertheless noted that young men and women were no longer 'locked into the traditional male/female paths'.

The former emphasis on women as birth-givers and nurturers was also being challenged with the disappearance of rigid gender roles. As one mother said:

> There is a… biological difference… It's still women who are giving birth and breast-feeding…
> I do see more men getting actively involved in parenting and… that's great… It's healthier
> that… the roles are… less polarised… and that there's some crossover… Men and women then
> become more whole as people. And then their children are able to… have… greater options
> available to them. Not just what they do in their lives but in their… emotional… and…
> personal development.

In parent interviews, men did not comment on their position as fathers. The change for women from a primarily home-based existence to a mixed base of home and work may explain why women analysed their role as mothers.[7] Less than half the women interviewed found motherhood singularly important and totally satisfying. The majority said that motherhood had compromised their sense of self. They experienced a loss of autonomy and freedom: 'I can never really do what I want', and with small children felt 'completely tethered'. They suggested that, if they had no husband or children, they could

---

[6] Of 28 mothers of parent interviewees, 13 had been in paid work and 15 were housewives/mothers who had not worked. By contrast, of 26 mothers of students, 20 were in paid work. Of the remaining 6, two worked part-time, one did voluntary work, while three were fulltime housewives/mothers.

[7] Of 26 parents who discussed their reactions to being parents, 12 (6 female and 6 male) responded positively, while 5 females responded negatively. Four parents (3 female and 1 male) gave mixed positive and negative responses. Three females were resigned to the parent role while 2 parents (1 male and 1 female) remarked on the social significance of parenting.

be teaching fulltime, doing special courses and making choices without having to consider the effects on others. Motherhood was also said by some to cause a 'loss of self': people recognised them as 'the mother of John and Mary', eclipsing their other identities. Mothers complained: 'You lose a lot of your identity' and are 'pushed into a little corner'. With motherhood, women also assumed new household roles that threatened to obscure their sense of self: 'I really struggle with keeping a tab on who I am in the big picture when I'm not being a mother or a wife or a cleaner or… some other role.' Women mentioned that, even when parenting provided the core of their identity and became a priority, it was not completely fulfilling:

> You want to make some wider contribution to society as well… It [parenting] can't be my only life work… I couldn't fulfil all my needs if you like, through them [the children].

In attempting to account for frustrations with motherhood, women referred to an equation made between a person's identity and his or her career or job. One woman argued that recent redundancies exposed the strong link that men made between their work and identity, as indicated by their saying 'I am a lawyer', for example, rather than 'I am a father'. Women also pointed out that having children rarely resulted in fathers giving up their work or identities. By contrast, many women said their work-related identities were 'lost' or forfeited after having one or more children. Other women, however, observed that feminists had mistakenly offered women a choice 'to be like a man and have that identity', whereas women's experiences as mothers gave them a self and identity that did not depend solely on work or motherhood. Nevertheless, working mothers said they acquired satisfaction and social approval from holding work-related identities (many as part-timers). Social approval also triggered self-approval: 'It's not like... I am only a mother, [or that that is] all I do and all I am.' The need to maintain a work identity also affected young mothers. One interviewee commented on the 'huge conflict' young mothers had when they unwillingly put their young children into child care in order to pursue careers and maintain employment positions, for which they had worked hard and were fearful of losing. By doing so, she suggested, young mothers were denying a biological urge to remain strongly bonded with their young children and the desire to continue parenting full time at home. Only two interviewees (a married couple) who equally shared the care of their disabled child affirmed that fathers are equally capable of providing homecare for children.

In Wellington's industrial/consumer society, the ability to earn was a mark of a person's independent worth. An ideology of autonomous independence conflicted with the mother role in that attributes positively associated with self-development were largely identified with jobs and careers outside the home. To forfeit this identity was perceived as an unacceptable sacrifice, an attitude expressed in student comments below. As Swidler (1980:138) argues, people 'no longer believe that an adult's life can be meaningfully defined by the sacrifice he or she makes for spouse or children'. When speaking of their frustrations with motherhood, Wellington women referred to a loss of the identity, freedom, autonomy, time and opportunities associated by them with the careers and jobs that had contributed to their social status and prestige. These desirable values and attributes that parents in general, and especially mothers, hoped to 'regain' once their children left home were precisely those values and attributes that parents inculcated in their children, regardless of gender, as they approached adulthood.

In analysing the social conditions of New Zealand women's lives, several feminist scholars (Else 1992; Bunkle and Lynch 1992; Craig 1992; Kell Easting 1992; Du Plessis 1993) point to factors contributing to the formation of attitudes such as those expressed above. In general terms they suggest that, whereas many women desired the choice, freedom and rights associated with an ideology of individual autonomy, many wives/mothers had little chance of attaining them. The problem was seen as the State's positioning of wives/mothers within 'family' as a natural phenomenon, taking it for granted that their work as wives/mothers was natural also, and unpaid. For social policy purposes, therefore, individual wives and mothers were treated not as individuals, but as members of households and families. The fusion of 'individual' with 'household' undercut a wife/mother's or caregiver's competitive chances in the market world, which was treated as separate from the home, often leaving her at the margins of a career or as a part-time worker with lower wages and reduced access to income. For wives/mothers, this position spelt dependency on men rather than autonomy. McKinley (1992:78) notes that a woman's unpaid work increased by 60% at marriage, by 91% when a mother, and that retired women did eight and a half hours of unpaid work. Munford (1992:94) notes the ambivalent feelings commonly associated with motherhood, including the satisfaction of watching a child develop yet frustration that the task division of households restricted valid choices. Collectively, these analysts indicated a general desire for wives/mothers' unpaid work to be

measured and valued, for recognition to be given to a wife/mother's 'reality of difference' rather than her invisibility, and for an increased access to childcare.

5.1.4. Separation from family and independence

Parents encouraged their children toward independence, free choice and self-responsibility. Their children's ultimate future directions were neither the parents concern, nor their responsibility, as seen in parent responses when asked about their children's future in ten years' time. Of a total of fifteen parents who commented on the future of their children, one mentioned a daughter's hopes to complete a nursing course, while another cited a son's hopes to do business studies. Five suggested that their children could complete tertiary studies and find employment, while others said tertiary education was possible. All qualified their suggestions with 'maybe', or 'probably' or 'it is likely', or phrases such as: 'But who knows?' and: 'She's got to paddle her own canoe.' Half the parents gave vague answers about their children's futures or said they 'didn't know'. One suggested that his daughter would pursue 'her own little vision', while another said his children would have 'left home' and could settle or might drift. Other parents said: 'They've got to develop themselves', or that: 'They'll start on their separate lives', or that: 'The future is the big unknown… They could be anywhere.'

Although concealed in vague terms, parents nevertheless expressed the hope that their children would find a good job and reap enjoyment from their lives. One father observed: 'You've got to be able to encourage them [the children] into any opportunities that they create for themselves', while another envisaged the time when he was free of his responsibilities:

> [I am] making sure that… they [his children] make the best of their opportunities and the best of their capabilities and… recognise what it is they want to do, and don't just sort of drift off into nothingness… [I] have this view that if they get to university or somewhere else that's suitable, at that point we can sort of relax and say… "It's over to you now mate."

When speaking of their children's futures, most parents did not raise the subject of marriage or partnerships.[8] They focussed on student part-time work and education, anticipating their children's need for qualifications for a career or job and financial independence.

---

[8] Of 32 parents, only 2 parents suggested that marriage/creating a family was significant for becoming an adult.

The cost of tertiary education concerned many parents as costs fell partially or wholly onto parents or their children. In the latter instance, the children needed to take part-time jobs while studying, or take out a state loan. Parents contrasted the cost of tertiary education with that of state-subsidised education and student life in their day. Most objected to paying for their children's tertiary education and encouraged sons and daughters to work part-time to cover some or all tertiary expenses. Parents disapproved of students' dependency on them and the accumulation of debts on the completion of their courses.

Parental disquiet over tertiary student dependence on parents (or the state) related to associations made between 'becoming adult', leaving home and financial independence. In discussing their own transitions to adulthood parents revealed that, despite social change, their pursuit of independence had followed patterns similar to those they advocated for their children. Many parents had sought some financial independence while still at school by earning their 'own money' through part-time work. They had also left home in search of independence. The ages at which parents had left home ranged from fifteen to twenty four, with the majority below twenty, while reasons for leaving included getting a job, going flatting, beginning tertiary courses and getting married.

In several other ways contemporary attitudes matched those parents had held in their past. One was that adulthood occurred at around twenty years by which time young people possessed a certain maturity. Another was the association between adulthood and getting a job, even when having a job preceded leaving home. Again, leaving home had been seen as 'a big step… in independence and adulthood' and was often identified with gaining freedom and self-responsibility. These attitudes came into play as parents contemplated their children's potential dependence on them throughout their tertiary studies. One parent who had left home at eighteen, as had her brother before her, recalled their actions as a 'lemming like drive to get out of home… [A] sense of… it's time to [leave]'. This attitude affected her reaction to being made responsible for her student son until the age of twenty-five:

> I think that's appalling… Apart from the financial implications for us… it must be an intolerable state of affairs for young adults… They don't want to be beholden to their parents. I would have loathed being… indebted to my parents. I wanted to… make my own decisions, live my own life [and] do things which… [were] my choice… If I was… earning my own income they couldn't [do anything]… It'd be impossible to have a sort of no strings approach [if you were dependent on parents].

Parents were torn between wanting their children to gain tertiary qualifications and wanting them to become independent and leave home sooner rather than later. They nevertheless anticipated that their children would leave home to become adult, using phrases such as 'when they become an adult and they leave home'. Parents commented: 'They're going to grow up and leave home'; or: 'They'll start on their separate lives'; or: 'That [i.e. leaving home] is going to happen. It's a matter of when it happens. And… of working through so that it does happen at some stage.' Parents noted signs of imminent departure: 'We're starting to now separate out, and… the older ones are starting to do their own thing', or: 'He is getting ready to leave the nest.' (Park 1991:134) Certainly parents thought it important that their children leave, commenting: 'It does them [young people] a lot of good… once they're working, to get out and go flatting and… enjoy life… You've got to get out from under your parents' wing… at that stage of life.' Parents also thought that leaving home was crucial for their children's being able to make independent decisions. Interviewees whose children had completed their training and already left home believed they were 'on the right path'. One parent who found it emotionally difficult to separate from her own parents nevertheless considered the effort to do so very important:

> Kids need to bust up from their parents… I think that… mature autonomous human beings need to do that [for] moral and emotional autonomy… It doesn't have to be acrimonious, but it has to be quite definite… You certainly have to stop being physically dependent, but you also have to stop seeking their approval.

Some parents were not ready for their children to leave: 'It [parenting] is a job… I'm having problems now letting go… They're not finished with me yet, and I'm not finished with them really yet.' A few parents showed mixed emotions. One mother said that when her son left for university she found it 'sad seeing him leave but… exciting too'. Half of those parents who discussed their children's leaving home hoped to 'stay in touch'. Some described themselves as a base to which their children could 'fall back' to seek guidance or assistance.[9] Of all those hoping for continued contact, however, few had any definite ideas of what this would mean, and few anticipated grandchildren. Just two mothers said that they would like to be grandparents, and just one father, with his two stepdaughters in mind, thought of an extended family as he planned to buy a bach: 'It's going to be a place where they and their families can come.'

---

[9] Of 18 parents, 9 fell into this category.

No parent imagined s/he would have continuing responsibilities to their children once they became financially independent. Neither did parents see their children as an insurance against old age: 'The… idea [that] they're going to be here to keep you going when you're old… You wouldn't want that.' Most parents assumed they would regain space and time for themselves when their children left home: 'We'd like to break our shackles… from the limits of having children.' Many wanted to reclaim lost independence and selfhood: having 'time to myself and time to do my own thing'. Mothers spoke of taking up hobbies, taking university courses, or moving into full time work. Parents expected to enjoy more freedom and planned to save or travel. Couples anticipated more time together: 'We're getting our lives back basically', while one early-married mother wanted to make up for lost time. Parents readily admitted that it was in their own interests, as well as their children's, to make their children independent: their children's independence implied their own resumption of full personhood.

Adulthood required that a young person became independent, outside and separated from the parental home. Young people accepted and most anticipated these implications of adulthood. Almost all students welcomed the idea that they would leave the family home. Indeed, almost half the students said they would prefer to live independently of home even while still at school, but were prevented from doing so by lack of money.[10] A number of students wanted to leave home immediately after completing school. Others wanted to remain at home longer, usually for financial reasons, as paying board was cheaper than flatting. Students planning to attend a university or polytech often said they would remain at home for the first or second year—or occasionally for the entire course—to postpone or avoid taking out a student loan.

Even though school students anticipated leaving home, they recognised the value of home life and associations with members of their families. Often students desired only freedom from parental restrictions, or disliked the location of the family house:

> Just to get out of the Hutt [Valley] is the main reason [for wanting to leave home]. Just to be closer in to town [Wellington], so I can do more … There's things like being able to have my music up louder, and… being able to smoke in the house and do things that I want to do. [I could] come home when I want to… But, I don't know. It's pretty good at Mum's house.

Another student expressed awareness of the material benefits of home life:

---

[10] One female student was already flatting and one student mentioned another who was also flatting.

I might [leave home now for good]… if I actually had a job that would pay a rent… I might do it… next year… I'd stay around home for a while because… meals are cooked for you and things [are] done for you… It's… a pretty good scene.

Parent attitudes could complicate students' decisions over leaving home. A student from a close-knit family said that parental agreement was crucial as to whether she would live in a university hostel or go flatting:

The plan was that I was going to live in a hostel… Now one of my friends is going up [to Auckland]… We're... thinking about getting a flat… They [my parents] are a bit sceptical [saying]… You know, "It costs a lot to set up and everything."… We talked through a lot… My Mum's a bit negative, but I think that's just because she doesn't really want me to go.

Even when parents accepted that students needed to live closer to a university, their attitudes could make leaving home more difficult:

Flatting in Wellington's fine [with me]… My Mum basically cries at the thought of me leaving home… They [my parents] will miss me heaps.

In other cases students thought their parents were eager for them to leave, or connived for this to happen:

I'll get kicked out… because Mum won't want me living with her anymore. She wants her own space… That's probably why she wants to send me to Massey [University, in Palmerston North]… She wants me to do a… computer course. I don't want to do that though… She [wants to] buy a [student] flat [for me there]. She wouldn't help me get it if she didn't want me out.

However much individual circumstances affected young people's leaving home, it was given that self-responsibility, maturity and independence implied a young person's separating out from family to become adult.

5.1.5. The independent self and relations with others

When students spoke of surviving 'on their own' in the manner of autonomous adults, they did not imagine a life entirely separated from others. On the contrary, they suggested their lives would be greatly enriched through social contacts with peers, flatmates in shared accommodation, and new friendships:

[Being adult means] you can do what you want… You have lots of friends because you've… met a lot of people through… lots of experiences.

Students also expected to receive emotional support from others. To one young woman 'being adult' included: 'Being aware that in times of need you can ask other people to support you… It's important right through your life to be able to do that, and to have people around you.' This student spoke of 'a group of people [being] there to support each other's needs', who would be the equivalent of family. She saw no contradiction between responsible independence and seeking support in times of need:

> I can be completely independent without any support from my parents… If… they were to move overseas… I'd just find other people which I could [trust]… That's an important step, being totally independent… and being able to look after myself. I can do that completely so [in] those areas I think I'm an adult.

Relations with parents required financial and emotional adjustments before young people were recognised by their parents as equal adults. Students often wanted their own 'space' to establish their own households, 'find' themselves, discover new relationships, and act as they liked. Most students did not anticipate that becoming independent meant completely severing ties to parents and siblings. In planning to leave home, students experienced tensions associated with imminent separation that often went away with maturity. Asked whether they would still see their parents in five or ten years time many students were affirmative, although the expected frequency of contact ranged from 'reasonably often' to once or maybe twice a year to 'not much'. Twice as many female students as male students anticipated some contact.

In their relations with others, students were above all looking for equality. They wanted an adult world that did not reflect the hierarchy and authority associated with age differentiations of their youth. They sought relationships that were mutually respectful, non-patronising and non-dependent. They envisaged sharing a flat with adults of an indeterminate age, where relationships were non-demanding and loose:

> As adults… a lot of the time you might only live with flatmates or something… They could just be that, flatmates, that's all. So you'll look after yourself.

While students considered non-binding friendships among peers important for forming opinions and gaining energy and motivation, a few allowed that adult independence might change in a future partnership:

> If you're looking after somebody else… you've got far more… considerations… You're far more responsible.

Likewise, a few students imagined that the possibility of caring for children would mitigate an independence focussed on the self:

> Having children… changes things… I guess that's the next step from independence.

The desire for autonomous independence was therefore tempered by a need to be with, and perhaps care for, others. Transitions in relations with others, however, involved moving away from a structured world of given relationships at home and school and entering one where nothing was a given any longer. Participating in an adult world entailed making independent decisions and choices. One student described the ability to do so in terms of acquiring a new vision:

> I think it's… a sense of how far you can see in front of you… When you're a child you… might not have many choices... You can only see so far in front of you…[in relation] to you and your immediate surroundings… Now you can see… what's going on around you, and you're more informed and you're more aware of your environment.

Transitions to an adult world also created a measure of uncertainty. The world of a child based on social foundations of family and school life could quickly change to one of shifting relationships conducted without recourse to known principles. One student felt inadequate about communicating with people, saying she needed to acquire this skill in order to become adult:

> [If] you don't know how to express things [you are not competent]… On a basic level, being able to tell people how you feel and what you're going to do, and things like that, is really important… That's part of being adult… It's a really important part of life.

Autonomous independence did not therefore indicate existential apartness. It allowed for give and take, friendship, loyalty and sharing. It was opposed to dependencies that cancelled a person's sense of being in charge of him/herself or created a sense of 'losing' self.

5.1.6. Relationships, personal choice and marriage

Young people were far more focussed on achieving independent lifestyles than on marriage or long-term partnerships that might lead to the birth of children. The muting of older gender distinctions and roles contributed to notions of a mobile world.

Parents did not distinguish between a son or daughter's participation in household tasks, leisure activities, or open future. Aside from recognising social dangers that young women faced and acting to protect daughters, parents tried to provide equal opportunities for sons

and daughters. Several parents consciously rejected gender-linked social roles. One mother said: 'Neither [roles]… have been satisfactory… If we can make small inroads… into changing… the polarity… I think that's important', while one father said:

> B [my wife] and I would… not let J [our son] see us… being… a housewife or a bread earner… We… didn't want J [our son] to fall into the gender role trap as we saw it at the time… That was an issue for us.

Students considered that women's ability to bear children was the main factor differentiating women from men. Women's realisation of this potential, however, was seen as just one among a number of possible choices for women:

> There's that whole mother-child rearing thing which I think is a lot to do with becoming a woman. Not that you have to take that on. Not in today's society. But it's there… Being able to have children, and being ready to… Guys don't have that really so much… That's the main difference.

Young adults of both genders deferred thoughts of marriage or partnerships with children to a distant future. Only half the students said they wanted a marriage or partnership with the possibility of children; of these twelve spoke in vague terms, and five in terms of 'maybe'. The remainder were either unconcerned, or had not thought about it.[11]

Marriage and having children were not thought essential or even important in the passage to adulthood. When speaking of children, students were negative about early pregnancies and saw no connections between having a child and becoming an adult: 'You can… have a baby when you're… fourteen or sixteen. Real young. It doesn't really make you an adult.' Students concurred, however, that the responsibilities attached to caring for a child could encourage qualities associated with adulthood and make a person 'more like an adult'. But they also agreed, as one student said, that 'in itself it still doesn't make you… an adult'. Although admitting that having children *after* becoming adult would bring increased responsibilities, students considered that having children was 'an experience' that would compromise a person's freedom. They supposed that 'you have to sacrifice a lot… It changes your whole perspective on life'; or that by having children you had 'to calm down… You've got to… stand up for your mistakes'; or that, 'you have to be rather

---

[11] In New Zealand, marriage rates were declining. In 1996 the mean average of 17.1 marriages per 1,000 of the not-married population over 16 years compared with the mean average in 1988 of 23.34 marriages per 1,000 (*New Zealand Official Year Book* 1998:115). In 1996 there were 33.1% of 'never married' males and 27.7% of 'never married' females. Between 1991 and 1996, the 'never married' males increased by 2.9% and 'never married' females by 7.8% (*New Zealand Official Year Book* 1998:114).

mature because… obviously your children are going to watch your every move and… mimic it in some way'.

Students also agreed that marriage did not signal adulthood: marriage, like giving birth to a child, could occur before people were mature and able to accept responsibilities: 'You can get married at sixteen. It doesn't show that you're an adult. It shows that you're stupid if you ask me, getting married at that age.'

Most students disliked the idea of formalised partnerships. As described above, they lived in a society where children born out of wedlock or to solo mothers were not stigmatised, where divorce was common, and reconstituted families not infrequent.[12] Most students preferred notions of partnerships dictated by emotional and sexual attraction to ideas of formal marriage. Those who thought marriage a viable option seldom saw it in religious terms or as a principle ordained by God. Some students dismissed the idea of marriage *because* they held no religious beliefs:

> I'm not a Christian, which makes me wonder if I should get married… The whole philosophy
> of it is Christian… You could… [deal with legal issues] in a Will… You don't really need to
> get married for it… I'd probably live with somebody… in a really long term relationship…
> You wouldn't need to… swear to be with each other for ever and ever… It's a pretty big
> commitment forever, you know. Pretty big.

Legal marriage contracts were seen here to interfere with freedom, although the legal implications of a formal marriage escaped the notice of some students altogether: 'Marriage doesn't mean anything to me. It's just a piece of paper… [with] no significance.' To one student, a formal wedding was important only as a ceremony: 'I'd probably get married for… the dress and the reception.'

A few students favoured marriage, just as some parents favoured marriage, as a way of structuring life, or as providing some form of permanence or respectability should children be born. One male student, who disliked the notion of being bound, nevertheless thought that marriage sanctioned a child's social acceptance:

> I'm looking forward to having children… It [marriage] is like a ball and chain… I'll get
> married but I'm just not looking forward to it. I don't think I'll have kids before I get married...
> What are they called? 'Bastards', yeah something like that… I knew it was a swear word.

---

[12] Parents of at least a third of the interviewed students were divorced or separated or in the process of separating.

Another male student who preferred to marry before having children was, however, ambivalent about its necessity, as well as about having children:

I don't think I'd have a kid if I wasn't married… unless the girl I really liked… didn't want to get married. I probably wouldn't really care much, as long as I liked her enough… I think it's nice to have kids… I reckon the whole purpose of life is… to reproduce, but I wouldn't really mind too much [if I didn't have children].

One female student said she would marry before having children so she could share child-caring responsibilities with her spouse:

I think I'd prefer to get married before I had kids so at least… I wouldn't be left with the responsibility of looking after them all the time.

Only one student advocated marriage at a young age of perhaps eighteen or twenty. He approved of lowering the age when a person could legally marry without parental consent. All other students suggested the mid-twenties as the earliest age for any long-term relationship, while many wanted to delay a committed relationship until thirty or beyond. And one male student suggested a cut-off age of thirty-seven years for marriage:

About that sort of age you'd think… something's missed, passed me by. I'd probably rush out… trying to get a wife… Or… [perhaps] by then I probably wouldn't really want one… But… I'd hate to die alone. I think that would suck.[13]

As marriage or a long-term partnership negated or compromised ideas of independence and freedom, students preferred keeping their options open:

They [my friends] don't really seem to be the kind of people that would really think about it [marriage and children]… I'd want to live a lot before I had kids.

Long-term relationships were less important than other considerations. The desire for overseas travel (Bell 2002) and associated 'experiences' were frequently given precedence over thoughts of marriage and a family.

It's not like a big priority to get married and have children… I'm sure I'll do that one day… [First I want to go to] university, and I want to… study overseas and just travel. All the sort of normal kind of things.

Parents also endorsed students' plans to travel:

My parents are really keen for me to [travel]... They'd be quite disappointed if I didn't… see everything and [if I] just met a guy and got married… They'd just think that was a bit of a waste of time.

---

[13] To 'suck' is a slang term indicating disappointment and disgust.

The need to secure a job, a career and a reliable source of income diminished the importance of marriage or children. Whether they married or established a partnership, male and female students alike desired a working life and planned to fit any future children in and around their jobs. Only one female student considered putting marriage above a working career. Although a few students had considered juggling a career with having a family, most wanted to secure their career first, as did one male student:

> [I would like to marry] in the late twenties. [First I want to] have fun, get some qualifications, [and] get a job. By then, I should have one anyway. [I want to] get it stable… where I'm getting the money and starting to get used to it… Then I'd get married… I'd wait a couple more years until my job's completely [secure] before I have kids so as I have enough money to support them.

Because students had choices other than getting married and having children, many— especially female— students preferred to defer making these decisions. Some students would eventually marry or form long-term relationships and some would have one or more children, while others would ultimately choose to remain single. These aspects of social existence were not deemed significant as adult markers. Long-term partnerships of whatever form were based primarily on emotional attraction and concepts of equality between the male and female partners. Such partnerships were not a priority; nor were they viewed as part of a tree of life, or as a link in a continuum of generations maintained through respect and affection. Instead, the family nucleus was aligned to parental careers in a market economy where jobs, income, travel and mobility remained the abiding focus.

Parents and young people confronted transitions to adulthood in a sociocultural environment where materialism and market forces had supplanted a liberal tradition in schools and universities. Young men and women were equally entitled to pursue careers, and status was identified with paid work. In such a society marriage patterns had widened to include *de facto* and reconstituting relationships, reducing the ability of the next generations to track their kinship identity and rely on kinship for support, yet affirming family relations conducted on the basis of respect for the independence of individuals. In the form of contractual relationships based solely on mutual commitment, and as domestic arrangements that young adults would leave, the 'family' did not offer permanence of 'place'. Each individual constructed his or her own sense of 'belonging' with others through choices s/he made although, ultimately, a person's 'belonging' rested with the self. An identity dependent for status and self-fulfilment on involvement in paid work altered

women's attitudes to the role of motherhood, which was often negatively perceived as self-sacrificing rather than self-affirming. Although parents had difficulty imagining their children's futures, parents acted to impart the impulses and understandings they themselves had followed when young in support of self-autonomy and freedom of choice. As adults, young people assumed an independent future entirely dependent on self-affirmation and individual choice in all undertakings, including those of commitments in long-term relations and having children.

5.2. SHIZUOKA: FAMILY TIES, GENDER ISSUES AND INDEPENDENCE

Unlike the situation in Wellington, where each adult person was free to choose his or her lifestyle and create his or her own sense of belonging, personhood in Shizuoka was always tied to family. 'Family' was where a person belonged, and the institution of family remained stable and central, standing as the 'inside' reference point for individual family members. In attempting to explain the significance of family, one mother referred to the family as a separate community:

> Family's something more than friends… [With] friends, you are individual to each other… Even though you're close, you should keep some distance. Well, I do good for them, and they do good to me. I respect them [and] I admire them… and they do. But… we should keep some line, some space… Cousins… know your background… [They] will not be as brothers and sisters. But sometimes they can advise you better than some friends… Sometimes friends are better than relatives. But [they are a] different community. A different relation[ship].

A person's ties with family were structured through recognition and celebration of ancestral spirits, recognition of lifelong indebtedness and responsibilities to parents, and through marriage and gendered roles. For most young people, these aspects of family were basic to the formation of identity and personhood, influencing decisions people made and their relations with others.

5.2.1. Concepts of the family

In Shizuoka, perceptions of the nature and composition of 'family', and of social roles of family members, were a mix of two systems legislated at different periods in time. Although the first system was abolished by the new postwar constitution, many families continue to keep some practices associated with it.

The first family system is that of the Meiji *ie*, brought into legislation as a definition of the family unit coincidental with the creation of the nation state. Under the Meiji Civil Code (1898), all people were required to register in a (multigenerational) household register (*koseki*)[14] so as to be part of an *ie*,[15] which literally means 'house'. The *ie* was headed by the father and succeeded by the first-born son or, if he were unable or unwilling, by another son, or by a daughter's husband adopted as a son (*mukoyoshi*) who took the name of his

---

[14] See Chapter 1.4.2. and Appendix 1.

[15] Information on Meiji and postwar family structures is taken from Traphagen (2000:367-9); Nishikawa 1996 (224-6); Kurosu 1994 (183); Kelly (1993:208); Uno (1993:303); Buckley (1993:347); Orpett Long (1996:159); Rindfuss et al. (1994:200-1); Cho and Yada eds. (1994:9); and Benedict (1989:55).

wife's family. Descent in an *ie* could therefore proceed through either males or females. Rights to inheritance implied that the (first-born) son would assume responsibilities for his father and mother in their declining years, although in practice these responsibilities fell to the son's wife. The household head had the duty to worship ancestors, as well as the right of control over family members in such matters as property, location of the family residence, marriage, and naming of new *ie* members. Although the *ie* structure was based on lineal descent from ancestors through the patriarch to future generations, the *ie* incorporated all who were registered in the *koseki*. In practice, power to decide on behalf of the *ie* was vested in the older *ie* members rather than in an individual. Control of the *ie* remained effective through common loyalty among *koseki* registrants until loosened by a person's marriage, or by a person's non-successorship. Based on respect and obedience, the *ie* became the basic unit of the nation state and came under the power of the emperor.

In the *ie* system, the main house (*honke*) was distinguished from branch houses (*bunke*), the latter ideally being established by males in the patriline who were not successors to the *ie* headship. In practice the head of a branch house might also be the husband of a sister or daughter of the main house head, or the adoptive son (Lebra 1984:22-24). Because of legal changes after World War II, many branch families in cities, and people lacking strong kin ties, lived more or less as nuclear households even though the *ie* system was in some cases retained.[16]

Postwar constitutional changes introduced new (and foreign) concepts of family, many of which have not been fully taken up. The 1947 Civil Code, drafted and guided into existence by SCAP, abolished the legal authority of the *ie*, the mandate to continue family lines, and primogeniture inheritance and succession. The new family ideology promoted equal inheritance by all children, and the free choice of spouse and career. It included equal rights for women, who could now manage property while married, inherit part of the husband's estate, have freedom of residence, and divorce their spouse.[17] Family registration could be in the name of either husband or wife, who then assumed headship of the nuclear family.

---

[16] For examples see Lebra 1984, Hamabata 1991, Traphagen 2000.

[17] According to the postwar constitution: '[M]arriage shall be based only on the mutual consent of both sexes and it shall be maintained through mutual co-operation with the equal rights of the husband and wife as its basis. With regards to choice of spouse, property rights, inheritance, choice of domicile, divorce and other matters pertaining to marriage and the family, laws shall be enacted from the standpoint of individual dignity and the essential equality of the sexes.' (Buckley 1993:347)

Significantly, the old system was able to survive through two legal measures. First, a patriline could still be maintained by repeated transfers of the *ie* registry to a first-born (or another) son, or through adopted sons bearing the family name, even though the conjugal couple had replaced the patriarch.[18] This was possible since the family register (*koseki*) was retained in law. Second, the person who would previously have been the head of the house, or the legal successor, was to legally succeed and preside over worship of the ancestors by inheriting ownership of genealogical records, utensils of religious rites, tombs and burial grounds, although in other ways inheritance could be divided (R.Smith 1974: 33-34). Thus households were able to retain the *ie* ideology and control extended family members, especially for business purposes and preserving care for parents in their old age. Even when many households abandoned the *ie* structure, certain attitudes associated with it prevailed. Notably, spouse selection and a three-generation co-residence pattern were two areas resistant to change.

In the rest of this chapter I examine the attitudes of young people and their parents to aspects of family life that created ties to family, and choices that perpetuated them or offered release from them. In so doing, interrelations between ideas of personhood, family, and the maturation of young people, will be clarified.

5.2.2. The family name, the family line, and ancestor worship
Pre- and post-war systems merged through concepts of the family name, the family line, and duties to ancestors for the protection of family members and the continuation of the line. To some informants, in order to be significant a 'family name' needed links to ancestral lines of high social rank, either of old nobility, or of new family lines made successful though business. Another view associated 'family name' with the 'good image' of a family.

Informants in Shizuoka agreed that ancestors could consolidate family lines and thus social status.[19] Most were mindful of their ancestors, and thought it important to clean and

---

[18] Because the Meiji code forbade polygamy, the *ie* also observed the priority of the conjugal bond. The wife of a patriarch sometimes assumed great power working as a house-head, and sometimes became successor to the business after the death of her husband (Ueno 1996:219).

[19] In some cases, the family line was preserved when, if the husband of a married couple was sterile, the couple sought artificial insemination using sperm donated by the father of the husband. *The Japan Times*, 16 Sept 2000.

protect the family grave[20] regardless of class. A few thought the family name and ancestors were not important. Attitudes, however, did not divide neatly. Opinions differed also on the importance of celebrating *Obon*, the annual Festival of the Dead, during which the spirits of dead ancestors returned for two days to the land of the living, to be welcomed into the home where they were entertained as honoured guests.[21]

Among a sample of ten graduate students and young working men and women, five favoured maintaining the ancestral family line, even when the name was not of high social status. One suggested that, although in other countries patterns were 'flexible and interesting', in Japan 'the [family] register is very perfect [exact] [so] names continue. In this view it is nice to have a line.' Three of the five considered that keeping the family line was a matter of choice. According to one:

> Well, I think that is up to the person. In my case, I have been told by my grandfather that I would carry on the house [family line], and… it is my dream to do so. So there is my value that I would like to pass onto [the next generations], so I hope my child [children] will carry on. But if someone claims that that does not matter, then that should be just fine too.

Significantly, eight of the ten informants considered it important or a duty to protect the family grave, and eight thought ancestors were important, believing they protected their lives. One was especially attentive to ancestors, placing daily ritual offerings of tea and rice on the family altar. One, who did not consider that his ancestors protected his life, nevertheless said: 'Rather, I think it is meaningful to go to the grave to show respect to the parents.'

While only five of the eight who considered ancestors important celebrated *Obon*, all eight nevertheless visited their ancestral graves at *Obon* and *Higan*[22] and continued to pray for ancestral help and protection. However, not all young men and women were attracted to *Obon* family gatherings. As one woman in her mid-twenties expressed: 'I want to have a good time with my family. But I don't [always] want to have a good time with my cousin

---

[20] A gravestone was inscribed with the family's last name and held the bones of members using that last name.

[21] *Obon* was a family occasion and a Buddhist festival, though Shinto also celebrated, and was commonly held on 13-15 August.

[22] *Higan* (the other shore) was a Buddhist celebration centred on the spring and autumn equinox marking the spirits of the dead reaching Nirvana after crossing the river of existence.

or something. It's OK sometimes. But… on every New Year's Day [and] every *Obon*, it's tiresome for me.'

Now that ancestral links were no longer essential for validating family lines, ancestor worship in some families had become just a matter of respect and affection for deceased family members, or was linked to Buddhist rituals, including memorial ceremonies in remembrance of deceased family members.[23] For one father, who explained that after the war 'every structure, every system in Japan was destroyed and a new model came up', memorial rituals were a personal response rather than a traditional duty, representing significant occasions for bringing family members together. In some families Buddhist rituals were not taken 'too seriously', although one graduate student pointed out that, whereas 'people in Japan are not religious, they like ceremonies and festivals'.

The keeping of *Obon* did not necessarily imply that people celebrated and/or or respected their ancestors as a duty or in search of a blessing. A family's celebration of *Obon* did, however, imply some formal connection with ancestors. In parent questionnaire responses, most (75%) conveyed that *Obon* celebrations helped keep the family together. This figure was similar to that regarding celebrations at New Year (83%), and birthdays (70%), as set against the significance of day-to-day activities (87%). Although informants told me that ancestral links were not thought as effective for keeping families together as in former times, almost half the high school students nevertheless agreed that the family tomb must be treasured and passed down to posterity. When questioned about their relative 'enjoyment' of *Obon*, 80% of high school students responded positively.

In Shizuoka, keeping links with departed ancestor spirits helped unite a family regardless of descent lines or family name, and perpetuated a sense of belonging and solidarity. By contrast, family members in Wellington structured their own concepts of belonging without recourse to ancestors. Without ancestral links helping to bind family members, young people in Wellington could more easily separate out from family to seek autonomous independence.

---

[23] Rituals for the immediate dead were conducted at regular intervals until the 50th anniversary of a person's death, and for remote ancestors on the 100th, 150th and 200th anniversary of death (Robert Smith 1974:77).

5.2.3. Issues of inheritance and the care of elderly parents

Family members in Shizuoka were also united through a recognition of indebtedness to parents. Unlike young people in Wellington, for whom an ideology of autonomous independence brought a certain 'amnesia about what one owes one's parents' (Bellah et al. 1985:82), young people in Shizuoka considered caring for their parents a reciprocal duty for the care they had themselves received. Young people in Wellington believed a parents' nurture was a child's right, as had their parents. These attitudes encouraged a linear projection toward gaining freedom of the self, rather than a cyclical view linking family members through mutual intergenerational responsibilities of give and take through time, as in Shizuoka.

As mentioned, descent within the *ie* occurred through primogeniture succession or an adopted substitute. The system favoured the first-born son, or the husband of first-born daughters adopted as a son (*mukoyoshi*). Few young people supported the idea of adoption to maintain the family name, as did few (4%) high school students, while most (75%) high school students thought perpetuating the family name unimportant.

A first-born son or daughter was once firmly connected with rules of inheritance and the duty to care for elderly parents and therefore most important. When asked whether a first-born was more important than other siblings, one young woman answered: 'Not really, not in my family. And I don't think it really is true in most families here.' Although concepts of equality between children were eroding the significance of a first-born, all children retained a strong sense of responsibility to care for their parents.

Among seven graduate students and working young men and women (interviewed in Japanese on my behalf), only one — a female, with no brother — thought the eldest (her sister) should inherit all parental property. Asked whether a first-born son should look after the parents she replied: 'I find it [a] strange [idea]. It can be the eldest son, but [also one of the] others… Someone among the children.' Another woman among this group indicated that, as first-born, she would inherit more, maintain the family business and grave, and perform ancestral duties. However, if the second born (in this case a brother) should receive more, the above obligations should become his responsibility. Four others, two of whom were first-born sons, believed the parents' property should be shared equally, though a third (an only son) insisted 'it is a matter [that] the parents should decide.'

Respondents felt personally responsible to care for their aged parents less as an obligation than a response to having been raised by their parents. Only one of the seven, a student on a scholarship and an elder son who favoured equal division of the parents' inheritance, did not consider the care of his parents a personal obligation: 'I don't have enough *yoyuu* ('time', 'energy', 'heart', 'composure') to take care of other people's lives.' The Japanese interviewer commented that this attitude was so unusual it was 'almost unheard of'.

When high school students were questioned on whether parental care was the duty of the eldest son, and on who should inherit the parents' property, their responses were similar to those discussed above.

Studies on care of the aged indicate widespread aversion to institutional care and nursing institutions, which were seen as 'prisonlike' and suggested abandonment (Lebra 1984:286-287). For the elderly who were frail the alternative was usually co-residential family care.[24] Orpett Long (1996:167-172) writes of the continued preference for family care as the ideal and norm as well as of its necessity, as alternative care in nursing homes was available to only a small percent of an ageing population.[25]

Although younger generations in Shizuoka felt obliged to care for ageing parents, not all parents wanted such care to fall on their children. Questionnaire responses indicated that almost a third of parents fell into this category. A fifth said they would prefer to be independent, which would be difficult to maintain when frail. With sufficient income, elderly couples or elderly siblings could maintain a nuclear lifestyle and receive home care through visiting care providers.[26] A surviving parent or parent-in-law could also live next to where a younger family member lived, as did the grandmother of one young woman:

> My father's mother lived with my family in Tokyo. Because my father's dad [is] dead… she was alone. So they got her. But everything is separate you know, entrance, and kitchen and

---

[24] 'Co-residency' refers to a household when an aged parent or relative has joined a son or daughter's nuclear household.

[25] Figures she provides, taken from a 1983 publication, placed less than 2% of those over 65 in nursing homes, and 90% of the physically and mentally impaired under family care. Orpett Long further mentions that alternative care in nursing homes would cost the nation a 'staggering sum', referring to demographic predictions that by 2025 a quarter of the population would be over 65.

[26] In the 80-plus age group, 68% of men and 93% of women lived in three-generational households. In younger age groups (70-79 and 60-69) men and women commonly lived in couple only households (Kawabe and Shimizu 1994:121-133).

everything… Just [the] bathroom is [the] same. Sometimes my mum go[es] to there and make[s] a picnic, or make[s] her orange or something like that. But almost all day she [is] alone. But it is good for her and for my mum.

In Shizuoka, however, most frail and bedridden elderly were ultimately cared for in a son or daughter's home, or hospitalised.[27] Growth into personhood involved the acceptance of responsibilities to care for ageing parents as family members, a responsibility that in Wellington played no part in most people's concepts of family or adulthood.

5.2.4. Intergenerational family relations

Among Shizuoka parent respondents, 40% of households were three generational. Three quarters of these comprised the father's parents, father and spouse and children, while a quarter comprised the mother's parents, mother and spouse and children. Some of these three generational households ('extended households') followed the *ie* pattern, in which a son/daughter and spouse lived with parents in the parental house from the time they married. Others were co-residential in that ageing parent/s or parent/s-in-law had become a part of a son/daughter's nuclear household. Overall, families had two children (44%) or three children (41%), with a few families (9%) having four children.

A family structure based on marriage and mutual care between the generations made for greater responsibilities in three generational households than in nuclear households. A small number of parents (14%) said that, once their children married, they would prefer to live with a married son/daughter and their children in an extended household. Often such households were connected with small family businesses. Most parents, however, said they would prefer their married son/daughter to live in nuclear households while maintaining close contact with them.

Unlike in Wellington, where just three parents anticipated becoming grandparents and the remainder were reluctant to predict their children's future lifestyles, all parents in Shizuoka anticipated their likely involvement as grandparents. On first becoming grandparents, however, parents in a nuclear household supporting an elderly parent or parent-in-law

---

[27] An insurance system, inaugurated in April 2000, to which every Japanese citizen aged 40 or more contributed, aimed at providing for nursing assistance for citizens aged 65 or over to supplement state contributions.

could be reluctant to take on the care of the very young as well, as they hoped to pursue their own interests, or take on part-time jobs.[28]

Parents' attitudes to grandparenting impacted on how daughters projected toward future careers, marriage and children, as full-time grandparenting would permit daughters/daughters-in-law with young children to follow careers. One mother I interviewed insisted that the care of grandchildren would not be her responsibility:

> Interviewer: Do they [her daughters] think about marriage and a job? Do they think they can manage both?
>
> Respondent: Yes they think so. But elder daughter is quite sneaky so she wants my help. But I don't want to.
>
> Interviewer: Your help in looking after children? {mhmhmhm} You don't want to?
>
> Respondent: No, no. I don't want to. I never say "yes." No, they should do by themselves.

Likewise a couple in their late fifties, whose parents were deceased and who lived with their high school daughter in a nuclear household, did not see future grandparenting as a role they should fill through duty. In certain situations, however, they would take on the role, as explained by the husband:

> Well, I don't think it is any kind of a duty or… obligation… But I would do the help if they need it… As a parent… I think I'll be glad to have the chance to help them.

Parent questionnaire responses indicated that just 18% wanted to be full-time grandparents, while 75% clearly hoped to combine grandparenting with other interests. Even though not all Shizuokan parents (30%) thought that garandparents were duty-bound to care for their grandchildren, believing their own interests and pleasures were also important, almost all (91%) would help out if the parents worked, while two thirds (64%) were willing to do so just for a short interval. Such willingness did, however, include notions of responsibility to kin.

In Shizuoka, being raised in a family structure that included notions of intergenerational contact and care strengthened a person's concepts of family and family bonds which, in the Wellington nuclear and re-constituted households, and households with few biological kin, were more tenuously maintained through individual commitment and mutual trust.

---

[28] Lock (1996:94) describes how some middle-aged women endured the role of caregiver in hardship or misery.

5.2.5. Marriage or a single life

In Shizuoka it was widely assumed that a person's destiny included marriage. The institution of marriage linked two families rather than two individuals, promoted strong familial relations and created new, extended boundaries for a person's 'belonging'. Attitudes contrasted with those in Wellington, where few students contemplated marriage and most, anticipating the autonomy and freedom of choice associated with adulthood, left permanent relationships open to the future.

In Shizuoka, full personhood and marriage were inseparable. Almost no high school students (below 5%) wanted a single life, the only acceptable alternative to marriage. Unlike in Wellington, where household arrangements were a matter of choice, unmarried people in Shizuoka did not live together as 'partners', nor did non-kin flat together forming households. *De facto* partnerships and household arrangements were neither legally sanctioned nor socially accepted.

Young people approved and desired marriage, knowing at what age in their twenties they planned to marry. Most (82%) also wanted children. The majority of parents thought it important for their children to marry, indicating however that decisions to marry and have children were for their son or daughter to make. While a third of the parents agreed they would support their son/daughter's choice to remain single, the majority opposed single lifestyles.

The age by which a person was expected to marry had recently risen to thirty years. Recent surveys on single lives reflected the 'accelerating pace of delayed marriage' rather than an increase in numbers opting for single lives (Natsukari 1994:135-143). Perceptions of a single life were commonly negative. Men who had failed to marry and father children by a certain age were regarded as marginal (Tsuya 1994:100). Companies favoured married men over single men for promotion, while marriage allowances (up to 10% of a male worker's salary) and reduced housing rates for married couples were normal company practices. Creighton (1996:212) observes that in the workplace the failure to marry within the accepted age bracket 'evokes pity at best and social rebuke at worst', while unmarried senior women were regarded by junior women as 'fearful reminders of the horrifying possibility of spinsterhood'.

Rosenberger (1996:26-30, 37) critiques magazine images of young women 'enjoying the single life—marrying later, divorcing more freely, and having fewer children later'. She points out that women followed neither the leisure activities and consumption patterns promoted through magazine messages, nor the government-promoted life of work/duty to family, noting that those on lower wages could not afford the lifestyle portrayed as 'internationalism and individuality'. Brasor (1999)[29] notes that many companies had policies of not hiring single women, landlords frequently refused to rent premises to single women, and 'office ladies'—especially those in their twenties—rarely earned enough to afford a one-room apartment within commuting distance from their work. Moreover, as 'selflessness' remained the feminine ideal, young single women were censured for placing their own desires before 'responsibilities' as wives and mothers.

According to informants, the number of young people trying a 'free lifestyle' increased during the 'bubble economy' of the 1990s, when businessmen earned enough to live in high-class apartments and 'spend money freely like an aristocrat'. At that time, a newly coined term '*dokushin-kizoku*' (*dokushin*: 'single unmarried person'; *kizoku*: 'aristocrat') became popular. With economic recession, this term fell into disuse, and people once referred as *dokushin-kizoku* disappeared from the social scene. Informants said their own futures would be compromised by economic recession.

Many graduate students, working young men and women, and high school students (64%) were tolerant of single lifestyles although they themselves wanted marriage. Roughly half the high school students against single lifestyles (33%) claimed that 'happiness lies in marriage'. Other young people thought a single life was 'not good' in situations 'when a person, without thinking much, follows the trend'. One female respondent worried about children and companionship: 'If I could live (survive/make my living) alone financially and mentally, then I think it's just fine. But if I want to have a child, or to have someone mentally supportive, then a form called marriage will (be needed).' A male respondent was likewise concerned about companionship: 'There must be a sense of loneliness somewhere. It is a great mystery to me how those people keep their minds off that.'

---

[29] Philip Brasor, 'Japanese women say single life fine - if they're financially independent'. *The Japan Times*, 15 April 1999

In Shizuoka, not only was marriage considered important, but a single life was measured against marriage and found wanting. Moreover, since personhood and marriage were inextricably linked, young people found it difficult to imagine any alternative.

5.2.6. Solo parents, divorce, and remarriage

In Japan, 'solo parents' referred to divorced men and women and people whose spouse was deceased. The term did not refer to the Wellington equivalent of 'solo mothers', a category which in Wellington represented a lifestyle adopted by some women whose relationship with the child's father proved untenable. Tsuya (1994:96) estimates that only 1% of children were born to unmarried mothers. Government policy supported marriage and, as children were always registered in the family register (*koseki*), those of unwed mothers were recorded as illegitimate. Since birth details were required for school enrolments, job applications and passports, a person born to a solo mother had a difficult life. Few women, therefore, gave birth out of marriage.

Unlike in Wellington, attitudes in Shizuoka toward divorce and solo mothers were largely negative. In the year 2000, two out of one thousand people had divorced, the highest rate ever recorded.[30] Most divorces occurred between couples in the 20s to mid-30s, with fewer people divorcing in their mid-40s to mid-50s.[31] Those pursuing a single life were largely women, since divorced women and widows, unlike divorced men and widowers, did not commonly remarry (Tsuya 1994:114). Just 1.83% of households in the parent questionnaire sample comprised only fathers and children, while just 3.33% comprised only mothers and children, some of whom may have been widowed rather than divorced.

Prior to World War II, divorce for women was especially difficult and divorced women were stigmatised.[32] A (non-Japanese) Shizuokan high school/university teacher said that divorced people were still referred to as 'one mark against them' (*batsu ichi*), while graduate students said that when they were at high school, a person with divorced parents would feel intense shame. Some informants suggested that attitudes to divorce were slowly becoming more tolerant perhaps because, within the current decade, television documentaries occasionally featured child abuse, incest, rape and violence in the home. As

---

[30] In 1998 the figure was 1.94 per 1000 (Facts and Figures of Japan, 2000:12)

[31] Statistics from a government survey reported in *The Japan Times*, 11 July 2000.

[32] See Lebra (1984:152-153) for attitudes that stigmatised women.

divorced men were likely to remarry, single fathers were generally solo through the death of a wife. Single divorced men who lived with their children were generally better off financially than their female counterparts who, with alimony set but not enforced and inadequate state benefits, usually endured economic hardship.[33]

The Japanese interviewer who questioned university students and young working men and women on my behalf was reluctant to include any question on divorce, believing the issue was intrusive and 'too difficult'. Eventually we agreed on a compromise. Interviewees were asked whether legal divorce was acceptable for a couple with no children who had lived separately for a long time. The question implied that any grown-up children might have left home. Although the question was dropped half way through the interviews, respondents either agreed with divorce or queried the need for a formal divorce.

Questions on divorce directed to high school students implied situations in which parents had children living at home. A third (33%) of the students did not know whether parents should be able to divorce. Another third (37%) rejected the idea of divorce, as it made caring for and supporting children difficult for each parent. A quarter (27%) favoured divorce on the grounds that each parent could then seek a better life, possibly indicating a more accepting attitude toward divorce in the next generation.

Few graduate students objected to the remarriage of a widow/widower, although one female respondent said she would prefer to be consulted,[34] adding: 'Maybe we will agree.' High school students were largely accepting of remarriage for a widow/widower. Over half (58%) agreed remarriage should be the parent's choice. A further 20% said it would depend on whether they liked the new partner.

Problems associated with the interview questions on divorce suggest that, as family was regarded as the central structure in a person's life, divorce was an issue that undermined the security associated with family 'belonging'.

---

[33] State benefits for single mothers or divorcees were below the poverty line (Buckley 1997:354). In 2000 state benefits were 42,370 yen (NZ$ 847; US$423) per month for one child, and 47,370 yen (NZ$947; US$473) for two children (Miyatake 2000:72).

[34] According to Lebra (1984:163) a widowed mother must ask her child's permission before remarrying.

5.2.7. Spouse selection

In Wellington, marriage implied the union of two adults whose concerns were their own. In Shizuoka, marriage in the *ie* system had united the concerns of two households rather than just two individuals and, despite constitutional changes, marriage continued to unite two households through obligations and the care of elderly. A person was therefore unable to contemplate a relationship that functioned solely in the self-interests of two individuals. Young people in Shizuoka applied this knowledge when searching for a marriage partner, yet choice played a part within given parameters.

High school students (94%) preferred a 'love marriage' (*ren-ai*: fall in love and get married) to one that was arranged (*miai*: arranged first meeting marriage). A 'love marriage' did not imply a contract system between a man and woman based on romantic love. Couples got married for the institution of marriage and sought to achieve the 'best match'. A young woman in her mid-twenties explained that when her female friends decided to marry, they would 'begin to search' for a partner. Informants agreed that, should the search fail to find a suitable partner, a person would normally accept a *miai* marriage where family friends of the parents, or a 'go between' matchmaker, arranged to introduce the son/daughter to a potential spouse in the hope that they would find each other suitable.

Although young people were more active in choosing a spouse than in the past, graduate students said some people 'do nothing and wait for a marriage arrangement'. Parents said that, if their children were passive, they would help achieve a marriage. Parents were also prepared to reject a son or daughter's choice of spouse: 'If my elder daughter wants to marry some guy that I can't… approve… I probably advise [against it].' Parents prevented a marriage by refusing to enter it in the family register, by which act a marriage was legalised.[35] One university student told how, influenced by pop singers and film stars, his 22 year old sister wanted to marry her boyfriend for passion but his parents flatly disallowed it. Graduate students noted that parents often hired detectives to check the background of a potential son- or daughter-in-law for suitability, and against family associations with crime and genetic diseases.[36] Apart from screening potential son/daughters-in-law, most parents left the choice of spouse to their children.

---

[35] Marriage ceremonies at a shrine asked for a blessing but did not confer married status on a couple.

Attitudes among twelve 20-30 year old people were divided between marriage types. One (a male) had not thought about marriage, while six said they would accept either a love marriage or an arranged marriage. One considered her status as elder daughter among three girls 'special' although responsibilities associated with a first-born reduced her chances of finding a suitable spouse. She accepted 'dates' organised on her behalf in the hope of finding a match. The remaining five preferred a love marriage. One, a young man, said: 'I want to fall in love and get married solidly (in the *chanto* way: 'the right path', or 'socially accepted way').' Another wanted a love marriage since: 'In an arranged marriage you wouldn't learn much about the person, so I wonder whether it would work out fine.' Qualities that young women valued were 'a man who makes me shine', 'a man who is suitable for my life', and 'a man who is honest and gentle, who loves children', while young men hoped for 'a kind person', '[a good] outside appearance', and 'someone who is quick witted'. All sought partners of a similar age since respect factors complicated social interactions of married people whose ages were greater than 3-4 years apart.

No-one among these respondents regarded the family line or value of the parents' property important in selecting a spouse. All agreed that marriage to a first-born could entail living with in-laws, while marriage between two first-borns could create conflict if each felt responsible to care for ageing parents. For one young man, living with in-laws was a major issue, while several women preferred to live separately from a husband's parents. One woman pointed out that choosing a spouse would become too complicated were she to worry about the character of a potential mother-in-law. Although she argued that a couple's desires concerning living arrangements should precede the expectations of the parents, she accepted that her in-laws would become her parents and that she would respect them. Some respondents suggested that a woman should avoid marrying a youngest son who had a female sibling, since the latter would replace the mother-in-law when she died.

Since women depended on men to provide a quality life, a person's income, education and occupation (where the occupation with a greater income was ranked as better) were more important for women than men. One woman said the age of marriage had risen to thirty because job security in potential husbands was a high priority. Young women I interviewed were quite frank about wanting to marry for financial security rather than

---

[36] Formerly, the chance that a prospective spouse might carry hereditary diseases was always investigated (Ohnuki-Tierney 1984:147-148).

romantic love, as the following examples show. The first is an excerpt from an interview with a seventeen-year old high school girl:

> Interviewer: If you were to get married, what things for you would be very important?
>
> Respondent: Ohhh, it's money. Money. I think if you [are] loved [that's one thing], but you can't live [on love]… I think [to] marry is a very big… change in life… So [you] must have money. But [to] love somebody and [to] marry is a [different thing] Yes, yes, [it] is very different.

In another interview, a woman in her mid-twenties explained:

> Maybe the most important thing is a feeling because we have to stay [together] so long time… But we have to live. So income. Income—what he do[es]—or [if] his job is OK or not. Or [if] he graduated from university or something like that. It's very, very important for me…. This is [the] important thing.

Urban women were more concerned than rural students with the income of a potential spouse and living separately from parents-in-law. Since in urban areas men's professions were linked to income levels, and since tertiary levels of education were commonly associated with well-paying male professions, education was important when choosing a spouse to almost half the female students at Shizuoka High School. According to Natsukari (1994:151), young women now placed stricter conditions on spouse choice, with an emphasis on personal attributes rather than on *ie* descent lines. She suggested that, among young people, there was 'an increased awareness of themselves as individuals and of their growing economic, social and psychological independence'. Criteria used in choosing a spouse, however, promoted 'traditional' patterns as much as they indicated a growing awareness of independence.

In these different ways young people weighed up their choice of spouse. Unlike partner choices of young people in Wellington that were based on free association and commitment, the decisions of young people in Shizuoka would have lifelong consequences in terms of status, identity and belonging.

5.2.8. The mother role

In the past and still today, marriage for women implied motherhood, a status bestowing strength and value. Lebra (1984:141,161-164) explains that the role of a new wife in an *ie* was to supply a son and heir for *ie* continuance. In fulfilling her duty, a new wife became

honoured, completing a transition toward maturity that began with her acceptance as daughter-in-law.

A mother's strength today was no longer understood primarily in terms of the production of any heir. It came from her role in nurturing her children as *social* persons, interdependent with others. Ideally, a mother's care and indulgence created a co-dependent relationship with the child to nurture him/her into ways of being throughout infancy, early school years and beyond. The child learned to value co-dependency in a relationship that would later enable him/her to seek and appreciate co-operative engagement and harmony with others. Doi (1981:7, 57) describes this affirmative attitude to dependence as the basis of human relationships and integral to the 'Japanese spirit'. The mother-child relationship also led to knowledge of an 'inside' relationship (*ura*) as opposed to the 'outside' in a formal relationship (*omote*).

Women's concerns with financial and social security through marriage were connected to an ideology developed with industrialisation encouraging women to fulfil the role of 'good wife, wise mother'. These concepts promoted an economic division of labour between husband and wife and notions, therefore, of gendered persons, as mothers were discouraged from realistically seeking careers. Working conditions for women (see below) reinforced ideas that a woman's place was primarily concerned with caring for family members. Women's identification as 'good wife', associated with a wife's service to a dominant mother-in-law, disappeared in postwar years when household appliances, and employment opportunities beyond family enterprises, became available. Women have remained identified as 'wise mother', even though women's roles in the community have widened beyond those of the home. As Uno (1993:316) notes, most participants in women's movements have viewed family as 'a wellspring of personal satisfaction' rather than 'a source of oppression'. Some feminists (Ueno1997:276-279; Nakanishi 1997:196-197; Kora 1997:117-118) argue that active, well-educated urban women, who cared for children and the elderly, saw their involvement in organisations supporting traditionally defined roles for women as a freedom of lifestyle.

Informants were puzzled that I frequently overlooked the value of motherhood. They agreed that wives were generally obedient to husbands, but pointed out that mothers aged 40-60 years were sometimes equal if not stronger than men. A strong woman in the home wielded considerable power and relations between husband and wife could operate

equitably. One woman emphasised that her own mother, and her grandmother before her, had been women known as *kaka/haha-denka* (haha: 'mother'; *denka = tenka*: 'governed the world'). Her own mother was not governed by her husband, nor did she defer to him. Women as mothers, as did men in their professions, grew in stature through time. Harmonious relations between husband and wife, however, could take the form of wifely obedience. Graduate students agreed that although young men spoke of equality in marriage before they married, hierarchical attitudes could occur immediately after marriage. Some women students pointed out that as patriarchal attitudes featured in historical television dramas, young men might think these attitudes normal.[37]

Recently some feminists have criticised the mother role suggesting that with fewer children, the absence of fathers at work, and an intense focus on a child's educational achievement, mothers risked overindulging, overprotecting and dominating their children (M.White 1987:176).[38] At the same time, feminists have agreed with Ueno (1997:277-283) that domestic labour and the power of women in the household is a fundamental and highly valued social role that women in Japan do not want to give up. Ueno rejects any necessary connection between the nurturing role and women, advocating that men take a more active part in nurturing children. She points out, however, that most Japanese women oppose the idea of 'equality and sameness' with men and want to retain the traditional gender segregation that has survived modernisation. Ide (1997:37-44) explains that Japanese references to *boseiai* (maternal love) imply something more than motherhood, as *boseiai* is not limited to the mother/child relationship. *Boseiai*, which occurs in negotiation and process, includes couple bonding and is not seen as oppressive or in need of being overcome.

These common perceptions of motherhood were found in Shizuoka. They were far removed from concepts held by many mothers in Wellington who associated motherhood with suffering a 'loss of self' and a 'loss of identity' or with being 'pushed into a little corner'. For mothers in Wellington who were raising children to value independence and

---

[37] Over 99% of the media industry was male (Saito 1997:254). For media presentations of women see Painter (1996:68).

[38] Several social aberrations have been linked to an over-indulgent mother-child bond. They include the obligation of sons to please mothers, in some cases leading to incest (Ueno 1997:286-287; Kanazumi 1997:76); a lolita complex in some young men (Miya 1997:182-184); violence in *manga* comics (Allison 1996b:xv, 188 n.41); father absenteeism and prostitution (Kanazumi 1997; Matsui 1997); material hardship due to absent father participation in work entertainment (Kanazumi1997:74); and negations of female sexuality (Miya:1997; Nakanishi:1997; Matsui:1997; Kanazumi:1997).

eventual autonomy, work associations provided a more acceptable self-image than non-work images that they associated with self-sacrifice and economic dependence on others.

5.2.9. Gendered roles, work and personhood

In Shizuoka it was more difficult for women, who were identified as dutiful, gentle, obedient and thoughtful, to develop a full-time career or job than it was for women in Wellington. Gendered roles in Shizuoka favoured careers for men, who were characterised as responsible, competitive, hard working, tough and vital and who sought pride in achievement at work. Although a gendered division of labour disadvantaged both women and men, most young women and men plotted their futures in accordance with gendered concepts of personhood determined through marriage and family roles.

After the 1970s, the numbers of working women climbed rapidly when women in Japan began to work part-time after the birth of their children. Toward the end of the twentieth century, 60% of all women were in paid employment (Ueno 1997:277; Buckley 1993:353).[39] Young women worked until marriage, became full time mothers while their children were young, and returned to work later in life on a part-time basis if at all. A 1982 survey showed that most (77%) companies had an unwritten policy that women would stop working on marriage or at the birth of the first child. Married women with children were mostly part-time employees, that is, they worked less than 35 hours a week. As part-timers they had limited access to employment benefits, were frequently excluded from unions,[40] could be asked to leave without notice, and earned on average 58% of the full-time wage. Part-time women workers in the early 1990's saved money for the family. Women began saving in their early thirties to contribute to their children's education, continued saving in their early forties to pay for their children's weddings and, in their late forties, began saving for retirement (Buckley1993:354-355).[41]

Women graduates seeking employment often experienced sexual discrimination. In 1995 only 63.5% of women graduates found jobs, while until November 1996, over ten thousand

---

[39] The figure for New Zealand at 64.9% for December 2001 (Statistics New Zealand, Household Labour Force Survey) is for all New Zealand, not the British/European sector.

[40] See Gordon (1993:392). Unions had recently been forced to disband due to government de-regulation measures.

[41] One young woman to be married in April 2001 estimated the cost of her wedding at 2,000,000 yen (NZ$40,000; US$20,000), an amount considered by her to be 'average'. An average wedding in New Zealand would cost NZ$10,000.

complaints of discriminatory hiring practices had been recorded by the Ministry of Labour from women graduates applying for career positions.[42] Few women had successfully made a career in scientific research or tertiary education.[43] In these fields, if women married they lost their professional names, yet were refused research grants if they persisted with their single names after marriage.

Japanese women's attitudes to working conditions for women ranged from strong opposition to gender inequality, to compliance. While opposition came from feminists, whose numbers were declining (Buckley1993:351; Saito 1997:248-249), working women were portrayed as accepting of—even being content with—lower wages and lowly positions, with a general disinterest in ideas of equality with men (Roberts:1996; Ogasawara:1998).

In school questionnaires, 80% of parents agreed that men and women should have the same fundamental rights, while 74% of parents agreed that, in practice, women did not have equal rights with men in employment and public status. Fewer parents (60%), however, thought that women who were mothers could expect the same rights as men in employment and public status.

The gender division of labour could also adversely affect men. Men's working hours were often long. Many men did not return home from work earlier than 10pm, a situation that most wives accepted as normal or even approved. Wives were ambivalent about wanting husbands to share evening meals and participate in raising the children, some agreeing it was desirable 'only in part'. Although more equally shared responsibilities might ideally seem attractive, the reality was that family security was gained through a husband's job, which often was also the source of his pride. One woman pointed out that her husband's preference was to work even when, for three months each year, his working hours extended beyond midnight due to high commercial output. Asked whether her husband would like to participate more in family home life, she replied: 'He? My husband? No, because he

---

[42] These complaints included the refusal of interviews to women (31%), the recruiting of women by companies only at times when male applicants were in short supply (16%), the refusal of jobs to women unless they lived with their parents (13%), and the mailing of employment brochures by companies only to male students (30%). Other complaints were that, in violation of the law, women had been told they were expected to leave a job when they married, or that they could not resume duties after taking maternity leave. *The Mainichi Daily*, 28 November 1996.

[43] In 2001, women comprised only 10% of the scientific research community, with 18.4% in universities, 8.4% in government laboratories and 5.1% in industry (*Nature* 22 March 2001, Vol. 410).

enjoys working, I think so. He's a man. He is how we call a promising man in the company.'

Economic recession in recent years created harsh competitive conditions for men that, according to media reports, continued to deteriorate. Between 1997 and 1998, the year of the Asian financial crisis, there was a 26% increase in the suicide rate of working men. Since 1998 the number of men who suffered depression due to overwork rose sharply, and statistically each year ten thousand or more men nationwide were victims of 'death from overwork' (*karoshi*).[44] More recently, depression followed from redundancies due to restructuring, or fears that full lifetime jobs would be downgraded to contract labour.[45] Although unemployment rates were statistically very low,[46] one informant mentioned that losing a job was a serious matter as insurance against redundancy was limited to six months.

Parent responses to questions concerning their own roles in relation to work and family supported conventional attitudes, yet cast doubt over the idea that men found primary satisfaction through their work. Moreover, three quarters of parents of both genders sought a balance between parenting and outside work and hobbies, reflecting women's and men's dissatisfaction with conditions of their respective employment. Alternatively, the idea of balanced parenting might have been a verbal correction to what, in recent years, was the much-discussed phenomena of absent fathers and overprotective mothers and their association with an increase in juvenile crime. In practice, however, few men showed any real interest in attaining a balance between men's and women's parenting and work as men's and women's identities as persons were associated with specific and differentiated qualities and roles that were commonly appreciated.

5.2.10. Work and marriage issues
Dwindling job opportunities due to recession was a major concern to most young men who planned transitions to marriage around their need to secure permanent employment. For

---

[44]Men averaged 50 hours overtime a month while being paid for only 30 hours overtime a month, and had taken an average of 9.1 paid days off work from an entitlement average of 17.5 paid days off work. 'Stress exacting harsh toll on corporate warriors', *The Japan Times*, 30 May 2000.

[45] 'Workers bullied out amid restructuring', *The Japan Times*, 22 January 2000.

[46] The unemployment rate in November 2000 stood at 4.5% for women with 1.26 million out of work, and at 4.8% for men with 1.93 million out of work. *The Japan Times*, 1 November 2000.

young men, marriage implied the ability to provide economic support for a future family. One male graduate student wanting marriage and more than one child itemised education expenses and mortgage payments on a house[47] as hard material realities he associated with marriage.

Almost all future careers desired by high school students required training at a professional college or university, and most young men wanted a full time job or professional career rather than a casual/freeter lifestyle. A patronage system supporting male workers in business, or in professional employment in research and tertiary institutions, was almost never extended to females. Women were generally unable to advance their careers precisely because they lacked such support.[48] Some male students anxious about securing a job said that women's unrestricted entry to the work force would create unwelcome competition and argued that the traditional separation of gender roles had virtue. One student explained that a married woman's decision to work should be a matter for married couples to resolve together.

> Recently… women take large part [in] society nowadays. However, some men think [of] it [with] displeasure… [Due to] restructuring of the companies, men could not work since there were few jobs… The problems… in understanding… the roles of women would start from [arrangements made between] a [married] couple.

After gaining qualifications and before seeking a job, women graduates deliberated whether to marry and have children, whether to work after marriage and after children, and whether extended qualifications would provide them with better opportunities. Since career opportunities were limited, gaining access to them required determination and effort. Yet tertiary qualifications improved prospects of a more economically secure marriage, reducing the need to seek work in the future (Buckley 1993:362). Although women worked toward a higher degree in the hope of 'having it all', their sights were not necessarily set on permanent careers. One PhD student was prepared to 'be tough' and find her way in a research environment that favoured men. At the same time, she wanted 'many' children and to be at home with them. Again, a young married woman with one young daughter had, before marriage, worked as a technician after completing her Masters

---

[47] His estimate of the cost of a basic house in Shizuoka ranged between 60,000,000 - 80,000,000 yen (NZ$ 1,200,000 - 1,600,000; US$600,000 – 800,000). Small apartments, depending on age and numbers of rooms, cost anything from NZ$500,000 upward.

[48] *Nature*, 22 March 2001, Volume 410:395-406.

degree. She had no desire to return to work but should she have to, would choose 'an easy job with no pressure'. Another PhD student decided to quit her course yet suffered depression, since she and her parents doubted that she would want, or could succeed in, a career. She pointed out that companies trained workers but would take male recruits over females. To my suggestion that she could make a valuable contribution to science through research, she replied:

> Asian style is not necessarily to imitate Western style. If I marry, I ask support from my husband. I want to work, have children and be mother. All, if possible. But Asian style is different.

Whether a woman would work or marry was, in reality, a question of how long a woman would defer marriage. Once married, issues of career versus children were placed in a balance. Aside from disincentives in pursuing careers, many women considered full-time motherhood important in and for itself.

Young men and women in Shizuoka considered future employment in relation to their roles as husbands, wives, and parents. Their futures and career choices did not involve the same focus on the individual self and sense of freedom experienced by young people in Wellington. The gender-based division of labour in Shizuoka favouring apprenticeships for young men in employment, and motherhood at home for young married women, stood in marked contrast to attitudes in Wellington, where young people assumed that, through equal access to jobs and day-care centres, marriage/long-term partnerships and children would be fitted around their self-choosing busy lives.

5.2.11. Choice, gendered roles and the centrality of family

Young men and women were consciously aware of the connection between a structured division of labour, marriage and family roles. As an example of awareness, two male and three female university pharmacy students wrote an essay on the topic: 'In Japan women are not equal to men'. All affirmed the proposition, and all mentioned the same five points: 1) the name: that at marriage women take the man's family name; 2) work: men assume that women work in the house; 3) salary: women who work are paid less and are therefore cheaper; 4) child responsibility: women will bring up the children; 5) the public arena: there are few female public figures and that almost all politicians are men.

On the question of equal sharing of household management, male graduate students theoretically affirmed their willingness to do house chores or cooking after marriage, most implying, however, that this role would for them be minor: 'I think it is a good thing, and [if asked] I will do as much as I can'; or: 'I think it is just fine [but] today's society… does not accept it'. Female student comments were positive: 'I am for it [support the idea]'; or: 'That's fine.'

As they contemplated their futures, young women deliberated the impact of gendered roles in the workforce. One who worked in the finance department of a company queried whether she would want children after marriage: 'Not if I work in the same job. There's no maternity leave.' In the years between gaining qualifications and marriage, however: 'Women want jobs and money.' Rosenberger (1996:27-31) suggests that a girl's social background determined for how long a young women would seek 'freedom and individual choice… [and] leisure and consumption' rather than jobs requiring 'long hours of devotion within a hierarchy'. Jobs, money and associated opportunities to explore a limited lifestyle of freedom characterised the 'new' feature of contemporary life, allowing young men and women to attain some control over their decisions and destinies.

Single young men and women's access to capital could lead to greater social mobility. The younger generation's postponement of marriage and the desire for a time of experimentation were suggestive of constraints and responsibilities from which they wanted freedom. Yet all young people said they ultimately desired marriage, which brought with it structured roles that most approved and found fulfilling. A mother with young children at home frankly admitted that, for all the hard work motherhood entailed, she much preferred her new way of life to the professional job she held before marriage. 'I am developing into a strong person but at work I had to struggle more.'

Young people's expectations of marriage family-identified roles were tied to associations made between the institution of marriage, maturation and personhood. Among parents there was no single view of when they 'became' a family. About 42% of parents thought they 'became' a family at marriage, and 30% thought the family began at the birth of their first child. Only 10% of parents regarded the family as an extension of one of the parent's family, while 7% thought they 'became' a family as the children matured and shared interests with them. When parents were asked *in what way* family was important to them, over half (53%) believed it was for mutual maturation and growth. About a third (35%)

thought family was important emotionally, to express affection. Almost none (3%) thought of family as important for economic reasons. In Shizuoka, therefore, assumptions of 'belonging' were built into an institution of marriage linked to ideas that maturation and growth would mutually benefit interdependent members of a family institution. In Wellington, energies were required to create a sense of belonging in a nuclear domestic unit against the knowledge that, without commitment and trust, the unit could disintegrate, while maturation and growth implied the development of individual autonomies.

Cherlin (1994:433) notes that 'it is quite well known that there is less emphasis on individual rights in Japan and more emphasis on responsibility to the family and community'. Most members of the younger generation wanted to marry, not principally because they wished to establish an equal and intimate bond with a partner for life, but for the security afforded by the institution. 'Family' was where a person belonged. Stresses imposed by spatial mobility, employment patterns and role conflict weakened the functioning of family households. Conflict resulted from 'absent' fathers and work displacement, and phased periods of freedom and responsibility in nuclear and extended/ co-resident families. One informant considered the one-child family as a modern form where notions of the collective 'inside' were more difficult to reproduce. Countering these trends, however, were positive evaluations of the maternal role, and unifying factors such as remembrance of ancestors and celebratory or ritual observances for the dead. These practices reinforced the idea of the family extending through time as the centre of belonging. Above all, normative concepts of respect, gratitude and obligation from the younger generation to the parent generation throughout life were strong social values.

5.3. CONCLUDING REMARKS

An exploration of family life helps bring the nature of personhood into sharper relief. In Wellington and Shizuoka, notions and structures of family life differed, as did the conceptions of personhood associated with them. In Wellington, 'family' was largely nuclear and took multiple forms, including marriage, same-sex or opposite-sex partnerships or unions, and children. In Shizuoka family was based on the institution of marriage, was multi-generational, and for the most part included ancestral spirits. In Wellington, young people separated out from family to become autonomously independent, and the decision to create a new family unit was optional. Family units in Wellington were based on commitment and trust between members but required a balance between commitment and

the need in members to maintain or achieve autonomy. Young men and women in both Wellington and Shizuoka deferred committing themselves to a long-term partnership or marriage in order to enjoy a certain freedom. In Shizuoka, however, almost all young people preferred and anticipated marriage over and above a single lifestyle, which was the only alternative, and searched for a spouse who would be compatible with their families and provide financial and emotional security. Marriage united two families rather than two individuals and, through obligations to care for parents and children, members in each generation found social belonging and place.

In Wellington distinctively gendered roles were minimal. In interviews, men made no comments concerning their roles as fathers. Both members in a partnership or marriage anticipated working in a career or job alongside caring for children. Most mothers who had been obliged to relinquish their career or job to care for young children felt sidelined, lacking in autonomy and a viable identity which they derived mainly through paid work. In Shizuoka, by contrast, women valued motherhood as an affirmation of their person. For most, the expectation of combining family with a lifelong career or work was not an option, while an identity as 'mothers' implied assuming the duty to care for young and old family members. Gendered roles placed fathers in the workforce. Their full-time positions were supplemented by part-time or less prestigious positions held by mothers with older children. Men's careers were associated with a man's identity as being responsible, competitive, tough and hard-working and conferred status and pride. In the maturation of young people in Wellington and Shizuoka, young people's future prospects were differently nurtured. In Wellington, young people were encouraged to leave home and create their own persons and sense of belonging whereas in Shizuoka young people were encouraged to respect and value their identity and place within the institution of the family.

Superficially, the clearly demarcated male and female 'spheres' in Shizuoka, namely, men's work roles in the public arena and women's nurturing role within the family, paralleled male and female 'spheres' in (European) New Zealand and American societies before the 1970s. In all these societies women were expected to become wives and mothers and also care for their elderly parents/relatives, and fathers were expected to be the main financial provider. Unlike in these New Zealand and American societies, however, in Shizuoka the male and female spheres were not hierarchised such that 'the public and more highly valued sphere [was] associated with men, the less valued sphere

with women' (Park1991:22), as male and female roles in Shizuoka were equally valued. Moreover, the gender dichotomy that had developed in these New Zealand and American societies, where women identified through relationships with others and men with personal autonomy (Gilligan 1982:17), did not exist in Shizuoka. In Shizuoka men and women alike situated themselves with others in terms of *honne*, *tatemae* and *kejime*, and through a sense of responsibility and obligation to others with an independence that implied knowing how to maintain proper relations with others.

In both the Shizuoka and Wellington societies of the 1990s-2000, young women were seeking more equitable employment opportunities. Again, however, self-images and relationships were organised according to different values. In Wellington, young men and women had both adopted orientations hitherto associated with men. That is, as in America (Bellah et al. 1985:98,102), they approached others from a base of self-knowledge and self-realisation in exchanges between 'authentic selves' in which mutual dependency, lasting commitment and binding obligation were suspect. In Shizuoka, young men and women sought to retain a strong center of mutual interdependency and obligation through the institution of marriage. Whereas in Wellington young men and women approached their futures through the ambivalence of wanting both an isolating individualism and sustained commitment (Bellah et al. 1985:151), young men and women in Shizuoka approached their maturation in accordance with Plath's (1980,1989) field model of self realisation in relation with others.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSIONS

Modernity does not necessarily entail convergence toward a similar set of cultural frameworks governing or shaping the way people live their lives (Dore 1973,1987). It does not imply an 'individualisation' or 'Westernisation' of existence in societies the world over. While notions of an autonomous individualism associated with 'adulthood' may make sense in some modern societies, as they did in Wellington, this is not the case in other modern societies, such as Shizuoka. And while, in both Wellington and Shizuoka, development toward full personhood implied attaining independence, responsibility and freedom, in each society valued meanings identified with these concepts belonged with different ways of being in the modern world.

Concepts of personhood and correlative social values collectively influence young people's choices and their anticipation of the future, just as their choices and decisions create the distinctiveness of each society. In comparing interrelations between concepts of personhood, subjective agency and choice in Wellington and Shizuoka, I have argued that, cognitive components of personhood were based on different values and that maturation was directed toward different ends. I have demonstrated for each society variations in and different emphases placed on concepts of self, concepts of rights and responsibility, the social relevance of gender and age, equality and hierarchy, independence and its implications, and of citizenship. I have argued that, in each society, participation in institutions of education, employment, and family differently affected young people's maturation and the way they experienced modernity, and that these different experiences were reflected in the choices they made in the construction of their persons and, therefore, in the re-creation of their societies. In doing so, I have contested characterisations of modernity formulated by Giddens' (1991) and other scholars such as Beck (1992) and Bauman (2000) that are referenced only to those societies wherein attributes of gender, lineage and social status are free-floating and in which individuals autonomously forge their own self-identities. In terms of current academic debates concerning the homogenising or heterogenising effects of globalisation (Featherstone and Lash 1995; Robertson 1995; Appadurai 1996; Hannerz 1996; Kahn 2001), my thesis is supportive of arguments that recognise the existence and significance of multiple forms of modernity.

Concepts of personhood in Wellington were articulated in terms of 'becoming an adult' at around twenty years, where 'adulthood' implied achieving maturity, life-experience, self-responsibility and autonomous independence in a society where gender was demarked. 'Becoming adult' also implied freedom of choice and rights connected to a national citizenship emphasising a collectivity of individuals equal before the law. By contrast, becoming a person in Shizuoka was considered a gradual development achievable by middle life. Maturation implied achievement in personal endeavours, and competence in managing and maintaining social relations of reciprocity and harmony, where seniority and social distinctions based on gender were respected. Citizenship was linked to the family register rather than the individual.

Changing components of Wellington and Shizuoka societies visible through parents' attitudes and assessments included growth in information technology and materialism, as well as the younger generation's lessened respect for authority and seniority. Wellington parents also noted changes in the widening concepts of 'family', an erosion of gender-based divisions of labour, and a decline in religious adherence. Nevertheless, the identification by Wellington parents of autonomous independence, responsibility and maturity with 'being adult' remained consistent with concepts of adulthood they had held in their own youth. In Shizuoka, despite postwar constitutional changes and an increase in material wealth, most parents held to some aspects of the social structure established during early periods of industrialisation, namely, the central significance of marriage and the institution of family, a division of labour according to gender and educational merit, and respect for seniority and status (maintained through *tatemae/honne* distinctions). Thus, despite modifications brought about through increased industrialisation and globalisation, in Wellington and Shizuoka basic—but very different—values influencing the next generation persisted through time.

An inherent contradiction lies at the heart of modern societies consisting of a disjunction between demands for 1) an educated, mobile population dependent on work and earned incomes, and capable of sustaining economic growth and 2) a social system capable of nurturing and enculturating the young within a stable community for the reproduction and continuance of a networked society. The concept of independent adulthood as understood in Wellington was linked to an ideology promoting the first set of imperatives, resulting in fluid social relations and muted gender distinctions. Concepts of gender differentiation and

phased development through time in Shizuoka were strongly supportive of the second set. Since each society of necessity attempted to meet the demands of both sets, there were structural contradictions and challenge where either one or the other ideology partially or inadequately represented the whole and where notions of personhood were negotiated against given social ideals. For example, some women in Wellington experienced individual conflicts of interest when the moral independent self, through an interest in utility or self-identity, opposed the caring self required for nurturing human bonds and relationships. In Shizuoka, some young women were conflicted in their inability to reconcile desires to strive for both professional careers and motherhood.

I have argued that the ideological construction of 'self' in Wellington appeared to be more wholly if not completely equated with a person's self-aware self than was the case in Shizuoka. By identifying with an autonomous adult self as the goal of maturation, young people developed their ability to show individual initiative and participate competently in New Zealand society. I further argued that in Wellington the ideological goal of maturation as an autonomous, gender-demarked independent self was problematic in that it masked the interdependence of human relations and obscured social inequalities, such as gender differentiated salaries and conditions in the work force. The adequacy of the concept of an autonomous individual has also been queried by those who, in opposing Cartesian concepts of cognition as a property of individuals, have begun to emphasise the interpersonal and collaborative sociocultural activity involved in human cognition (Lerner 2002:356-358). Spiro (1993:136-141), who also insists that '[n]o major Western student of the self… holds the view that the self, Western or otherwise, is not interdependent', nevertheless notes that the Western *folk model* conceives of the self as autonomous and context independent. I have attempted to flesh out the Western folk model with reference to the Wellington material.

A model of personhood that places self-responsibility over and above responsibility to and for others diverts attention from considerations of others in the building of community life. As mentioned, in New Zealand an ideology of autonomous independence is supportive of libertarian politics that emphasise competitive rationalism rather than cooperative loyalties. The cohesiveness once associated with citizenship to which, through concepts of individual rights, the idea of adulthood is still attached, is undermined by an ideological construction of personhood focussed on self-interest. Furthermore, in that sovereignty and the nature of

citizenship in New Zealand is openly contested by Maori and also by Pasefika peoples (Spoonley 1997), the New Zealand nation state no longer approximates notions of a culturally cohesive unit of collective individual identities (Castles 1997) that helped give rise to and partially justified an adulthood associated with individualism. Among the different cultural units in New Zealand there are different concepts of self/person and maturation (Drewery and Bird 2004). In rethinking citizenship and the nature of the state these differences will need to be acknowledged.

On the basis of my research in Shizuoka I have argued that young people demonstrate a personal subjectivity in being goal oriented, while in their relations with others they are both group-oriented and, in that they cultivate their ability to manage relations with others, also person centred. That is, in their orientations they most resemble Plath's relational field model of development. Since cultural meanings ascribed to values in Shizuoka and Wellington differ, there can be no satisfactory interpretation and evaluation of the social practices in one society in terms of the other's values. I have suggested that Benedict's search for a Japanese equivalent of a (Western) integrated personality and moral foundation for a 'centred' self, and Shimizu's search for a (Western) culturally transcendent ontological self, have misread and overlooked the cultural significance of *tatemae/honne* and the constant relational adjustments required to preserve their distinction, and the need to seek social harmony. More particularly, in Shimizu's study of three teenagers, Western concepts of honesty and directness are hierarchised over and above the practice of *tatemae/honne* and harmony that, in his subjects, is not yet perfected. As M.White (1993:207) points out, teenagers in Japan are only beginning to develop an 'adult' sense of personhood, needing to find a secure 'private self' that must be protected as they realise their public/private selves. Shimizu's study confuses the teenagers' private selves with a transcendental ontological self.

Young people's maturation into personhood in Wellington and Shizuoka involved attempts to balance individual choices and decisions with sociocultural ideals and constraints. Inevitably each society was undergoing continual transformations and shifts through time. Based on Western models of modernisation, some analyses of change in Japan imply that there will be an eventual break with 'traditional' elements such that social reorganisation will align with Western practices. Recently Mathews and B.White (Mathews and B.White eds. 2004:3, 9, 10, 199-200), for example, investigated whether young people in Japan are

instigating historical (becoming like the West) change as opposed to generational change. Mathews and B.White admit that this idea is 'open to debate', that contributors 'disagree with one another' and are often 'ambivalent', and conclude that they 'have not been able to answer whether young people in Japan are creating a new society'. They nevertheless suggest that on an individual level many young people 'are indeed acting to destroy the society of their elders' and speak of the 'delegitimization' of the social order by young people. Yet, as I have indicated, in the case of freeters Mathews is uncertain about young people's motives and ambitions, while the numbers of young people who are freeters, or who are more assertive returnees, are statistically minor or inadequately contextualised. In one other example, in suggesting that 'there are ten million "parasite singles" not leaving home to start their own families', Mathews and B.White (1993:7) refer to young people in their late twenties and early thirties who 'may never "enter the adult social order"'—in this case through marriage. They overlook, however, the phenomenon of delayed marriage (discussed by Nakano and Wagatsuma in Chapter 8) and the fact that most young people in Japan still desire marriage. While I agree that young people in Japan have more choices than their parent's generation had, and that some may follow different paths, I disagree that these nuances necessarily signal historical over generational change.

Sociocultural change will inevitably occur in both societies, although the nature of these changes cannot be predicted. Some changes, such as the recent 'boomerang children' phenomenon in Wellington that followed from government funding cutbacks for tertiary education, will result from national legislation in domestic areas. The sources of other changes and their consequences are far less certain. No one can foretell national responses to and attitudinal changes that might result from, for instance, dwindling levels of fossil fuels, the effects of climate change, or China's emergence as a superpower.

It is possible, however, through an analysis of concepts of self and personhood, to consider the way young people in different societies perceive and experience their lives and make day-to-day decisions concerning their own and their society's futures. In so doing, it is also possible to appreciate the different sociocultural factors at work in creating alternate forms of modernity.

GLOSSARY

Amae	the seeking of indulgence in relationships
Furiitah	'freeter'; freelance or unskilled person
Gaikoku-jin	'foreigners'
Giri	social obligation; duty to another
Higan	Buddhist celebration at spring or autumn equinox
Honne	private/ inner/ informal relationship; truth, inner feeling
Ie	main house in Meiji household structure
Ijime	bullying involving demands for money
Isei-jin	'aliens'
Jibun	self; self-part
Jiritsu	independence; internalised habits of self-maintenance; ability to perform successfully
Judai	10-19 year olds' generation
Juku	cram school providing supplementary courses
Karoshi	death from overwork
Kashikoi	wise, clever, intelligent
Kejime	a distinction; knowledge needed to shift fluidly between *omote* and *ura*
Kokoro	heart, sentiment, spirit, mind
Koseki	family register
Meiji era	restoration of Imperial rule 1868-1912
Miai	'arranged first meeting' between prospective marriage partners
Mukoyoshi	man adopted as son by wife's parents
Nihonjinron	'what it means to be Japanese'
Ninjo	human feeling; personal feeling
Obasan	aunt; middle-aged woman
Obon	Festival of the Dead
Ojisan	uncle; middle-aged man
Omote	outside, front
Otona	maturity in mind; person with good thinking and judgement; adult
Ren-ai	fall in love; love; romantic attachment

GLOSSARY (contd.)

SCAP	Acronym for 'Supreme Commander of Allied Powers' under General MacArthur
Seijin	a person over twenty; 'of age'; legally adult
Seijin-no-hi	Coming of Age day
Seishin	spirit; inner strength
Shinjinrui	'the new breed'
Shitsuke	being disciplined in moral training; 'moulding'
Soto	outside
Sunao	compliant, cooperative
Tokugawa era	Tokugawa Shogunate 1600-1868
Tatemae	public/ outer/ formal relationships; façade; surface frame reality
Uchu-jin	'creatures of outer space'
Ura	inside, back
Wa	harmony

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ackermann, Peter. 2004. "How Japanese Teenagers Cope. Social Pressures and Personal Responses." In *Japan's Changing Generations. Are Young People Creating a New Society?*, eds. Gordon Mathews and Bruce White, 67-82. London: RoutledgeCurzon.

Allison, Anne. 1996a. "Producing Mothers." In *Re-Imaging Japanese Women*, ed. Anne E. Imamura, 135-155. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Allison, Anne. 1996b. *Permitted and Prohibited Desires. Mothers, Comics, and Censorship in Japan.* Colorado: Westview Press.

Anderson, Benedict. 1991. *Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism,* 2nd ed. London: Verso.

Andreoni, Helen and Fujimori, Kumie. 1998. "*Shitsuke*: Child-rearing Values and Practices in a Japanese Community in Sydney." *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 19 (1): 69-83.

Aoki, Yayoi. 1997. "Biography, Interview, 'Feminism and Imperialism' and List of Selected Works." In *Broken Silence. Voices of Japanese Feminism*, ed. Sandra Buckley, 1-31. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Appadurai, Arjun. 1996. *Modernity at Large. Cultural Dimensions of Globalisation*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Ariès, P. 1962. *Centuries of Childhood* (trans. R. Baldick). London: Jonathan Cape.

Armstrong, Nicola. 1994. "State." In *New Zealand Society. A Sociological Introduction*, 2nd ed., eds. Paul Spoonley, David Pearson and Ian Shirley 113-129. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Azuma, Hiroshi. 1986. "Why Study Child Development in Japan?" In *Child Development and Education in Japan*, eds. Harold Stevenson, Hiroshi Azuma and Kenji Hakuta, 3-12. New York: W.H.Freeman and Company.

Bachnik, Jane. 1992. "*Kejime*: Defining a Shifting Self in Multiple Organizational Modes." In *Japanese Sense of Self*, ed. Nancy R. Rosenberger, 152-172. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bauman, Zygmunt. 2000. *Liquid Modernity*. Malden, MA: Polity Press in association with Blackwell Publishers.

Beck, Ulrich. 1992. *Risk Society. Towards a New Modernity* (trans. Mark Ritter). London: SAGE publications.

Befu, Harumi. 1980. "A Critique of the Group Model in Japanese Society." In *Social Analysis* 5-6.

Befu, Harumi. 1986. "The Social and Cultural Background of Child Development in Japan and the United States." In *Child Development and Education in Japan*, eds. Harold Stevenson, Hiroshi Azuma and Kenji Hakuta, 13-27. New York: W.H.Freeman and Company.

Befu, Harumi. 1989. "A Theory of Social Exchange as Applied to Japan." In *Constructs for Understanding Japan*, eds. Yoshio Sugimoto and Ross E. Mouer, 39-66. London: Kegan Paul International.

Bell, Claudia. 2002. "The Big 'OE': Young New Zealand Travellers as Secular Pilgrims." *Tourist Studies* 2 (2): 143-158.

Bell, Claudia and Adair, Vivienne. *Women and Change. A Study of New Zealand Women.* Wellington: The National Council of Women of New Zealand.

Bellah, Robert N.; Madsen, Richard; Sullivan, William M.; Swidler, Ann and Tipton, Steven M. 1985. *Habits of the Heart. Individualism and Commitment in American Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Ben-Ari, Eyal. 1990. "Many Voices, Partial Worlds: on Some Conventions and Innovations in the Ethnographic Portrayal of Japan." In *Unwrapping Japan*, eds. Eyal Ben-Ari, Brian Moeran and James Valentine, 140-162. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Benedict, Ruth. 1989. *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword*. *Patterns of Japanese Culture*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Berger, Suzanne. 1996. "Introduction." In *National Diversity and Global Capitalism*, ed. Suzanne Berger and Ronald Dore, 1-25. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Berger, Suzanne and Dore, Ronald eds. 1996. *National Diversity and Global Capitalism.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Berque, Augustin. 1992. "Identification of the Self in Relation to the Environment." In *Japanese Sense of Self*, ed. Nancy R. Rosenberger, 93-104. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Béteille, André. 1986. "Individualism and Equality." *Current Anthropology* 27 (2): 121-134.

Bourdieu, Pierre and Passeron, Jean-Claude. 1990. *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. 2nd ed. London: Sage Publications.

Boyer, Robert. 1996. "The Convergence Hypothesis Revisited: Globalization but Still the Century of Nations?" In *National Diversity and Global Capitalism*, ed. Suzanne Berger and Ronald Dore, 29-59. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Briar, Celia and Cheyne, Christine. 1998. "Women and Social/Economic Policy: New Feminist Agendas for Changing Times?" In *Feminist Thought in Aotearoa/New Zealand. Differences and Connections*, eds. Rosemary Du Plessis and Lynne Alice, 209-215. Auckland: Oxford University Press.

Bradford Brown, B. 1993. "Peer Groups and Peer Cultures." In *At the Threshhold. The Developing Adolescent*, eds. Shirley S. Feldman and Glen R. Elliott, 171-196. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Braun, Friederike. 1988. *Terms of Address. Problems of Patterns and Usage in Various Languages and Cultures.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Buckley, Sandra. 1993. "Altered States. The Body Politics of "Being-Woman"." In *Postwar Japan as History*, ed. Andrew Gordon, 347-372. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Buckley, Sandra ed. 1997. *Broken Silence. Voices of Japanese Feminism*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bunkle, Phillida and Lynch, Jo. 1992. "What's Wrong with the New Right?" In *Superwoman, Where Are You? Social Policy and Women's Experience,* eds. Celia Briar, Robyn Munford and Mary Nash, 23-40. Palmerston North: The Dunmore Press.

Carrithers, Michael. 1985. "An Alternative Social History of the Self." In *The Category of the Person. Anthropology, Philosophy, History*, eds. Michael Carrithers, Steven Collins and Steven Lukes, 234-256. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Castles, Stephen. 1997. "Globalisation and the Ambiguities of National Citizenship." In *Migration and Citizenship*, Stephen Castles and Paul Spoonley, 3-20. Auckland: Massey University.

Celtel, André. 2005. *Categories of Self. Louis Dumont's Theory of the Individual*. New York: Berghahn Books.

Cherlin, Andrew. 1994. "The Japanese Family in Comparative Perspective." In *Tradition and Change in the Asian Family*, eds. Lee-Jay Cho and Moto Yada, 421-433. Honolulu: East-West Center, in cooperation with University Research Centre, Nihon University, Tokyo.

Cho, Lee-Jay and Yada, Moto. 1994. "Introduction." In *Tradition and Change in the Asian Family*, eds. Lee-Jay Cho and Moto Yada, 3-17. Honolulu: East-West Center, in cooperation with University Research Centre, Nihon University, Tokyo.

Cho, Lee-Jay and Yada, Moto eds. 1994. *Tradition and Change in the Asian Family.* Honolulu: East-West Center, in cooperation with University Research Centre, Nihon University, Tokyo.

Condon, John and Kurata, Keisuke.1974. *In Search of What's Japanese about Japan.* Tokyo: Shufunotomo Co.Ltd.

Craig, Wendy. 1992. "The Politics of Caring." In *Superwoman Where Are You? Social Policy and Women's Experience,* eds. Celia Briar, Robyn Munford and Mary Nash, 104-120. Palmerston North: The Dunmore Press.

Creighton, Millie R. 1996. "Marriage, Motherhood and Career Management in a Japanese 'Counter Culture'." In *Re-Imaging Japanese Women*, ed. Anne E. Imamura, 192-220. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Dale, Peter N. 1986. *The Myth of Japanese Uniqueness*. London: Croom Helm, University of Oxford and Nissan Institute for Japanese Studies.

Davey, Judith. 1994. *From Birth to Death.* Wellington: Victoria University of Wellington.

Davey, Judith. 1998. *Tracking Social Change in New Zealand: From Birth to Death.* Wellington: Victoria University of Wellington.

DeVos, George and Suarez-Orozco, Marcelo M. 1986. "Child Development in Japan and the United States: Prospectives of Cross-Cultural Comparisons." In *Child Development and Education in Japan*, eds. Harold Stevenson, Hiroshi Azuma and Kenji Hakuta, 289-298. New York: W.H.Freeman and Company.

Doi, Takeo. 1981. *The Anatomy of Dependence* (trans. John Bester). Tokyo: Kodansha International.

Doi, Takeo. 1988. *The Anatomy of Self* (trans. Mark A. Harbison). Tokyo: Kodansha International.

Dore, Ronald ed. 1967. *Aspects of Social Change in Modern Japan.* New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Dore, Ronald. 1973. *British Factory―Japanese Factory: The Origins of National Diversity in Industrial Relations.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Dore, Ronald. 1987. *Taking Japan Seriously. A Confucian Perspective on Leading Economic Issues.* London: The Athlone Press.

Dore, Ronald. 1996. "Convergence in Whose Interest?" In *National Diversity and Global Capitalism*, ed. Suzanne Berger and Ronald Dore, 366-374. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Dower, John W. 1993. "Peace and Democracy in Two Systems: External Policy and Internal Conflict." In *Postwar Japan as History*, ed. Andrew Gordon, 3-33. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Drewery, Wendy and Bird, Lise. 2004. *Human Development in Aotearoa. A Journey Through Life*. Auckland: McGraw Hill.

Dumont, Louis. 1977. *From Mandeville to Marx. The Genesis and Triumph of Economic Ideology*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Dumont, Louis. 1980. *Homo Hierarchicus. The Caste System and Its Implications* (trans. Mark Sainsbury, Louis Dumont and Basia Gulati). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Dumont, Louis. 1986. *Essays on Individualism. Modern Ideology in Anthropological Perspective.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Du Plessis, Rosemary. 1993. "Women, Politics and the State." In *State and Economy in New Zealand,* eds. Brian Roper and Chris Rudd, 210-225. Auckland: Oxford University Press.

Duus, Peter and Scheiner, Irwin. 1988. "Socialism, Liberalism and Marxism." In *The Cambridge History of Japan. Volume 6*, ed. Peter Duus, 654-710. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eisenstadt, S.N. 2000. "Multiple Modernities." In *Daedalus* 129 (1): 1-29.

Elliott, Glen R. and Feldman, Shirley S. 1993. "Capturing the Adolescent Experience." In *At the Threshhold. The Developing Adolescent*, eds. Shirley S. Feldman and Glen R. Elliott, 1-13. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Else, Anne. 1992. "To Market and Home Again. Gender and the New Right." In *Feminist Voices. Women's Studies Texts for Aotearoa/New Zealand,* ed. Rosemary Du Plessis, 209-223. Auckland: Oxford University Press.

Facts and Figures of Japan. 2000 Edition. Foreign Press Center, Japan.

Featherstone, Mike and Lash, Scott. 1995. "Globalization, Modernity and the Spatialization of Social Theory: An Introduction." In *Global Modernities*, eds. Mike Featherstone, Scott Lash and Roland Robertson, 1-24. London: SAGE Publications.

Fortes, Meyer. 1984. "Age, Generation, and Social Structure." In *Age and Anthropological Theory*, eds. David I. Kertzer and Jennie Keith, 99-122. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Frager, Robert and Rohlen, Thomas P. 1976. "The Future of a Tradition: Japanese Spirit in the 1980s." In *Japan: The Paradox of Progress*, ed. Lewis Austin, 255-278. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Geertz, Clifford. 1975. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. London: Hutchinson and Company Ltd.

Geertz, Clifford. 1983. "From the 'Native's Point of View': On the Nature of Anthropological Research." In *Local Knowledge. Further Essays in Interpretive Anthropology*, 55-70. New York: Basic Books.

Gellner, Ernest. 1986. *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Giddens, Anthony. 1991. *Modernity and Self-Identity. Self and Society in the Late Modern Age.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Gilligan, Carol. 1982. *In a Different Voice. Psychological Theory and Women's Development*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Gluck, Carol. 1993. "The Past in the Present." In *Postwar Japan as History*, ed. Andrew Gordon, 64-95. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Goodman, Roger. 1990. "Deconstructing an Anthropological Text: a 'Moving' Account of Returnee Schoolchildren in Contemporary Japan." In *Unwrapping Japan*, eds. Eyal Ben-Ari, Brian Moeran and James Valentine, p.163-187. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Gordon, Andrew. 1993. "Contests for the Workplace." In *Postwar Japan as History*, ed. Andrew Gordon, 373-394. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gordon, Andrew. 1993. "Conclusion." In *Postwar Japan as History*, ed. Andrew Gordon, 449-464. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gourevitch, Peter A. 1996. "The Macropolitics of Microinstitutional Differences in the Analysis of Comparative Capitalism." In *National Diversity and Global Capitalism*, ed. Suzanne Berger and Ronald Dore, 239-259. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Greenhouse, Carol. 1992. "Signs of Quality: Individualism and Hierarchy in American Culture." In *American Ethnologist* 19 (2): 233-254.

Grenside, Louise. (undated). *Growing up Greek: "What is this Greek Thing?"* Unpublished paper.

Gullestad, Marianne. 1996. "From Obedience to Negotiation: Dilemmas in the Transmission of Values between Generations in Norway." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 2 (1): 25-42.

Hamabata, Matthews Masayuki. 1991. *Crested Kimono. Power and Love in the Japanese Business Family*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Hannerz, Ulf. 1996. *Transnational Connections. Culture, People, Places*. London: Routledge.

Hearn, Lafcadio. 1971. *In Ghostly Japan*. Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle Company.

Hendry, Joy. 1984. "Becoming Japanese: A Social Anthropological View of Child-Rearing." In *Journal of the Anthropological Society of Oxford* 15 (2):101-118.

Hendry, Joy. 1986. *Becoming Japanese: The World of the Pre-school Child*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Hendry, Joy. 1993. *Wrapping Culture. Politeness, Presentation and Power in Japan and other Societies*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Higgins, Jane. 2002. "Young People and Transition Policies in New Zealand." *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand* 18: 44-61.

Hobsbawm, Eric J. and Ranger, Terence O. eds. 1983. *The Invention of Tradition.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hubinger, Václav. 1997. "Anthropology and Modernity." *International Social Science Journal* 154: 527-536.

Ide, Sachiko. 1997. "Biography, Interview, and excerpts from 'Women's Language, Men's Language' and List of Selected Works." In *Broken Silence. Voices of Japanese Feminism*, ed. Sandra Buckley, 32-65. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Inoue, Nobutaka. 2000. *Contemporary Japanese Religion.* About Japan Series, no.25. Japan: Foreign Press Center.

Ivy, Marilyn. 1995. *Discourses of the Vanishing. Modernity, Phantasm, Japan.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

James, Bev and Saville-Smith, Kay. 1994. *Gender, Culture and Power. Challenging New Zealand's Gendered Culture.* Revised ed. Auckland: Oxford University Press.

Jesson, Bruce. 1987. *Behind the Mirror Glass. The Growth of Wealth and Power in New Zealand in the Eighties.* Auckland: Penguin Books (N.Z.) Ltd.

Jesson, Bruce, Ryan, Allanah and Spoonley, Paul. 1988. *Revival of the Right. New Zealand Politics in the 1980s.* Auckland: Heinemann Reed.

Kahler, Miles. 1996. "Trade and Domestic Differences." In *National Diversity and Global Capitalism*, ed. Suzanne Berger and Ronald Dore, 298-332. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Kahn, Joel S. 2001. "Anthropology and Modernity." *Current Anthropology* 42 (5): 651-680.

Kanazumi, Fumiko. 1997. "Biography, Interview, 'Problematizing Reproductive Technologies' and List of Selected Works." In *Broken Silence. Voices of Japanese Feminism*, ed. Sandra Buckley, 66-101. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kawabe, Hiroshi and Shimizu, Hiroaki. 1994. "Japanese Perceptions of the Family and Living Arrangements: The Trend toward Nuclearization." In *Tradition and Change in the Asian Family*, eds. Lee-Jay Cho and Moto Yada, 121-133. Honolulu: East-West Center, in cooperation with University Research Centre, Nihon University, Tokyo.

Kawashima, Takeyoshi. 1967. "The Status of the Individual in the Notion of Law, Right, and Social Order in Japan." In *The Japanese Mind. Essentials of Japanese Philosophy and Culture*, ed. Charles A. Moore, 262-287. Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle Company.

Keesing, Roger M. and Keesing, Felix M. 1971. *New Perspectives in Cultural Anthropology*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Keesing, Roger M. and Strathern, Andrew J. 1998. *Cultural Anthropology. A Contemporary Perspective*. 3rd Edition. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

Kell Easting, Susan. 1992. "Early Childhood Services" In *Superwoman Where Are You? Social Policy and Women's Experience,* eds. Celia Briar, Robyn Munford and Mary Nash, 121-138. Palmerston North: The Dunmore Press.

Kelly, William W. 1993. "Finding a Place in Metropolitan Japan: Ideologies, Institutions, and Everyday Life." In *Postwar Japan as History*, ed. Andrew Gordon, 189-216. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kelsey, Jane. 1995. *The New Zealand Experiment: A World Model for Structural Adjustment?* Auckland: Auckland University Press.

Kester, Carl W. 1996. "American and Japanese Corporate Governance: Convergence or Best Practice?" In *National Diversity and Global Capitalism*, ed. Suzanne Berger and Ronald Dore, 107-137. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Kishimoto, Hideo. 1967. "Some Japanese Cultural Traits and Religions." In *The Japanese Mind. Essentials of Japanese Philosophy and Culture*, ed. Charles A.Moore, 110-121. Tokyo: Charles E.Tuttle Company.

Kodansha Encyclopedia of Japan. 1983. Tokyo: Kodansha Ltd.

Kodansha's Romanised Japanese-English Dictionary (new edition), 2001. Ed. Timothy J.Vance. Tokyo: Kodansha International.

Kondo, Dorinne. 1992. "Multiple Selves: The Aesthetics and Politics of Artisanal Identities." In *Japanese Sense of Self*, ed. Nancy R. Rosenberger, 40-66. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Koopman-Boyden, Peggy G. ed. 1978. *Families in New Zealand Society.* Wellington: Methuen.

Kora, Rumiko. 1997. "Biography, Interview, Selected Poems and Prose, and List of Selected Works." In *Broken Silence. Voices of Japanese Feminism*, ed. Sandra Buckley, 102-130. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kosai, Yutaka. 1996. "Competition and Competition Policy in Japan: Foreign Pressures and Foreign Institutions." In *National Diversity and Global Capitalism*, ed. Suzanne Berger and Ronald Dore, 197-215. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Kosaka, Masaaki. 1967. "The Status and Role of the Individual in Japanese Society." In *The Japanese Mind. Essentials of Japanese Philosophy and Culture*, ed. Charles A. Moore, 245-261. Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle Company.

Koschmann, J.Victor. 1993. "Intellectuals and Politics." In *Postwar Japan as History*, ed. Andrew Gordon, 395-423. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Koseki, Shoichi. 1998. *The Birth of Japan's Postwar Constitution* (trans. Ray A. Moore). Colorado: Westview Press.

Kotani, Satoshi. 2004. "Why Are Japanese Youth Today So Passive?" In *Japan's Changing Generations. Are Young People Creating a New Society?*, eds. Gordon Mathews and Bruce White, 31-45. London: RoutledgeCurzon.

Kurosu, Satomi. 1994. "Who Lives in the Extended Family and Why? The Case of Japan." In *Tradition and Change in the Asian Family*, eds. Lee-Jay Cho and Moto Yada, 179-198. Honolulu: East-West Center, in cooperation with University Research Centre, Nihon University, Tokyo.

Kusserow, Adrie Suzanne. 1999. "De-Homogenizing American Individualism: Socializing Hard and Soft Individualism in Manhattan and Queens." In *Ethos* 27 (2): 210-234.

LaFleur, William R. 1992. *Liquid Life. Abortion and Buddhism in Japan*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

La Fontaine, J.S. 1985. "Person and Individual: Some Anthropological Reflections." In *The Category of the Person. Anthropology, Philosophy, History*, eds. Michael Carrithers, Steven Collins and Steven Lukes, 123-140. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lebra, Takie Sugiyama. 1984. *Japanese Women. Constraint and Fulfillment*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Lerner, Richard M. 2002. *Concepts and Theories of Human Development.* Third Edition. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Lindholm, Charles. 1997. "Does the Sociocentric Self Exist? Reflections on Markus and Kitayama's "Culture and the Self".' In *Journal of Anthroplogical Research* 53: 405-422.

Lock, Margaret. 1996. "Centering the Household: The Remaking of Female Maturity in Japan." In *Re-Imaging Japanese Women*, ed. Anne E. Imamura, 73-103. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Lu, David John. 1974. *Sources of Japanese History. Volume Two.* New York: McGraw Hill Inc.

Lukes, Steven. 1973. *Individualism.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Lukes, Steven. 1985. "Conclusion." In *The Category of the Person. Anthropology, Philosophy, History*, eds. Michael Carrithers, Steven Collins and Steven Lukes, 282-301. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MacFarlane, Alan. 1978. *The Origins of English Individualism. The Family, Property and Social Transition.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Marr, David G. 2000. "Concepts of 'Individual' and 'Self' in Twentieth-Century Vietnam." In *Modern Asian Studies* 34 (4):769-796.

Marriott, McKim. 1976. "Hindu Transactions: Diversity without Dualism." In *Transaction and Meaning*, ed. B. Kapferer. Philadelphia: ISHI Publications (ASA Essays in Anthropology 1).

Marriott, McKim and Inden, Ronald B. 1977. "Toward an Ethnosociology of South Asian Caste Systems." In *The New Wind: Changing Identities in South Asia*, ed. Kenneth David, 227-238. The Hague: Mouton.

Mathews, Gordon. 1996. "The Stuff of Dreams, Fading: *Ikigai* and 'the Japanese Self'." *Ethos* 24 (4): 718-747.

Mathews, Gordon. 2000. *Global Culture/Individual Identity*. London: Routledge.

Mathews, Gordon. 2004. "Seeking a Career, Finding a Job. How Young People Enter and Resist the Japanese World of Work." In *Japan's Changing Generations. Are Young People Creating a New Society?*, eds. Gordon Mathews and Bruce White, 121-136. London: RoutledgeCurzon.

Mathews, Gordon and White, Bruce. 2004. *Japan's Changing Generations. Are Young People Creating a New Society?* London: RoutledgeCurzon.

Mathews, Gordon and White, Bruce. 2004. "Introduction. Changing Generations in Japan Today." In *Japan's Changing Generations. Are Young People Creating a New Society?*, eds. Gordon Mathews and Bruce White, 1-12. London: RoutledgeCurzon.

Matsui, Yayori. 1997. "Biography, Interview, 'Asian Migrant Women in Japan' and List of Selected Works." In *Broken Silence. Voices of Japanese Feminism*, ed. Sandra Buckley, 131-155. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Mauss, Marcel. 1979. "A Category of the Human Mind: The Notion of Person, the Notion of 'Self'." In *Sociology and Psychology. Essays* (trans. Ben Brewster)*, 57-94. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

McCurdy, David W., Spradley, James M., and Shandy, Dianna J. 2005. *The Cultural Experience. Ethnography in Complex Society*. 2nd Edition. Illinois: Waveland Press, Inc.

McKinley, Robin. 1992. "Women and Unpaid Work." In *Superwoman Where Are You? Social Policy and Women's Experience,* eds. Celia Briar, Robyn Munford and Mary Nash, 69-81. Palmerston North: The Dunmore Press.

McVeigh, Brian J. 2004. "'Guiding' Japan's University Students through the Generation Gap." In *Japan's Changing Generations. Are Young People Creating a New Society?*, eds. Gordon Mathews and Bruce White, 99-117. London: RoutledgeCurzon.

Miller, Laura. 2004. "Youth Fashion and Changing Beautification Practices." In *Japan's Changing Generations. Are Young People Creating a New Society?*, eds. Gordon Mathews and Bruce White, 83-97. London: RoutledgeCurzon.

Miya, Yoshiko. 1997. "Biography, Interview, excerpts from 'Sexuality' and List of Selected Works." In *Broken Silence. Voices of Japanese Feminism*, ed. Sandra Buckley, 156-184. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Miyatake, Go. 2000. *Social Security in Japan. About Japan Series 17*. Japan: Foreign Press Centre.

Moeran, Brian. 1984. "Individual, Group and *Seishin*: Japan's Internal Cultural Debate." In *Man* (ns) 19 (2):252-266.

Moeran, Brian. 1985. *Okubo Diary. Portrait of a Japanese Valley*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Moeran, Brian. 1990. "Rapt Discourses: Anthropology, Japanism and Japan." In *Unwrapping Japan*, eds. Eyel Ben-Ari, Brian Moeran and James Valentine, 1-17. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Mori, Barbara Lynne Rowland. 1996. "The Traditional Arts as Leisure Activities for Contemporary Japanese Women." In *Re-Imaging Japanese Women*, ed. Anne E. Imamura, 117-134. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Mori, Shunta. 2004. "What Happens When They Come Back. How Japanese Young People with Foreign University Degrees Experience the Japanese Work Place." In *Japan's Changing Generations. Are Young People Creating a New Society?*, eds. Gordon Mathews and Bruce White, 155-170. London: RoutledgeCurzon.

Morris, Brian. 1994. *Anthropology of the Self. The Individual in Cultural Perspective*. London: Pluto Press.

Morris-Suzuki, Tessa. 1998. *Re-Inventing Japan. Time, Space, Nation*. New York: M.E.Sharpe.

Munford, Robyn. 1992. "Caregiving. The Invisible Work of Women." In *Superwoman Where Are You? Social Policy and Women's Experience,* eds. Celia Briar, Robyn Munford and Mary Nash, 82-120. Palmerston North: The Dunmore Press.

Najita, Tetsuo and Harootunian, H.D. 1988. "Japanese Revolt against the West: Political and Cultural Criticism in the Twentieth Century." In *The Cambridge History of Japan. Volume 6*, ed. Peter Duus, 711-774. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nakamura, Hajime. 1967. "Consciousness of the Individual and the Universal Among the Japanese." In *The Japanese Mind. Essentials of Japanese Philosophy and Culture*, ed. Charles A. Moore,179-200. Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle Company.

Nakane, Chie. 1970. *Japanese Society*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Nakanishi, Toyoko. 1997. "Biography, Interview, excerpts from 'Our Bodies, Ourselves' and List of Selected Works." In *Broken Silence. Voices of Japanese Feminism*, ed. Sandra Buckley, 185-225. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Natsukari, Yasuo. 1994. "A Structural Study of Spouse Selection in Japan." In *Tradition and Change in the Asian Family*, eds. Lee-Jay Cho and Moto Yada, 135-152. Honolulu: East-West Center, in cooperation with University Research Centre, Nihon University, Tokyo.

Nishikawa, Yuko. 1996. "The Modern Japanese Family System: Unique or Universal?" In *Multicultural Japan. Paleolithic to Postmodern*, eds. Donald Denoon, Mark Hudson, Gavan McCormack, and Tessa Morris-Suzuki, 224-232. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ogasawara, Yuko. 1998. *Office Ladies and Salaried Men. Power, Gender and Work in Japanese Companies*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Ohnuki-Tierney, Emiko. 1984. *Illness and Culture in Contemporary Japan. An Anthropological View*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ohnuki-Tierney, Emiko. 1987. *The Monkey as Mirror. Symbolic Transformations in Japanese History and Ritual*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Ohnuki-Tierney, Emiko. 1993. *Rice as Self. Japanese Identities through Time.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Orpett Long, Susan. 1996. "Nurturing and Femininity. The Ideal of Caregiving in Postwar Japan." In *Re-Imaging Japanese Women*, ed. Anne E. Imamura, 156-176. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Ortner, Sherry B. 1995. "The Case of the Disappearing Shamans, or No Individualism, No Relationalism." *Ethos* 23 (3): 355-390.

Ostry, Sylvia. 1996. "Policy Approaches to System Friction: Convergence Plus." In *National Diversity and Global Capitalism*, ed. Suzanne Berger and Ronald Dore, 333-350. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Painter, Andrew A. 1996. "The Telerepresentation of Gender in Japan." In *Re-Imaging Japanese Women*, ed. Anne E. Imamura, 46-72. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Park, Julie. 1991. "Introduction." In *Ladies a Plate. Change and Continuity in the Lives of New Zealand Women*, ed. Julie Park, 17-34. Auckland: Auckland University Press.

Park, Julie. 1991. "Connections: Women in Relationships." In *Ladies a Plate. Change and Continuity in the Lives of New Zealand Women*, ed. Julie Park, 96-143. Auckland: Auckland University Press.

Park, Julie ed. 1991. *Ladies a Plate. Change and Continuity in the Lives of New Zealand Women.* Auckland: Auckland University Press.

Pearson, David. 2001. *The Politics of Ethnicity in Settler Societies.* Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Pearson, David G. and Thorns, David C. 1983. *Eclipse of Equality. Social Stratification in New Zealand.* Sydney: George Allen and Unwin.

Plath, David W. 1980. *Long Engagements: Maturity in Modern Japan*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Plath, David W. 1989. "Arc, Circle and Sphere." In *Constructs for Understanding Japan: Schedules for Selfhood*, eds. Yoshio Sugimoto and Ross E. Mouer, 67-93. London: Kegan Paul International.

Pratt, John. 1994. "Crime, Deviance and Punishment." In *New Zealand Society. A Sociological Introduction.* 2nd ed., eds. Spoonley, Pearson and Shirley, 213-236. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Pyle, Kenneth B. 1989. "Meiji Conservatism." In *The Cambridge History of Japan. Volume 5*, ed. Marius B. Jansen, 674-720. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Random House Webster's Pocket Japanese Dictionary (second edition), 1996. New York: Random House.

Riches, David. 2000. "The Holistic Person; or, The Ideology of Egalitarianism." In *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* (N.S.) 6 (4): 669-685.

Rindfuss, Ronald R., Liao, Tim Futing and Tsuya, Noriko O. 1994. "Contact with Parents in Japan: Effects on Attitudes toward Gender and Intergenerational Roles." In *Tradition and Change in the Asian Family*, eds. Lee-Jay Cho and Moto Yada, 199-219. Honolulu: East-West Center, in cooperation with University Research Centre, Nihon University, Tokyo.

Roberts, Glenda S. 1996. "Careers and Commitment: Azumi's Blue-Collar Women." In *Re-Imaging Japanese Women*, ed. Anne E. Imamura, 221-243. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Robertson, Roland. 1995. "Glocalisation. Time-Space and Homogeneity-Heterogeneity." In *Global Modernities*, eds. Mike Featherstone, Scott Lash and Roland Robertson, 25-44. London: SAGE Publications.

Rohlen, Thomas P. 1976. "The Promise of Adulthood in Japanese Spiritualism." In *Daedalus* (Spring):125-143.

Rohlen, Thomas P. 1983. *Japan's high Schools*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Rosaldo, Renato. 1993. *Culture and Truth. The Remaking of Social Analysis*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Rose, Nikolas. 1999. *Powers of freedom: Reframing Political Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rosenberger, Nancy R. 1992. "Introduction." In *Japanese Sense of Self*, ed. Nancy R. Rosenberger, 1-20. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rosenberger, Nancy R. 1996. "Fragile Resistance, Signs and Status: Women between State and Media in Japan." In *Re-Imaging Japanese Women*, ed. Anne E. Imamura, 12-45. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Rudé, George. 1965. *The Eighteenth Century*. New York: The Free Press.

Saito, Chiyo. 1997. "Biography, Interview, 'What is Japanese Feminism?' and List of Selected Works." In *Broken Silence. Voices of Japanese Feminism*, ed. Sandra Buckley, 245-271. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Sakurai, Tetsu. 2004. "The Generation Gap in Japanese Society Since the 1960s." In *Japan's Changing Generations. Are Young People Creating a New Society?*, eds. Gordon Mathews and Bruce White, 13-30. London: RoutledgeCurzon.

Sasagawa, Ayumi. 2004. "Centred Selves and Life Choices. Changing Attitudes of Young Educated Mothers." In *Japan's Changing Generations. Are Young People Creating a New Society?*, eds. Gordon Mathews and Bruce White, 171-187. London: RoutledgeCurzon.

Sawicka, Theresa and Urry, James. 1997. "Young People, Marriage and the Attainment of Adulthood in Contemporary New Zealand." http://www.vuw.ac.nz/yfp

Schneider, David M. 1968. *American Kinship. A Cultural Account.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-hall Inc.

Shimizu, Hidetada. 2000. "Beyond Individualism and Sociocentrism: An Ontological Analysis of the Opposing Elements in Personal Experiences of Japanese Adolescents." *Human Development* 43: 195-211.

Shively, Donald H. 1991. "Popular Culture." In *The Cambridge History of Japan. Volume 4*, ed. John Whitney Hall, 706-770. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Singer, Kurt. 1973. *Mirror, Sword and Jewel. The Geometry of Japanese Life.* Tokyo: Kodansha International.

Smith, Rosemarie. 1991. "Who Am I? Identity." In *Ladies a Plate. Change and Continuity in the Lives of New Zealand Women,* ed. Julie Park*, 60-95.* Auckland: Auckland University Press.
.
Smith, Robert J. 1974. *Ancestor Worship in Contemporary Japan*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Smith, Robert J. 1985. *Japanese Society: Tradition, Self and the Social Order*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sökefeld, Martin. 1999. "Debating Self, Identity and Culture in Anthropology." In *Current Anthroplogy* 40 (4): 417-447.

Spiro, Melford E. 1993. "Is the Western Conception of the Self 'Peculiar' within the Context of the World Cultures?" *Ethos* 21 (2): 107-153.

Spoonley, Paul. 1995. *Racism and Ethnicity.* Revised ed. Auckland: Oxford University Press.

Spoonley, Paul. 1997. "Migration and the Reconstruction of Citizenship in Late Twentieth Century Aotearoa." In *Migration and Citizenship*, Stephen Castles and Paul Spoonley, 21-40. Auckland: Massey University.

Spoonley, Paul, Pearson, David and Shirley, Ian eds. 1994. *New Zealand Society. A Sociological Introduction.* 2nd ed. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Steinhoff, Patricia G. 1994. "A Cultural Approach to the Family in Japan and the United States." In *Tradition and Change in the Asian Family*, eds. Lee-Jay Cho and Moto Yada, 29-44. Honolulu: East-West Center, in cooperation with University Research Centre, Nihon University, Tokyo.

Stockwin, J.A.A. 1998. "Japanese Scholarship in Australia and New Zealand: An International Perspective." In *Australasian Studies of Japan. Essays and Annotated Bibliography*, ed. Purnendra C. Jain, 14-25. Rockhampton: Central Queensland University Press.

Storry, Richard. 1960. *A History of Modern Japan.* Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books.

Strathern, M. 1988. *The Gender of the Gift. Problems with Women and Problems with Society in Melanesia.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Streeten, Paul. 1996. "Free and managed Trade." In *National Diversity and Global Capitalism*, ed. Suzanne Berger and Ronald Dore, 353-365. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Sugimoto, Yoshio and Mouer, Ross. 1989. "Introduction. Cross-currents in the Study of Japanese Society." In *Constructs for Understanding Japan*, eds. Yoshio Sugimoto and Ross E. Mouer, 1-35. London: Kegan Paul International.

Swidler, Ann. 1980. "Love and Adulthood in American Culture." In *Themes of Work and Love in Adulthood*, eds. Neil Smelser and Erik Erikson, 120-147. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Taira, Koji. 1993. "Dialectics of Economic Growth, National Power, and Distributive Struggles." In *Postwar Japan as History*, ed. Andrew Gordon, 167-186. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Thomas, J.E. 1996. *Modern Japan. A Social History since 1868*. London: Longman.

Tillich, Paul. 1963. *The Courage To Be.* The Fontana Library.

Tobin, Joseph. 1992. "Japanese Preschools and the Pedagogy of Selfhood." In *Japanese Sense of Self*, ed. Nancy R. Rosenberger, 21-39. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Traphagen, John W. 2000. "The Liminal Family: Return Migration and Intergenerational Conflict in Japan." In *Journal of Anthropological Research* 56:365-385.

Tsuya, Noriko. 1994. "Changing Attitudes toward Marriage and the Family in Japan." In *Tradition and Change in the Asian Family*, eds. Lee-Jay Cho and Moto Yada, 91-119. Honolulu: East-West Center, in cooperation with University Research Centre, Nihon University, Tokyo.

Ueno, Chizuko. 1996. "Modern Patriarchy and the Formation of the Japanese Nation State." In *Multicultural Japan. Paleolithic to Postmodern*, eds. Donald Denoon, Mark Hudson, Gavan McCormack, and Tessa Morris-Suzuki, 213-223. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ueno, Chizuko. 1997. "Biography, Interview, 'Are the Japanese Feminine? Some Problems of Japanese Feminism in Its Cultural Context', and List of Selected Works." In *Broken Silence. Voices of Japanese Feminism*, ed. Sandra Buckley, 272-301. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Uno, Kathleen S. 1993. "The Death of 'Good Wife, Wise Mother'?" In *Postwar Japan as History*, ed. Andrew Gordon, 293-322. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Upham, Frank K. 1993. "Unplaced Persons and Movements for Place." In *Postwar Japan as History*, ed. Andrew Gordon, 325-346. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Upham, Frank. 1996. "Retail Convergence: The Structural Impediments Initiative and the Regulation of the Japanese Retail Industry." In *National Diversity and Global Capitalism*, ed. Suzanne Berger and Ronald Dore, 263-297. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Valentine, James. 1990. "On the Borderlines: The Significance of Marginality in Japanese Society." In *Unwrapping Japan*, eds. Eyal Ben-Ari, Brian Moeran and James Valentine, 36-57. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Vaughan, Karen. 2003. "Changing Lanes: Young People Making Sense of Pathways." *Paper presented at the NZCER Annual Conference, 'Educating for the 21st Century, 8 August 2003.* http://www.nzcer.org.nz/pdfs/12223.pdf

Wade, Robert. 1996. "Globalization and Its Limits: Reports on the Death of the National Economy are Greatly Exaggerated." In *National Diversity and Global Capitalism*, ed. Suzanne Berger and Ronald Dore, 60-88. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Wardhaugh, Ronald. 2002. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* 4th Edition. Malden: Blackwell Publishers.

Weller, Robert P. 1999. *Alternate Civilities. Democracy and Culture in China and Taiwan.* Boulder: Westview Press.

White, Bruce. 2004. "The Local Roots of Global Citizenship. Generational Change in a Kyushu Hamlet." In *Japan's Changing Generations. Are Young People Creating a New Society?*, eds. Gordon Mathews and Bruce White, 47-63. London: RoutledgeCurzon.

White, Bruce and Mathews, Gordon. 2004. "Epilogue. Are Japanese Young People Creating a New Society?" In *Japan's Changing Generations. Are Young People Creating a New Society?*, eds. Gordon Mathews and Bruce White, 189-200. London: RoutledgeCurzon.

White, Merry. 1993. *The Material Child. Coming of Age in Japan and America*. New York: The Free Press.

White, Merry. 1987. *The Japanese Educational Challenge. A Commitment to Children*. Tokyo: Kodansha International.

White, Merry I. and LeVine, Robert A. 1986. "What is an *Ii ko* (Good Child)?" In *Child Development and Education in Japan*, eds. Harold Stevenson, Hiroshi Azuma and Kenji Hakuta, 55-62. New York: W.H.Freeman and Company.

Wilks, Chris. 1994. "Class." In *New Zealand Society. A Sociological Introduction*, 2nd ed., eds. Paul Spoonley, David Pearson and Ian Shirley, 66-80. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Williams, Gwyn. (undated) *Growing Up Indian: "Getting Involved and Finding Yourself."* Unpublished paper.

Wilson, Margaret. 1998. "Paid Work, Policy, and the Concept of Equality." In *Feminist Thought in Aotearoa/New Zealand. Differences and Connections*, eds. Rosemary Du Plessis and Lynne Alice, 223-228. Auckland: Oxford University Press.

Woolcock, Stephen. 1996. "Competition among Forms of Corporate Governance in the European Community: The Case of Britain." In *National Diversity and Global Capitalism*, ed. Suzanne Berger and Ronald Dore, 179-196. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Yamamura, Yoshiaki. 1986. "The Child in Japanese Society." In *Child Development and Education in Japan*, eds. Harold Stevenson, Hiroshi Azuma and Kenji Hakuta, 28-38. New York: W.H.Freeman and Company.

Yang, Mayfair Mei-Hui. 1994. *Gifts, Favours, and Banquets. The Art of Social Relationships in China.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

APPENDIX 1

THE *KOSEKI*: THE HOUSEHOLD REGISTER IN JAPAN [1]

The household registration system (*koseki* system) was introduced in the seventh century to control land distribution and taxation and record household relations and hereditary titles (Ryosuke Ishii 1980:20-21, 27). The system was reintroduced during the Tokugawa shogunate, when *koseki* were maintained by local temples to aid the suppression of Christianity and control population drifts to urban areas (Nakai and McClain (1991:540). In Meiji times, the first nationwide compilation of family records was completed in 1872. Following the establishment of *ie* households in 1898, a register was compiled for each *ie* determining the legal head of each household and rights of succession and inheritance.

Koseki records contain information about every household and must be regularly updated, supplying details such as a household members' names, dates of birth and death, the reason for entry (e.g. marriage or birth), and the names of the mother and father (natural or adoptive) of each member listed. A "household" refers to a married couple, a married couple and their unmarried children (natural or adopted) of the same surname, an individual with unmarried children (natural or adopted) of the same surname, or an individual (a person outside the standard family structure.)[2] A person may in cases such as divorce, or of dissolution of adoption, or upon the death of a spouse, revert to his or her former surname and return to the former *koseki*.

A child born to a non-Japanese man or woman who is married to a Japanese national is entered into the *koseki* of the Japanese parent and takes that person's name. (Foreigners living in Japan for more than one year are registered with local authorities as aliens and are required to carry an alien registration card at all times.) A new *koseki* is created when a couple marries at which time a line is drawn through their names on their former household registers. The couple nominate whose name will become the household name and the spouse with that name becomes the head of the new household. In 98% of cases the husband's name is chosen.

---

[1] Unless otherwise specified, information concerning the household register (*koseki*) is taken from *Kodansha Encyclopedia of Japan*, Vol.3 (1983:240-241) and Buckley (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Contemporary Japanese Culture* (2002:14, 136, 138-139, 266).

[2] If a person has not already married, he or she can apply to leave the family register at twenty, the legal adult age, and have a new *koseki* compiled.

APPENDIX 2

THE YOUTH AND FAMILY PROJECT (YFP)

The Youth and Family Project investigated relations between young people and adults in several ethnic communities in the Wellington region of New Zealand. The project, funded by the Foundation for Research and Technology, was devised and carried out by a research team from the Department of Anthropology at Victoria University of Wellington. The team included Dr Diane Bennett and Dr Theresa Sawicka (successive Project Co-ordinators), Dr Vishvajit Pandya and Dr James Urry, Kirsty Barr, Katene Eruera, Kate Fairfax, Duane Grace, Louise Grenside, Peter Howland, Niki Hunia, Jonathan Thomson, and Gwyn Williams.

The project's aims were:
 "1) To look at relationships between young people and adults, young people's attitudes towards adults, and how various cultural values and age roles are created.
  2) To learn how different communities are created, how they define youth, and how they understand the process of becoming adult.
  3) To study how culture is passed on through generations and how different ethnic groups contribute to the shared culture of New Zealand.

  Our aim is to investigate relations between the generations and the development of youth identity as normal aspects of life, in contrast to many studies which focus on problems such as drug and alcohol use, unemployment, teen suicide, and family conflict. Our emphasis on the processes of cultural transmission and adaptation will provide a basis for understanding the dynamics of family and community life."

The YFP European/Pakeha research population was established through contacts with local high school principals or school counsellors from whom were obtained permission to explain the project to class members, and to seek the students' and their parents' participation in the project.

Stage One: 1995-1997
The YFP researchers took questionnaires into four secondary schools in the greater Wellington region. Two schools were co-educational, one was a single-sex girls' school and one a single-sex boys' school. Students from the fourth form (aged 14-15) and sixth

form (aged 16-17) completed and returned these anonymous questionnaires during one of their regular one-hour classes. The students then took similar questionnaires home to their parents, who were provided with a postage-paid envelope in order to mail their responses back to the research team. Both students and parents were invited to give their name and contact details if they wished to participate in a face-to-face interview.

739 questionnaires were returned in total:

183 fourth form students (106 female, 77 male)

249 sixth form students (135 female, 114 male)

307 parents (169 female, 138 male)

Stage Two: 1995-1997

Shortly after the student questionnaires were completed, the researchers returned to each school class and presented a summary of the questionnaire responses from that class. The students were then divided into groups of 8-10 participants and asked for their ideas and experiences about 'growing up', 'adulthood' and relations with their parents. Each group discussion was facilitated by one or two members of the YFP team, and was audio-taped. The recorded discussions were later transcribed.

Stage Three: 1996-1998

Face-to-face interviews were held with 98 volunteers from the school survey population. A structured interview schedule with open-ended questions was used (see Appendix 2 for YFP interview guides). Interviewers aimed to ask all of the questions but there was not always sufficient time for this. Interviewers were also free to diverge from the schedule where appropriate in order to pursue interesting and relevant topics as they arose in discussions. The majority of students were interviewed individually, but some parents were interviewed as couples. During this stage interviews were also held with 16 'young adults' aged between 18 and 30. These young adult participants were primarily recruited through the researchers own social networks. Interviews lasted one to three hours and were audio-taped. A large proportion of the tapes were transcribed verbatim.

114 interviewees in total:

12 fourth form (10 female, 2 male)

52 sixth form (29 female, 23 male)

35 parents (19 female, 16 male)

16 young adults

Two on-line papers drawing on the YFP research are available at the YFP website at http://www.vuw.ac.nz/yfp   No other papers based on the YFP research have been published. Working independently yet concurrently with my own research and analysis, Louise Grenside prepared a PhD thesis based on the YFP material.

APPENDIX 3

YFP SCHOOL STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Are you? (please circle)   Female   Male
2. Age: ....   Birthdate: ....
3. Where were you born? (if outside New Zealand, please say where you were born and when you arrived in New Zealand)……

Family:
4. Where were your parents born? (a) Mother:… (b) Father:…
    Where were your grandparents born? (c) Mother's parents: .. (d) Father's parents..

Language:
5. (a) What language(s) do you use at home?……
    (b) What language(s) do you use with your parents?……
    (c) What language(s) do your parents use with your grandparents?……
    (d) What language(s) do your grandparents use with you?…..

Education and Training:
6. How long do you think you will continue your education? (Please tick all the boxes that you think will apply to you)
    Complete 6th Form
    Complete 7th Form
    Go to Polytech
    Go to University
    Other (Please state)

7. Do you have any idea of what you will do after you finish your education?
    (e.g. House-painter, lawyer, surfer, not going to look for employment etc)……

Who you live with:
8. (a) Do you stay in more than one home? (*Not* including holiday houses)
         (Please circle)   Yes   No
    (b) If you stay in more than one home, how *long* and how *often* do you stay at
         each home?
     (e.g. Every weekend with my dad *or* For a few days with my grandmother when I need the break)
    Home 1:……   Home 2:……

9. Who do you live with?
    First Name   Sex   Age   Relationship to you
                            (please circle)   (e.g. sister, step-father etc)
                            M / F
                            M / F (etc)
    (a) Home 1
    (b) Home 2

260

Income:
10. Who provides income for your home(s)? (Please circle all that apply)
    (a)   Home (1)   Mother   Father
Other contributor? e.g. brother, stepmother (Please say how related to you)
    (b)   Home (2)   Mother   Father
              Other contributor? e.g. brother, stepmother (Please say how related to you)

11. (a) Do you have any idea how much income your parents/caregivers and/or
other contributors receive yearly? (Please circle)
                          Yes   No   (Please go to Question 12)
    (b) If you answered YES, please circle what income you think your parents and/or
other caregivers/contributors receive annually before tax.

	(i)	Mother		(ii)	Father
	A	Nil		A	Nil
	B	$1 - $10 000		B	$1 - $10 000
	C	$10 001 - $20 000		C	$10 001 - $20 000
	D	$20 001 - $30 000		D	$20 001 - $30 000
	E	$30 001 - $40 000		E	$30 001 - $40 000
	F	$40 001 - $50 000		F	$40 001 - $50 000
	G	$50 001 - $60 000		G	$50 001 - $60 000
	H	$60 001 - $100 000		H	$60 001 - $100 000
	I	$100 001+		I	$100 001+

Caregiver(s)/Contributors (Please say how related to you)

	(iii)	....		(iv)	....
	A	Nil		A	Nil
	B	$1 - $10 000		B	$1 - $10 000
	C	$10 001 - $20 000		C	$10 001 - $20 000
	D	$20 001 - $30 000		D	$20 001 - $30 000
	E	$30 001 - $40 000		E	$30 001 - $40 000
	F	$40 001 - $50 000		F	$40 001 - $50 000
	G	$50 001 - $60 000		G	$50 001 - $60 000
	H	$60 001 - $100 000		H	$60 001 - $100 000
	I	$100 001+		I	$100 001+

12. (a) Please describe the sources of income your mother receives (e.g. from benefits,
as an office clerk and from investments etc)……
    (b) Please describe the sources of income your father receives (e.g. from benefits, as
an office clerk from investments etc) ……
    (c) Please describe the sources of income other caregivers/contributors receive
                  Source   Relationship to you

13. Please list the sources of personal income *you* receive *each week* (e.g. part-time job,
pocket-money, educational-grant, clothing allowance etc.)

Source	Amount $ before tax	No. of hours worked in week (if applicable)

Consumption:
14. Do *you personally* own or have use of any of the following? (Please circle)

(a) Bicycle   Own   Use of   None

              What kind?..

(b) Driver's Licence   Full licence   Learner's Licence   No licence

(c) Do you drive a car?   Own   Family   None

(d) Motor-bike   Own   Use of   None

(e) Bedroom   Own   Share

      Who do you share with? (eg brother etc)   Home 1:

....

                                        Home 2:

....

(f) Stereo   Own   Use of   None

              What kind?...

(g) TV   Own   Use of   None

      Is it in your own room?   Yes   No

(h) Computer   Own   Use of   None

      Is it in your own room?   Yes   No

(i) Telephone   My own phone   My own extension   Use of family phone

                    My own cellphone   Not allowed to use phone

(j) Bank account   Own   Use of   None

(k) Money machine card   Own   Use of   None

(l) Credit card   Use of   None

      If you have use of a credit card please state whose (e.g. family's etc)……

      What is your credit limit? $.....................................

(m) Books/Reading Material

  (i) What kinds of books/reading material do you own? (e.g. fiction, magazines, thriller)…

  (ii) What kinds of books/reading material does your family have in your home(s)?…

  (iii) What kinds of library books do you borrow?……

(n)   What are your three favourite television programmes?……

(o)   Who are your three favourite singers or bands?……

(p)   What radio station(s) do you listen to the most?……

(q)   Who do you listen to music with? (if you listen to music on your own, please say so)…

(r)   How often do you listen to music with your friends?……

(s)   Where do you listen to music with your friends?……

Identity:
15. (a) Do you identify as a member of an ethnic group? (Please circle)   Yes   No
15. (b) If you answered YES, please state which (e.g. Indian, Greek, Samoan etc)……

16. Do you use any of these terms to describe yourself? (Circle as many as you wish)

British	European Pakeha	Pacific Islander
Maori	English	Kiwi
European	Pakeha	New Zealander
None of these		

17. (a) Do you have Maori ancestry? (Please circle)   Yes   No
   (b) If you answered YES, can you name your hapu and/or iwi? (Please circle)
                          Yes   No
      (i) Please name your hapu.......
      (ii) Please name your iwi......

 18. Where did your family originally come from? (e.g. father, great-great grandmother etc.)
    In this question we are trying to find out about your ancestry. Can you tell us what you
     know about when your family first came to NZ and where they came from?
    (a) Mother's family
(i) When did they come to New Zealand? (e.g. last century sometime, 1984, etc)......

(ii) Where did they come to New Zealand from? (e.g. Scotland, Chile, Samoa, etc).....
    (b) Father's family:
(i) When did they come to New Zealand? (e.g. last century sometime, 1984, etc)......

(ii) Where did they come to New Zealand from? (e.g. Scotland, Chile, Samoa, etc)...…

19. (a) Do you know what your nationality is? (Please circle)   Yes   No
   (b) If you answered YES, please state your nationality……

Interaction with Adults:
20.   What sorts of things do you do with your parents and/or other ADULT family
members? (e.g. celebrate birthdays, go to tangi hanga, share/prepare meals, watch TV, do
household chores, visit marae, go to church)
                          Relationship   Activity

21.   What other ADULTS have you had direct contact with in the last 4 weeks? (e.g.
other relatives, club members etc.) What activities did you do together and where? (e.g.
played netball at local club etc)
                          Relationship   Activity

Adulthood:
22. What do you think makes an adult? It's OK to list your ideas (e.g. leaving home,
marriage, life experience)

YFP SCHOOL PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Please note:
All information that you give is strictly confidential and anonymous.
You do not have to answer a question if you do not wish to.

1. Are you? (Please circle)   Female   Male
2. Age: ....   Birthdate:……….
3. Marital Status : (Please specify)
4. Where were you born? (if outside New Zealand, please say where you were born
    and when you arrived in New Zealand) ……

Family:
5. Where were your parents born? (a) Mother:……   (b) Father:……
    Where were your grandparents born? (c) Mother's parents:…(d) Father's parents:

Education, Training and Work:
6. For how long did you continue your education? (Please tick all the boxes that apply
 to you)
4th Form
5th Form……   Qualification:……
6th Form……   Qualification:……
7th Form……   Qualification:……
Polytech……   Qualification:……
University……   Qualification:……
Other (Please state)……   Qualification:……
7. Current occupation(s) (Please specify, e.g. house-painter, lawyer, unemployed)….

Language:
8. (a) What language(s) do you use at home?……
    (b) What language(s) do you use with your children?……
    (c) What language(s) do you use with your parents?……
    (d) What language(s) do your parents use with you?……

Who you live with:
9. Who do you live with?

First Name	Sex	Age	Relationship to you
	(please circle)		(e.g. step-son, wife etc)
	M / F		
	M / F (etc)		

Income:

10. Please circle your annual personal income and household income (before tax).

	(a) Individual Income Before Tax		(b) Household Income Before Tax
A	Nil	A	Nil
B	$1 - $10 000	B	$1 - $10 000
C	$10 001 - $20 000	C	$10 001 - $20 000
D	$20 001 - $30 000	D	$20 001 - $30 000
E	$30 001 - $40 000	E	$30 001 - $40 000
F	$40 001 - $50 000	F	$40 001 - $50 000
G	$50 001 - $60 000	G	$50 001 - $60 000
H	$60 001 - $100 000	H	$60 001 - $100 000
I	$100 001+	I	$100 001+

11. Is this personal or household income used to financially support anybody outside your household? (Please circle)   Yes   No

    If YES, please specify their relationship to you (e.g. son, step-daughter, parent, niece etc)……

12. Who provides income for your household? (Please tick all that apply)
    (a)   Self
    (b)   Partner/spouse who lives with you
    (c)   Other parent of your child(ren)
    (d)   Other parent of partner's child(ren)
    (e)   Other (please state relationship to you)

Identity:

13.   (a) Do you identify as a member of an ethnic group? (Please circle)   Yes   No
    (b) If you answered YES, please state which? (e.g. Indian, Greek, Samoan etc)….

14. Do you use any of these terms to describe yourself? (Circle as many as you wish)

British	European Pakeha	Pacific Islander
Maori	English	Kiwi
European	Pakeha	New Zealander
None of these		

15. (a) Do you have Maori ancestry? (Please circle) Yes   No
    (b) If you answered YES, can you name your hapu and/or iwi? (Please circle) Yes/No
       (i) Please name your hapu……
       (ii) Please name your iwi……

16. Where did your family originally come from? (e.g. father, great-great grandmother etc)   In this question we are trying to find out about your ancestry. Can you tell us what you know about when your family first came to NZ and where they came from?
       (a) Mother's family:
(i) When did they come to New Zealand? (e.g. last century sometime, 1984, etc)...…
(ii) Where did they come to New Zealand from? (e.g. Scotland, Chile, Samoa etc)......
       (b) Father's family:
(i) When did they come to New Zealand? (e.g. last century sometime, 1984, etc)……
(ii) Where did they come to New Zealand from? (e.g. Scotland, Chile, Samoa, etc)......

17. (a) Do you know what your nationality is? (Please circle) Yes   No
    (b) If you answered YES, please state your nationality ……

Interaction with Young People:
18. What sorts of things do you do with your teenagers and/or other teenage family members?   (e.g. celebrate birthdays, go to tangi hanga, share/prepare meals, watch TV, do household chores, go to church, visit marae).
              Relationship……   Activity……

19. What other *young people,* not in your family, have you had direct contact with in the last 4 weeks? (e.g. club members etc) What activities did you do together and where? (e.g. played netball at local club etc)
              Relationship……   Activity……

Adulthood:
20. What do you think makes an adult? It's OK to list your ideas. (e.g. leaving home, marriage, life experience)…….

APPENDIX 5

YFP SCHOOL STUDENT INTERVIEW GUIDE

Profile sheet asking for basic information (filled in by interviewer):
Age, birthplace, parents' birthplace, number and age of siblings, immigration history, ethnic identity, languages used, income, household composition, religion, sport/club activities etc

Home/Family life
Describe your house, who lives there?
Describe your room(s) in the house (Who decorated it, who cleans it, who says what can put on the walls? What do you do in this space? Where do you do your homework?)
Where are all the things which you own, in the house?
Does being a male or female make a difference to the space you have in the house?

How would you spend a typical week in term time?
(Curfews? How much time would you spend with your parents? Would you go on holidays with your family? Do you go on family outings/meals? Do you enjoy them? Does anyone make sure you do your homework? Who gets you up in the mornings?
Who do you spend time with when you're out of the house?)
Do your brothers and sisters get the same sort of curfews, spend the same amount of time with parents?

What jobs do you have around the house?
(Do you have a share in the cooking, the cleaning, the gardening? Who would make your own lunch? Who would do your washing?)
Does being male or female make a difference in the jobs people do?
Does your place in the family make a difference to the way you're treated, the jobs you're given?

Who decides what you do with your money?
How did you and your parent(s) decide who would buy your clothes, shoes, make-up, entertainment etc?

Who makes the decisions about your school subjects; what part-time work you do;   going out (who with, where, when, for how long); getting a driver's licence/using the car choosing what to watch on television; listening to own music/how loud can you have it?
Would you like your parents to be more or less involved in the decisions you make?
(What things do you and your parents agree on? What about disagree? How would your parents try and change your mind if they disagreed with you? Do you ever lose privileges?).

How important is your family to you?
Would you leave home now if you could? Why/why not?
Where do you see yourself in 5 years time in relation to your family? 10 years?
Do you think you're like you're mother or father? Do you *want* to be like them?

What things are you passionate about?

Can you describe a typical family in New Zealand? (How are New Zealand families different from families in Australia? America? Do you think of your family as typical? In what way, or how is it different?)

Community
Do you feel like you belong to a community of some sort?
How do you think your situation compares to the Greek/Indian communities?
People talk about Greek/Indian/Maori culture. Do you think that you have a culture?
What is New Zealand culture?

Age categories
What do you think about the legal age restrictions?
(You can buy instant kiwis at 16; consent to sex at 16; be tried in the adult courts at 17; vote at 18; get the dole at 18; can get the minimum adult wage at 20; buy alcohol at 20[1]; you are officially an "adult" at 20)
Are these restrictions fair? (logical?)
Is it a problem, not being able to drink, vote, get the minimum wage, drive with passengers?
When do you think people are able to make their own decisions about gambling? Drinking?
Who do you think should pay for you to go to university/polytech etc? (You? Your parents? The government?)
Do you think these age restrictions affect young women in the same way that they do young men? (e.g. do you think that making a decision about having sex is the same for males and females?)

Interactions between young people and adults
Where do young people mix with adults? (Work-mates, employers? Friends' parents? Teachers? Outside activities, e.g. coaches?)
How would you describe your relationship with these people? (Do they treat you as adults? Do you have a joking relationship with any adults? Do you call any adults by their first name? What do your parents ask your friends to call them?)
How much contact do you think adults generally have with young people?
Do you think adults (in general) have an accurate picture of young people?

Adulthood
Do you think of yourself an adult?
Is this based on how adults treat you, or on how you feel?
Are you looking forward to being an adult? What's good/bad about it?
How do you think you will become an adult (or have become an adult?)
"Independence" and "responsibility" were common responses to the survey question asking 'what do you think makes an adult?'. What does independence mean?
How are you taught independence? What about responsibility - what does it involve?
Do you think that becoming an adult is the same thing for boys as it is for girls?
Do you think that young men and young women take on responsibility in the same way (or for the same things)?

---

[1] Note that the legal drinking age was lowered to 18 in 1999.

APPENDIX 6

YFP PARENT INTERVIEW GUIDE

Profile sheet asking for basic information (filled in by interviewer):
Age, birthplace, parents' birthplace, number and age of siblings, marital status, immigration history, ethnic identity, languages used, income, household composition, religion, sport/club activities etc

Family (natal and procreative)
Could you draw a diagram of your relations (that also includes your parents, brothers and sisters as well as your children)
Can you describe the family you grew up in?
Was it important for you to have children? Was it important what time you had your children?
When did you become a family? What makes a family?
Do you think family means the same thing to men and women (to you and your partner?)
How did having children affect your life?

Home/Family life
Do your children have their own room? What can they do there? (e.g. what do they put on the walls, how is it decorated?)
Do you find that there's a difference between males and females in your household in terms of how much space they take up, what rooms they use etc?
What about when you were a teenager? How does it compare?

Can you give us an idea of how the members of your family spend their time in a typical week?
Do you eat meals together? Go on holidays, outings together?
Do you think you would spend the same amount of time with your son as with your daughter? Do you apply the same rules, curfews to each?
Is this different from when you were a teenager?

What jobs do your children do around the house? Do you pay them?
How did you decide who does what? Does being male or female make a difference in the jobs people do around the house?

Do you give your children an allowance/pocket money?
How did you decide how much? How is it paid to them?
Do they have part-time work? Who decided they should get a job?
Do you monitor what they do with their money?
Scenario: What would you say if they wanted a computer/car/stereo or alcohol, junk food, outrageous clothes?
What sorts of things are they buying for themselves and what do you buy for them?
Do you encourage them to save? to spend?
If they go to university/polytech, who will pay?

Responsibility and decision-making
How are decisions made about:
What subjects your children take; when they can go out; who they go out with, and when they should be home; getting use of the car.
Do they ask for your help in decision-making? What would you do if you disagreed with a decision they made?
Scenario: What would you say if your 16 year old wanted to go to Australia this Christmas with friends? What if they wanted to go to a party with friends who you don't know? What if they want to leave school and look for full-time work? What if your daughter wanted to stay the night at her boyfriend's or go on the pill?

Role of a parent
Is being a parent what you thought it would be?
What's the difference between parenting a 16 year old and a 10 year old? Between parenting a boy and a girl?
Do you feel that you have a job to do as a parent? Are you trying to achieve anything in particular in the way you bring up your children? What things are important for children to learn?
As far as being a parent goes, what is different about being a mother or a father? What differences do you see between being a parent now and when you were a teenager?
Are there things about the way your parents parented you, that you are trying to repeat with your children?

Future
If we look ahead 5 years how do you see you role in relation to your 16 year old? What about 10 years?
In 5 years time do you think/want your children to be living at home? How do you feel about them flatting? Paying board?
What expectations do you have of your children?

Interactions between young people and adults
Where do you mix with young people (particularly young people other than your children)? What do you do?
How much contact do you think adults generally have with young people? How do you think they get on/relate to each other?
Do you think the way young people and adults interact has changed since you were a teenager?

Adulthood
Do you see your children becoming adults? In what ways?
When did you start thinking of yourself as an adult?
How do your kids see you?

APPENDIX 7

SHIZUOKA SCHOOL STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Note: Please circle the number of the most appropriate answer, or fill in the blanks with numbers. Where extra information is requested, please write in the space provided.

Q1. Are you   1. male   2. female

Q2. How old are you?   #………yrs

Q3. Are you   1. an eldest son/daughter
               2. a second son/daughter
               3. a third son/daughter
               4. other (please specify)…………………………………………………

Q4. Which course do you want to follow after you graduate?
            1. full time job   4. other (please specify)……………
            2. go to professional college   …………………………………..
            3. go to university   5. not decided yet

Q5-1. Have you some idea of what kind of future employment you hope to have when your formal education is completed. 1. Yes   2. No

Q5-2. If you answer to Q5-1 is yes, please specify what kind of occupation you will have
      …………………………………………………………………………………..

Family Activities

Q6. How would you describe the family you live in?
       1. father and children   4. mother's parent(s), parents and children
       2. mother and children   5. father's parent(s), parents and children
       3. parents and children   6. other (please
       specify)………………………

Q7. Do you do the following things with your parents and/or other <u>adult</u> family members?

	Yes	No	Sometimes
A.) Go to movies or sports events	1	2	3
B.) Go to concerts	1	2	3
C.) Play sports	1	2	3
D.) Eat out or do some shopping	1	2	3
E.) Go on an overnight or longer trip	1	2	3
F.) Visit friends, acquaintances or relatives	1	2	3
G.) Share meals at home	1	2	3
H.) Watch TV at home	1	2	3
I.) Celebrate birthdays	1	2	3

Q8. How often do you see your grandparents?

	Several times a week	Approx. once a week	Approx. once a month	A few times a year	Never
A.) Mother's mother	1	2	3	4	5
B.) Mother's father	1	2	3	4	5
C.) Father's mother	1	2	3	4	5
D.) Father's father	1	2	3	4	5

Personal Income

Q9. What sources of personal income do you receive and how often do you receive it?

	Received each week	Received each fortnight	Received once a month	Received once a year	Not have any
A.) Part-time job earnings	1	2	3	4	5
B.) Pocket money from parents	1	2	3	4	5
C.) Money from grandparents	1	2	3	4	5
D.) Pocket money from doing household jobs	1	2	3	4	5
E.) Educational grant	1	2	3	4	5
F.) Clothing allowance	1	2	3	4	5
G.) Other (please specify)……… …………………………………	1	2	3	4	5

Personal Belongings or Use Items

Q10. Which of the following do you personally own or have use of?

	Own	Use of	Don't own or use
A.) Bicycle	1	2	3
B.) Motor scooter	1	2	3
C.) Motorbike	1	2	3
D.) Stereo/CD player	1	2	3
E.) Television	1	2	3
F.) Computer	1	2	3
G.) Cellphone	1	2	3
H.) Bank account	1	2	3
I.) Money machine card	1	2	3
J.) Credit card	1	2	3

Q11. What kinds of books/reading material do you personally own, what kinds of books etc. does your family own, and what kinds of books/reading material do you borrow? (Multiple choice answer)

	I own	My family owns	I borrow	Don't own or borrow
A.) Fiction	1	2	3	4
B.) Magazines	1	2	3	4
C.) Thrillers	1	2	3	4
D.) Comics	1	2	3	4
E.) History	1	2	3	4
F.) Travel	1	2	3	4
G.) Biography	1	2	3	4
H.) Science	1	2	3	4
I.) Sport	1	2	3	4
J.) Reference	1	2	3	4
K.) Other	1	2	3	4

Q12. How often do you watch on television or listen on radio to the following TV and Radio programmes?

	Every day	A few times a week	A few times a month	Seldom	Never
A.) TV Sit Com	1	2	3	4	5
B.) TV Drama	1	2	3	4	5
C.) TV Thriller	1	2	3	4	5
D.) TV News	1	2	3	4	5
E.) TV Animation	1	2	3	4	5
F.) TV Documentary	1	2	3	4	5
G.) TV Language programme	1	2	3	4	5
H.) Radio news	1	2	3	4	5
I.) Radio popular music	1	2	3	4	5
J.) Radio classical music	1	2	3	4	5
K.) Radio drama	1	2	3	4	5
L.) Radio Interviews	1	2	3	4	5

Q13. Do you listen to music
      1. on you own   2. with friends   3. with parents

Personal Space and Activities and Family Relationships

Q14. Excluding the kitchen, hallway and bathroom, approximately how much living space do you have in your house? (Include western style rooms.)
1. less than 10 tatami mats
2. 11 - less than 15 tatami mats
3. 15 - less than 20 tatami mats
4. 20 - less than 25 tatami mats
5. 25 tatami mats or more

Q15. In your home do you have a room of your own?
1. Yes (if yes, please answer Q16 and Q17)
2. No (if no, please go to Q17)

Q16. In you home do you share a room
1. with sister(s) (#……………)
2. with brother(s) (#……………)
3. with other(s) (please specify)…………………………

Q17. In your home do you share futon space with other family members? 1. Yes 2. No

Q18. (If you put no to Q15, answer this question. If you put yes to Q15, go to Q19)
In your home, if you do not have your own room or share a room, is there an area of space you regard as being your own?   1. Yes   2. No

Q19. (This question is about your own space) In your own room, or part of a room, or an area in the house you regard as your own, who was/is responsible for the following:

	You	Your parents	Your father	Your mother
A.) Who decorated it	1	2	3	4
B.) Who cleans it	1	2	3	4
C.) Who decides what to put on the walls	1	2	3	4
D.) Who chose the furniture	1	2	3	4

Q20. Where do you keep all your own things (CDs, books, make-up etc)?
   1. in different places throughout the house
   2. in my room
   3. in the room I share
   4. in an area of the house I regard as my own space

Q21. Which of the following activities do you do in your room, or in your own area of space (as opposed to shared family space) at home?

	Every day	A few times a week	A few times a month	Seldom	Never
A.) Entertain your friends	1	2	3	4	5
B.) Watch television/videos	1	2	3	4	5
C.) Eat your dinner	1	2	3	4	5
D.) Do your homework	1	2	3	4	5
E.) Listen to music	1	2	3	4	5
F.) Eat snacks	1	2	3	4	5

Q22. Do you have to do any of the following jobs at home?

	Yes	No	Sometimes
A.) Help with the cooking	1	2	3
B.) Help with washing the dishes	1	2	3
C.) Help with cleaning the house	1	2	3
D.) Make your own lunch	1	2	3
E.) Wash your own clothes	1	2	3
F.) Wash/clean the car	1	2	3

Q23. How much do you enjoy the following activities?

	Very much	Quite a lot	OK	Very little	Not at all
A.) Family holidays	1	2	3	4	5
B.) Being with parents	1	2	3	4	5
C.) Family outings	1	2	3	4	5
D.) Family meals	1	2	3	4	5
E.) Going out with friends	1	2	3	4	5
F.) Being at school	1	2	3	4	5
G.) Family celebrations at Obon	1	2	3	4	5
H.) New Year	1	2	3	4	5

Q24. Do you or your parents decide about the following matters?

	I decide	My parent(s) decide
A.) The choice of subjects you will follow at school	1	2
B.) What time you will get up in the morning	1	2
C.) What part-time work you will do	1	2
D.) Whether you will have a scooter or motorbike	1	2
E.) Whether you save or spend your money	1	2
F.) How you spend your money	1	2
G.) What videos you will watch	1	2

Q25. In the following situations, who makes the decisions? Do you and your parent(s) always agree about what you want to do?

	You decide	Your mother decides	Your father decides	You and your parents consult together	You and your parents sometimes disagree	You and your parents often disagree
A.) Whether you should go on a family outing	1	2	3	4	5	6
B.) How loud you may listen to music	1	2	3	4	5	6
C.) Whether you should go on a family holiday	1	2	3	4	5	6
D.) Who you can go out with	1	2	3	4	5	6
E.) Where you can go when you go out	1	2	3	4	5	6
F.) When you may go out (e.g. weekdays or weekends)	1	2	3	4	5	6
G.) How long you can go out (or when you must be home)	1	2	3	4	5	6
H.) Whether you must tell your parents where you are	1	2	3	4	5	6

Q26. As extra activities and/or club activities, do you participate in any of the following sports?

	Regularly (or in season)	Sometimes	Not
A.) Tennis	1	2	3
B.) Soccer (football)	1	2	3
C.) Volleyball	1	2	3
D.) Football (American)	1	2	3
E.) Baseball	1	2	3
F.) Judo	1	2	3
G.) Golf	1	2	3
H.) Skiing/snowboarding	1	2	3
I.) Swimming	1	2	3
J.) Track and field	1	2	3
K.) Other (please specify)…………… ………………………………..	1	2	3

Q27. As extra activities and/or club activities, are you learning any of the following?
  1. Music   4. Calligraphy   (multiple choice)
  2. Drama/theatre   5. Ballet
  3. Art   6. Other (please specify)……………………
                              7. None

Q28. When you spend time with your friends or go out with them, how often do you do the following things?

	Several times a week	Every weekend	A few times a month	A few times a year	Never
A.) Play computer games	1	2	3	4	5
B.) Eat at MacDonalds	1	2	3	4	5
C.) Go to the movies	1	2	3	4	5
D.) Watch videos	1	2	3	4	5
E.) Go to karaoke bars	1	2	3	4	5
F.) Go shopping	1	2	3	4	5
G.) Go to pop concerts	1	2	3	4	5

Q29. Does being male or female make any difference to how your parents treat you in the following situations?

	Boys/brothers have more	Girls/sisters have more	Boys/brothers and girls/sisters have the same
A.) The amount of space in the house that is yours, or that you may use	1	2	3
B.) Opportunities or encouragement to take extra activities (e.g. music, ballet, sport)	1	2	3
C.) Opportunities or encouragement to take extra coaching in school subjects	1	2	3
D.) The number of restrictions parents set when you go out	1	2	3

Q30. What kinds of items do you buy with your own money, and what kinds of items do your parents pay for?

	Mainly own money	Mainly parents' money	Don't buy
A.) Bus/train fares	1	2	3
B.) Movies	1	2	3
C.) Meals	1	2	3
D.) Gifts	1	2	3
E.) Junk food	1	2	3
F.) CDs and tapes	1	2	3
G.) Clothes	1	2	3
H.) Make-up	1	2	3
I.) Film/photos	1	2	3
J.) CD Player	1	2	3
K.) Bicycle	1	2	3

Q30. (ctd)

	Mainly own money	Mainly parents' money	Don't buy
L.) Motor scooter	1	2	3
M.) Television set	1	2	3
N.) Motorbike	1	2	3

Q31. Do you try to save any money?   1. Yes   2. No

Q32. Would you like your parents to be more involved in the decisions you make?
                                        1. Yes   2. No

Q33. Would you like your parents to be less involved in the decisions you make?
                                        1. Yes   2. No

Q34. How is your family important to you? (choose one)
        1. emotionally, to express affection
        2. economically, for daily life support
        3. for your growth and future well-being
        4. because you must respect and care for your parents
        5. other (please specify)…………………………………………..

Q35. If you could afford to, when would you like to live in your own separate apartment?
        1. this year
        2. next year
        3. when you have finished high school
        4. when you are in your 20's
        5. you don't want to live separately from family

Q36. Do you think you are like your mother or father in character/personality?
        1. Yes   2. No   3. Sometimes

Q37. Do you want to be like your mother or father in character/personality?
        1. Yes   2. No   3. Sometimes

Q38. Please complete the following sentences:
    1. When I think of my father I ………………………………………………….

        …………………………………………………………………………..

    2. When I think of my mother I …………………………………………..

        ………………………………………………………………………….

Ideas about Roles and Marriage
Q39. In the future, if you get married, at what age would you like this to take place?
        1. at age 20 - 24
        2. at age 25 - 29   5. at age 40 or later
        3. at age 30 - 34   6. timing of marriage has nothing to do with age
        4. at age 35 - 39   7. I wish to remain single all my life

Q40. If you get married, would you prefer it to be (choose only one)
        1. an arranged marriage
        2. a love match
        3. other

Q41. Recently the number of young people who prefer to lead single lives on their own, rather than to marry, has been increasing. Do you agree with this tendency?
        1. I agree (Please go to Q41-1)
        2. I do not agree (Please go to Q41-2)

    Q41-1 If you agree that more people should live single lives (Q41 Answer No1), select   your reason from the following. I agree (choose only one answer)
        1. because one can live freely without being restricted by one's family
        2. because it encourages economic independence
        3. because married life is not the only way to live
        4. because one can concentrate on work and hobbies
        5. other (please specify)…………………………………………………….

    Q41-2 If you do not agree that more people should lead single lives (Q41 Answer No2),   select your reason from the following. I agree (choose only one answer)
        1. because happiness lies in marriage
        2. because it does not look good in other people's eyes
        3. because it encourages sexual immorality
        4. because the number of children will decrease
        5. other (please specify)…………………………………………………

Q42. If you decide to marry, will the following characteristics of your spouse-to-be be important, and to what degree?

	Very important	Important	Not very important	Not important
A.) Academic background	1	2	3	4
B.) Profession	1	2	3	4
C.) Income	1	2	3	4
D.) Age	1	2	3	4
E.) Religion	1	2	3	4
F.) Living together with, or separately from, the parent(s)	1	2	3	4
G.) Property of the parents	1	2	3	4
H.) The family lineage	1	2	3	4

Q43. Do you think parents who have an unhappy marriage should be allowed to divorce?
        1. yes, because divorce enables each parent to seek a better life
        2. no, because divorce makes it difficult for each parent to care for and support their children
        3. I don't know

Q44. When parents die, who do you think should be allowed to inherit their property?
  1. the eldest son
  2. the property should be divided equally among the children
  3. the person in the family, if it is not the eldest son, who takes care of the parents
  4. the person, if it is not a family member, who looks after the parents in their old age
  5. the hospital or welfare facility that looks after the parents in their old age
  6. other (please specify)…………………………………………………………..

Q45. If your mother or father died, would you object if the surviving parent re-married?
    1. it would depend on whether I liked the new partner
    2. I would have no objections, it would be their choice
    3. in principle I object to second marriages
    4. I don't know

Q46. Choose one answer to express your opinion about the following subjects.

	Yes, I think so	No, I don't think so	I don't know
A.) It is the eldest son's duty to look after his parents	1	2	3
B.) The family's name must be continued even if that means adopting a child	1	2	3
C.) The tomb of your ancestors must be treasured and should be passed on to posterity	1	2	3

Q47. Do you think of a man should do kitchen work?
      1. Yes (please go to Q47-1)
      2. No (please go to Q 47-2)

  Q47-1. If you answered yes to Q47, choose only one reason from the following:
      1. the number of working women is increasing and men should contribute equally to the housework
      2. the idea that housework is women's work is wrong
      3. the number of men working and living apart from their families is increasing; they
           should prepare food by themselves.
      4. because of population ageing, all men should be able to cook for themselves
      5. other (please specify)…………………………………………………………..

  Q 47-2. If you answered no to Q47, choose only one reason from the following:
      1. since men work outside the home, they should not have to work when they are at home
      2. it is not good to deprive housewives of their work
      3. women should not work outside at the expense of attending to their housework
      4. it does not look good in other people's eyes
      5. other (please specify)…………………………………………………………

Q48. If you get married, would you like to have children?

        1. Yes   2. No   3. I don't know

Q49. What kind of person do you think a woman should be, and what kind of person should a man be? (Choose 3 answers from the whole list for a woman, and again choose 3 answers from the whole list for a man. Write the numbers in the boxes provided.)

   1. a gentle and obedient person
   2. an independent person
   3. a competitive, hard-working person
   4. a person with leadership qualities
   5. a popular person among friends
   6. a thoughtful person
   7. a responsible person
   8. a tough, vital person
   9. a dutiful person
 10. a person who can enjoy his/her life

Qualities for a woman		

Qualities for a man		

Q50-1. In most cases, do other people describe you as

   1. a highschool girl/boy   4. someone of the *judai* generation
   2. a highschool student   5. a young man or woman
   3. a teenager   6. a young adult

Q50-2. In most cases, would you prefer to be called

   1. a highschool girl/boy   4. someone of the *judai* generation
   2. a highschool student   5. a young man or woman
   3. a teenager   6. a young adult

Q51. Which of the following items do you think are important signs that you are 'grown-up'?

(Choose 3 answers from the whole list and write the numbers in the box provided.)

   1. intellectual independence
   2. emotional control
   3. finishing your education
   4. leaving home
   5. getting a job
   6. earning wages
   7. achieving financial independence
   8. forming a partnership
   9. getting married

Important signs for being 'grown-up'		
(Choose 3, and write the answers in the boxes below)		

Q52. Consider the following legal positions in Japan:
- at 16yrs of age you can be tried for crime in an adult court
- at 16yrs of age females can get married with parental consent
- at 18yrs of age males can get married with parental consent
- at 20 yrs of age you can vote
- at 20yrs of age you can celebrate being 'adult'
- at 20yrs of age you can buy alcohol and cigarettes

   (A) Do you think the above age restrictions are fair?
             1. Yes   2. No   3. I don't know
   (B) Do you think these restrictions are logical?
             1. Yes   2. No   3. I don't know

Q53. Do you find the following restrictions a problem?

	Yes	No
A.) That you cannot vote till age 20	1	2
B.) That you cannot drink alcohol till age 20	1	2
C.) That you cannot smoke cigarettes till age 20	1	2
D.) That you cannot qualify for the minimum adult wage under 15 yrs	1	2
E.) That you cannot drive a car till age 18	1	2

Q54. At what age do you think people are able to make their own decisions about gambling, smoking or drinking?

	17yrs	18yrs	19yrs	20yrs
A.) Age of decisions to gamble or not	1	2	3	4
B.) Age of decisions to drink alcohol or not	1	2	3	4
C.) Age of decisions to smoke cigarettes or not	1	2	3	4

Interactions between Young People and Adults

Q55. Which of these adults do you have contact with, and how often?

	Every week	Once or twice a fortnight	Once or twice a month	A few times a year	Never
A.) Parents of your friends	1	2	3	4	5
B.) Employers/workers at your part-time job(s)	1	2	3	4	5
C.) Teachers	1	2	3	4	5
D.) Sports coach/coachers	1	2	3	4	5

Q56. How do you relate to the following adults? (multiple choice)

	With great respect	In a joking manner	I call them by their first name	With polite conversation
A.) Parents of your friends	1	2	3	4
B.) Employers/workers at your part-time job	1	2	3	4
C.) Teachers	1	2	3	4
D.) Sports coach/coachers	1	2	3	4

Q57. Do you think adults have an accurate picture of young people? 1. Yes   2. No

Q58. Are you looking forward to becoming an adult?   1. Yes   2. No

Q59. Write down three things that you think you will enjoy about being an adult.

1.
…………………………………………………………………………………..

2.
…………………………………………………………………………………..

3.
…………………………………………………………………………………..

Q60. Write down three things you think will be difficult when you are an adult.

1.
…………………………………………………………………………………

2.
…………………………………………………………………………………

3.
…………………………………………………………………………………...

Q61. In ten years from now, what kind of lifestyle do you think you will be living? What roles and responsibilities will this include?

.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

APPENDIX 8

SHIZUOKA SCHOOL PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE

(A cover page explained the nature of my research and its link to the YFP research, and that all answers were voluntary, anonymous and confidential.)

Note: Please circle the number of the most appropriate answer, or fill in the blanks with numbers.
Where extra information is requested, please write in the space provided.

Q1. Are you   1. male   2. female

Q2. Which age group do you belong to?
                1. 20-29yrs   4. 50-59yrs
                2. 30-39yrs   5. over 60yrs
                3. 40-49yrs

Q3. Your family's high school student(s) are   1. male
                                              2. female
                                              3. both male and female

Q4. In total, how many children do you have?
                1. son(s) #…………   age(s)…………………
                2. daughter(s)#…………..age(s)……………….

Family Patterns and Concepts
Q5. How would you describe the family you grew up in?
      1. father and children   4. mother's parent(s), parents and children
      2. mother and children   5. father's parent(s), parents and children
      3. parents and children   6. other (please specify)……………
                                            …………………………………..
Q6. How would you describe the family you live in now?
      1. father and children   4. mother's parent(s), parents and children
      2. mother and children   5. father's parent(s), parents and children
      3. parents and children   6. other (please specify)……………

Q7. How many people live together in your household?   #………………….

Q8. The family has many roles. Which of the following do you consider the most important role?   (Choose only one answer)
      1. providing economic support for daily life
      2. a base for sharing emotional affection
      3. a place to raise a family
      4. a place for mutual growth and maturation among family members
      5. a place where the older generation can find support and meaning

Q9. When did you "become" a family?
1. at marriage
2. at the birth of your first child
3. when your child/ren were young and very dependent
4. as the child/ren matured and shared interests with you
5. you always thought of your family as an extension of your parent's family

Q10. Was it important for you to have children?   1. Yes   2. No

Q11. What was the most noticeable change in your life after you had children?
1. the higher cost of living
2. the loss of personal freedom
3. a greater sense of responsibility and purpose in life

Q12. Do you think family means the same thing to men and to women? Which of the following do you agree with, and which do you disagree with?

	I agree	I disagree
A.) Women feel more fulfilled by raising a family than men do…	1	2
B.) Men enjoy their family but their first interest is their job…….	1	2
C.) Men and women should both contribute to and enjoy family, and both should enjoy outside work and hobbies…………….	1	2
D.) Women are more burdened by family than men are………….	1	2
E.) Children are more dependent on mothers than on fathers for day to day physical and emotional care ………………………	1	2

Q13. What do you think of a man's doing kitchen work? (choose only one answer)
1. It is a good thing (if you choose 1, go to Q13-1)
2. It is not a good thing (if you choose 2, go to Q13-2)

Q13-1. If you think a man's doing kitchen work is a good thing, choose only one reason for you answer from the following:
1. The number of working women is increasing and men should contribute equally to the housework
2. The idea that housework is women's work is wrong
3. The number of men working and living apart from their families is increasing: they should at least prepare meals by themselves
4. Because of population ageing, all men should be able to cook for themselves
5. Other (please specify)…………………………………………………….

Q13-2. If you think a man's doing kitchen work is not a good thing, choose only one reason for your answer from the following:
1. Since men work outside the home, they should not have to work when they are at home
2. It is not good to deprive housewives of their work
3. Women should not work outside at the expense of attending to their housework
4. It does not look good in other people's eyes
5. Other (please specify)…………………………………………………….

Concepts and Use of Space in the Home
These questions are about how space in the house is used, and who controls the use of space in the home.

Q14. Excluding the kitchen, hallway and bathroom, approximately how much living space do you have in your house? (Include western style rooms.)
      1. less than 10 tatami mats
      2. 11 - less than 15 tatami mats
      3. 15 - less than 20 tatami mats
      4. 20 - less than 25 tatami mats
      5. 25 tatami mats or more

(In the following questions, answer with reference to your own high school son/daughter)
Q15. Does your high school son or daughter
      1. have his/her own room
      2. share a room with brother(s) or sister(s)
      3. other (please specify)………………………………………..

Q16. In your son or daughter's own room (or space), who was/is responsible for the following activities?

	You	Your spouse	You and spouse	Son/daughter
A.) Who decorated it	1	2	3	4
B.) Who chose the furniture	1	2	3	4
C.) Who decides what to put on the walls	1	2	3	4
D.) Who cleans it	1	2	3	4

Q17. Does your high school son/daughter use his or her room (or space) for the following activities?

	Often	Sometimes	Never
A.) Entertain their friends	1	2	3
B.) Watch television/videos	1	2	3
C.) Eat meals	1	2	3
D.) Do homework	1	2	3
E.) Listen to music	1	2	3
F.) Play computer games	1	2	3
G.) Eat snacks	1	2	3

Control Over and Use of Time
These questions are about how families spend their time in a typical week.

Q18. Which of the following meals does your family sit down to eat all together?

	Always together	Not all together	Sometimes all together
A.) Breakfast	1	2	3
B.) Evening meal	1	2	3
C.) Weekend meals	1	2	3

Q19. How often do you and your high school son/daughter do the following activities together?

	Every week	Every month	Sometimes	Never
A.) Make family visits or go to see friends	1	2	3	4
B.) Go out for shopping or meals	1	2	3	4
C.) Play sport	1	2	3	4
D.) Go to movies, sports events or concerts	1	2	3	4
E.) Watch television at home	1	2	3	4
F.) Go on weekend holidays	1	2	3	4

Q20. Would you spend more time with your son(s), or more time with your daughter(s)?
1. more time with son(s)
2. more time with daughter(s)
3. equal amounts of time with each
4. your children are all the same gender

Q21. Does your high school son/daughter need your encouragement to do the following activities?

	Needs encouragement	No encouragement needed
A.) To spend more time in family activities	1	2
B.) To spend more time in school activities	1	2
C.) To spend more time on school homework	1	2
D.) To spend more time with friends	1	2

Q22. Which occasions do you think are more important for keeping the family together?

	Important	Not important
A.) Day to day living	1	2
B.) Birthday celebrations	1	2
C.) Festivals such as Obon	1	2
D.) School activities	1	2
E.) New Year	1	2

Jobs/tasks in the House

Q23. Do you expect your high school son/daughter to do any of the following jobs at home?

	Yes	No	Sometimes
A.) Help with the cooking	1	2	3
B.) Help wash the dishes	1	2	3
C.) Help clean the house	1	2	3
D.) Make their own lunch	1	2	3
E.) Wash their own clothes	1	2	3
F.) Wash/clean the car	1	2	3

Q24. How often is your high school son/daughter paid for doing household jobs?
1. Regularly   2. Sometimes   3. Never

Q25. Is job allocation in your house distributed according to gender?   1. Yes   2. No

Money, Responsibility and Decision Making

Q26. Does your high school son/daughter receive an allowance in the form of the
following?
    1. pocket money as free distribution
    2. pocket money earned by doing household jobs
    3. a clothing allowance
    4. an educational allowance
    5. other (please specify)…………………………………………………….

Q27. Does your high school son/daughter do part-time work on a regular basis?
    1. Yes   2. No
(If your answer to Q27 is yes, go to Q28. If your answer to Q27 is no, go to Q29)

Q28. Who decided your son/daughter should get a job?
    1. he/she decided and applied for the job
    2. we discussed the issue and decided together
    3. I/we as parents suggested a part-time job was a good idea
    4. other (please specify)…………………………………………………….

Q29. When your highschool son/daughter buys the following items, which items do they
have to pay for with their own money, and which items do you mostly pay for?

	Parents mostly pay	Son/daughter mostly pays	Situation decides
A.) Bus/train fares	1	2	3
B.) Movies	1	2	3
C.) Meals	1	2	3
D.) Gifts	1	2	3
E.) Junk food	1	2	3
F.) CDs, tapes, computer games	1	2	3
G.) Clothes	1	2	3
H.) Make-up	1	2	3
I.) Film/photos	1	2	3
J.) CD player	1	2	3
K.) Bicycle	1	2	3
L.) Scooter/50cc bike	1	2	3
M.) TV	1	2	3
N.) Motorbike	1	2	3

Q30. Which parental attitude do you think is most helpful in teaching your high school
son/daughter the value of money
    1. encouragement to allocate and spend their money freely according to their
       own choice
    2. encouragement to save and invest some of their money
    3. encouragement to target items they want or need, and to save so they can
       afford them
    4. other (please specify)
    5. don't know

Q31. Do you think your high school son/daughter has more money to spend than you
had at the same age?   1. Yes   2. No

Q32. Who has more influence over how your high school son/daughter spends his or her
own money?
     1. you have more influence
     2. your son/daughter's friends/television etc. have more influence
     3. both you, and their friends and television, have about equal influence

Q33. Do you ever feel that you have lost control over the values your high school
son/daughter adopts because of what he or she chooses to do with his or her own
money?
     1. Sometimes   2. Often   3. Very rarely

Other areas of Negotiated Responsibility and Decision Making
          The following questions relate to situations that frequently result in
differences of opinion between parents and teenage children.

Q34. How were decisions made between you and your high school son/daughter in the
following situations?

	Parent advice was followed	Compromise decision made	Son/daughter decided alone
A.) The choice of subjects son or daughter will follow at school	1	2	3
B.) Whether son/daughter can drink alcohol or smoke cigarettes	1	2	3
C.) Who son/daughter can go out with	1	2	3
D.) Where son/daughter can go out with friends	1	2	3
E.) When (e.g. weekend or weekdays) son/daughter can go out with friends	1	2	3
F.) The time son/daughter must come home after going out with friends	1	2	3
G.) Whether son/daughter must inform parents where they are if they go out with friends	1	2	3
H.) Whether son/daughter can stay out overnight with friends	1	2	3
I.) Whether son/daughter must participate in a family holiday	1	2	3

Q35. Does your high school son/daughter often ask for your help in decision-making?
          1. Yes   2. No
     (If your answer to Q35 is yes, go to Q36. If your answer to Q35 is no, go to Q37.)

Q36. If your high school son/daughter asks for help when trying to make a decision, do
you
     1. tell them what they should do
     2. encourage them to make up their own minds
     3. suggest alternatives they may consider

Q37. If your high school son/daughter wanted to do any of the following, would you allow it or not allow it?

	Allow it	Not allow it
A.) Go overseas for a holiday with friends	1	2
B.) Go to a party with friends you do not know	1	2
C.) Leave school and look for full-time work	1	2
D.) Leave home and live in an apartment	1	2
E.) Stay overnight at a boyfriend's or girlfriend's house?	1	2

Role of a Parent

Q38. For how long do you think your responsibility as a parent to your son/daughter should continue?
1. until the end of high school
2. until the age of legal adulthood (20 years)
3. until he/she gets a job
4. until he/she marries
5. until he/she becomes a parent
6. the parent is always responsible

Q39. Do you have a sense of mission as a parent to raise your son/daughter to meet certain standards of understanding and values?   1. Yes   2. No

Q40. Do you think your son/daughter's age group has a different set of standards and values from the ones you are trying to impart?
   1. Yes   2. No
(If you answered yes to Q40, go to Q41. If you answered no to Q40, go to Q42.)

Q41. If you answered yes to Q40, do you still hope your values etc. will finally be adopted by your son/daughter, or do you believe that change is inevitable?
1. you hope your values will triumph
2. change is inevitable
3. your own values are undergoing change

Q42. (Only answer if you have both son(s) and daughter(s))
   Do you think it is more important to encourage your son's development for a future career than it is to encourage and work for a daughter's career?
   1. Yes   2. No

Q43. Are the ways you carry out your responsibilities to your son/daughter
1. a repetition of the way your parents raised you
2. innovative and changing to meet the needs of your son/daughter
3. adjusted to accommodate your work and other outside activities beyond the house

Q44. Which of the following values do you consider the most important to try to pass on to your son/daughter? (choose 3)
   1. obedience   2. harmony   3. leadership
   4. capability   5. responsibility   6. success
   7. honesty   8. judgement   9. empathy   10. challenging spirit

Q45. Would you select the same values as being important for a girl as for a boy?
    1. Yes   2. No

Q46. Do either you or your spouse have to commute for work over long distances with the result that for some periods each week/month you must live in separate places?
    1. Yes   2. No
  (If you answered yes to Q46 go to Q47. If you answered no to Q46, go to Q48.)

Q47. If you or your spouse is away from the family base for work, does the spouse who spends most time caring for the son/daughter and other family members believe parenting would improve if it could be more equally shared?
    1. Yes   2. No

Future
The questions in this section ask about what kind of aspirations parents might have for their high school sons and daughters, and what kind of lifestyles they envisage their children could follow. Other questions are about parental attitudes to the roles they themselves will live in the future.

Q48. Do you have any aspirations for your high school son/daughter's future occupation?   (Choose one)
    1. I expect my son/daughter to continue the family business
    2. I expect my son/daughter to work toward a position as an executive or professional
    3. I will be happy for my son/daughter to be in a clerical position
    4. I prefer for my son/daughter to be in manual work in a factory
    5. I prefer my son/daughter to be in farming work
    6. I prefer my son/daughter to do forestry work
    7. my son/daughter's position will depend on working conditions
    8. my son/daughter's future occupation is for him/her to decide

Q49. How much formal education would you like your son/daughter to receive?
    1. up to the end of high school
    2. a two year college education
    3. a four year university education
    4. the time spent in formal education is for my son/daughter to decide

Q50. Do you think it is necessary for their future status that your son/daughter should attend a college or university with a good reputation or name?
    1. Yes   2. No

Q51. Do you hope that your son/daughter will eventually marry and have children?
    1. marriage is important for my son/daughter's future life
    2. the choice of whether to marry and have children is up to him/her

Q52. Where do you want your high school son/daughter to live after he or she has graduated from high school?
    1. at home until he/she marries
    2. at home until he/she can afford to live in an apartment
    3. in an apartment close to his/her job or college/university
    4. in the parental household permanently, if possible

Q53. Recently the number of people who are choosing to live single lives on their own, rather than to marry, has been increasing. How would you react if your son/daughter chose a single lifestyle?

    1. my son/daughter has many talents and wants to develop them. I would support his or her choice of a single lifestyle to focus on those interests
    2. I would be disappointed if my son/daughter made this choice as happiness lies in marriage
    3. I would support my son/daughter's choice of a single lifestyle because a married lifestyle is not the only way to live
    4. a single lifestyle does not look good in other people's eyes and I would prefer my son/daughter to enjoy the values and traditions associated with married life

Q54. If you son/daughter marries and has children, would you prefer the living arrangement they have with you to be

    1. living in an extended family household
    2. a nuclear family with close contact between us
    3. a nuclear family without close contact

Q55. In general, do you think that family mobility to accept employment opportunities loosens ties between family members and lessens the ability of family members to care for each other?

    1. I think families can withstand mobility and remain strongly united
    2. mobility has helped disperse extended kin (family members) but relationships are sometimes better at a distance
    3. too much distance between family members reduces contact and shared experiences, so families are less united

Q56. In the future if your son/daughter marries and has children, do you want to be a full-time grandparent or do you want to travel and devote time to your interests and hobbies?

    1. I want to be a full-time grandparent because children benefit from these relationships and are enriched by them
    2. grandparents are more interesting to their grandchildren if they devote time to other interests and experiences as well

Q57. In the future would you be prepared to help care for your grandchildren if your son/daughter and his or her spouse want to continue in paid employment?

    1. Yes   2. No   3. Only for a short period

Q58. In the future do you think as a parent/grandparent you should put duty before pleasure?

    1. yes, because these are values I believe in
    2. no, because after raising my own family I am entitled to seek my own interests and pleasure
    3. duty is pleasurable, for to fulfill the expected roles brings pleasure and satisfaction

Q59. Would you like your son/daughter to care for you when you are old?
1. yes, because I prefer to stay with my family
2. no, because I do not want to burden my family
3. no, because I prefer to be independent

Interactions between Adults and Young People

Q60. In what situations do you meet the friends of your high school son or daughter?

	Yes	No
A.) In your home when they visit	1	2
B.) When you go with them on shared outings	1	2
C.) Through participation in school activities	1	2

Q61. Are you involved through any of the following activities with other (non-family) young people?

	Yes	No
A.) Through teaching	1	2
B.) Through coaching sports activities	1	2
C.) Through hobbies and interest groups	1	2

Q62. Do you try to get to know the young people who are friends of your high school son and daughter?   1. Yes   2. No

Q63. Do any of your son/daughter's friends confide in you and seek your advice about their problems?   1. Yes   2. No

Q64-1. Is there much difference between the attitudes and values of the high school generation today and those of your own generation when you were at high school? Would you agree or disagree with the following?

	I agree	I disagree
A.) High school students are more independent of parents than my generation was when I was at high school	1	2
B.) High school students today always do things today in groups of their own age	1	2
C.) High school students today are more willing to speak up about their own ideas and feelings	1	2
D.) High school students today are not as respectful to those who are senior to them than my generation was at that age	1	2

Q64-2. (This question refers to high school GIRLS only)
Do you agree with the following:
High school girls today make more choices about their interests and future, and act more on their own initiative, than they did when I was at high school.
1. I agree   2. I disagree

Q65. How do you react to changes you notice between values and attitudes of the high school generation today and those that you grew up with?

	Yes	No	I don't know
A.) You think the changes are for the better	1	2	3
B.) You think the younger generation in Japan is losing direction	1	2	3
C.) You think the changes are minor and will have no overall effect	1	2	3
D.) You think the differences between the world of the younger generation and their future, and your own world, are difficult to bridge	1	2	3
E.) You think all young people go through phases, and the traditional values will come to the fore as young people mature	1	2	3

Q66. Is there a clear distinction between childhood and adulthood?
    1. Yes   2. No   3. I don't know

Q67. When did you start thinking of yourself as being adult?
    1. at 20yrs of age
    2. when you got a job and became financially independent
    3. at marriage
    4. when you became a parent
    5. when you began to understand and practice values such as empathy, harmony and responsibility

Q68. Would you agree that a person over 20yrs, who has life-management skills and who is obedient to the law, but who lacks a sense of responsibility, is properly adult?   1. Yes   2. No.   3. I don't know

Q69. Do you think the high school generation is more focussed on concepts as "rights as adults" than as "responsibilities as adults"?
    1. Yes   2. No   3. I don't know

Q70. Do you agree with the following statements:

	I agree	I disagree
A.) Adult men and women should have the same basic fundamental rights	1	2
B.) In practice, women do not have equal rights to men in the following areas: employment opportunities and status; high levels of income; positions of public responsibility	1	2
C.) The role of "mother" includes giving birth and caring for children. Adult women who are mothers cannot expect to have equal rights with men in many areas of employment, in public positions, or in levels of income	1	2
D) Traditional values of *shitsuke* have changed (e.g. with new ideas of equality and equal rights between men and women). Being "adult" means to practice the values of *shitsuke*.	1	2

Thank you very much for your cooperation

APPENDIX 9

SHIZUOKA SCHOOL TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

(A cover page explained the nature of my research and its link to the YFP research, and that all answers were voluntary, anonymous and confidential.)

Note: Please circle the number of the most appropriate answer, or fill in the blanks with numbers. Where extra information is requested, please write in the space provided.

Q1. Are you   1. male   2. female

Q2. Which age group do you belong to?
1. 20-29 yrs	3. 40-49 yrs	5. over 60 yrs
2. 30-39 yrs	4. 50-59 yrs	

Q3. How long have you been a teacher?
1. 1-5 yrs	3. 11-15 yrs	5. over 20 yrs
2. 6-10yrs	4. 16-20 yrs	

Q4. What subject(s) do you teach?
1. mathematics	10. art
2. physics	11. music
3. chemistry	12. agriculture
4. biology	13. forestry
5. Japanese language and literature	14. business
6. English	15. sports
7. Japanese history	16. other please specify………
8. world history	……………………………
9. geography	

Q5. What kinds of schools have you taught in?
1. government schools
2. private schools
3. other (please specify)…………………………………………………

Q6. What classes have you taught in the past?
1. highschool student classes
2. junior highschool student classes
3. other (please specify)…………………………………………………

Q7. What is the average size of classes you teach at present? #……….students per class

Q8. Do you enjoy the challenge of teaching or do circumstances limit your enjoyment of teaching?
1. Mostly yes, I enjoy the challenge
2. I enjoy the challenge very much
3. Classes are too large to teach as effectively as I would like
4. On the whole students are not so responsive and teaching them is a difficult task

Q9. Do you think students respect teachers now as much as they did 10 years ago?
        1. Yes   2. No

Q10. Is your mission as a teacher to help develop students' attitudes and values, or is the main focus the subject matter of your course?
1. the first and major aim is to impart a positive attitude to the subject and to further the students' knowledge in it
2. the teaching of values and attitudes cannot be separated from any teaching regardless of the subject taught
3. the development of attitudes and values is the responsibility of parents. My job is to teach my subject

Q11. What 3 values from the following list would you rate as the most important for your students to learn?

1. obedience	4. capability	7. honesty	10. judgement
2. responsibility	5. empathy	8. harmony	
3. challenging spirit	6. leadership	9. success	

Q12. Do you and the parents of your students have the same aspirations for your students?
1. No. I focus on the subject but the parents focus on the grades
2. Yes. We both want the students to do as well as possible
3. I don't know. Parents expect teachers to take too much responsibility for the future of their high school students

Q13. From your own experience, what is the most successful method of encouraging students to conform to expectations?
1. through personal example
2. by appealing to reason
3. by appealing to group solidarity and harmony

Q14. As well as class contact, do you have contact with your students through any of the following activities?
1. sports
2. interest groups (drama, debating, music etc.)
3. other (please specify)   4. no extra activities

Q15. Do you think you have good knowledge of the students you teach?
    1. on the whole, yes   2. not really   3. only a few

Q16. Do any students confide in you about their personal problems and seek your advice?
    1. Yes   2. No

Q17. From your own experience, do you think that parents really know what is going on in young people's lives?   1. Yes   2. No

Q18. Who do you think would have the biggest influence on the high school generation?
1. parents
2. teachers
3. peer group

Q19. What percentage of your students have one of their parents absent through commuting during the working week?   #……………%

Q20. What percentage of your students would have working mothers (full or part-time) as well as working fathers?   #……………%

Q21. How much difference do you notice in this generation of high school students from others you have taught (or have known) in the past ten years with regard to the following:

   A.) amount of respect shown toward people who are older than they are
                1. More   2. Less   3. No change
   B.) openness about their own ideas and opinions
                1. More   2. Less   3. No change
   C.) willingness to co-operate with teaching staff
                1. More   2. Less   3. No change
   D.) willingness to work together as a group
                1. More   2. Less   3. No change
   E.) tendency to act independently
                1. More   2. Less   3. No change
   F.) sense of responsibility to others
                1. More   2. Less   3. No change
   G.) sense of duty to achieve and do well
                1. More   2. Less   3. No change

Q22. Do you think students today have more access to money than in the past?
          1. Yes   2. No

Q23. Do computer games, movies etc. interfere with schoolwork?   1. Yes   2. No

Q24. What percentage of high school students in your high school would think of school as a place
        1. to focus on subjects they prefer and enjoy …………..%
        2. to qualify with the best marks from subjects that will gain entry to a high status college or university………..%
        3. to qualify them for their life's work………..%

Q25. Do most parents of students in your high school want their sons and daughters to have a tertiary education?   1. Yes   2. No

Q26. Do parents of students in your high school encourage their sons/daughters to choose subjects according to their perceived status and value at tertiary level?
                1. Yes   2. No

Q27. What percentage of your high school students would have some idea of the occupations they want to follow in the future?
        1. 10-20%   3. 50-60%   5. 90-100%
        2. 30-40%   4. 70-80%

Q28. Do more male students than female students hope to qualify for a full-time future profession through university training?
        1. Yes   2. No

Q29. In general do male students tend to show the following attitudes more than female students?

    A.) a competitive attitude for good grades   1. Yes   2. No
    B.) attention seeking from teaching staff   1. Yes   2. No
    C.) willingness to struggle with difficult subjects   1. Yes   2. No
    D.) a belief that they should get priority treatment
        on account of gender?   1. Yes   2. No

Q30. Do you treat your students as adults?   1. Yes   2. No   3. Some

Q31. Do your students want to be treated as being responsible and adult?
                                   1. Yes   2. No   3. Some

Q32. Do you encourage your students to form their own opinions or are they guided to accept a prescribed orientation?
    1. I encourage them to form their own opinions
    2. as a teacher I must transmit prescribed orientations

Q33. Do you teach that duty and respect should be shown
    1. toward others
    2. toward self
    3. toward self and others
    4. don't know

Q34. Do you think your students' general skills with information technology and access to the internet help, or conflict with, your role as teacher?
    1. students are easily swayed by orientations from other sources
    2. students need more maturity to evaluate information they can access from other sources
    3. information technology opens wider horizons to the students and they mature more quickly
    4. information technology is advantageous to teaching

Q35. What percentage of your last year's students refused to compete with other students or were disillusioned about their future and left high school before completing the final year?
    #………………….%

Q36. Rights as "adults" are conferred at different ages by law (e.g. a person can be tried by law in a criminal court at 14yrs, can marry with the consent of one parent at 16yrs (female) or 18yrs (male), but cannot vote till 20 yrs). Do you think high school students have an understanding of what "citizenship" and the accompanying rights mean?
        1. Yes   2. No   3. Don't know

Q37. Does your school have any civics classes?
        1. Yes   2. No

Q38. Do you think civics is an important part of a high school curriculum?
        1. Yes   2. No   3. Don't know

Q39. Do you think there is any conflict between a person's legal rights as a citizen and a person's responsibilities as a member of a family?
        1. Yes   2. No   3. Don't know

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

APPENDIX 10

SHIZUOKA SCHOOL STUDENT INTERVIEW GUIDE
(Used independently of School Survey)

Profile sheet asking for basic information: Age, birthplace, parents' birthplace, number and age of siblings, religious observances kept (a household *kamidana/butsudan*? visits to shrines? celebration of *Sichi-go-san* and *O-bon…*?), celebration at 20 years?

Home/Family life
Describe your house, who lives there?
Describe your room(s) in the house (Who decorated it, who cleans it, who says what can put on the walls? What do you do in this space? Where do you do your homework?)
Where are all the things which you own, in the house?
Does being a male or female make a difference to the space you have in the house?

How would you spend a typical week in term time?
(Curfews? How much time would you spend with your parents? Would you go on holidays with your family? Do you go on family outings/meals? Do you enjoy them? Does anyone make sure you do your homework? Who gets you up in the mornings?
Who do you spend time with when you're out of the house?)
Do your brothers and sisters get the same sort of curfews, spend the same amount of time with parents?

What jobs do you have around the house?
(Do you have a share in the cooking, the cleaning, the gardening? Who would make your own lunch? Who would do your washing?)
Does being male or female make a difference in the jobs people do?
Does your place in the family make a difference to the way you're treated, the jobs you're given?

Personal Income and Personal Belongings
Which of the following would you own, and which would you have the use of: Computer? Stereo/CD player? Television? Cellphone? Bicycle? Licence for scooter or motorbike? Motor scooter? Motorbike? Bank account? Money machine card? Credit card?

What sorts of personal income do you have? Part-time job? What kind of hours do you work? Are you paid well?
Pocket money? Do you earn it by doing jobs or are you given it?
Educational grant? Clothing allowance?

What kinds of books do you personally own, or borrow? What kind does your family own? (e.g. fiction, magazines, history, comics, travel, biography, science, sport, thrillers, reference……)

Decision-making
What TV do you like to watch? How often? What about radio? What programmes do you like? (Do you listen to music on your own? With family? With friends?) What about

computer games? (Do you play them on your own? With family or friends?) How often do you play computer games? Where do you play?
Do you play any sports? What about music, ballet…? Did you decide to take the classes?

Who decides what you do with your money? Do you save or spend it? What do you spend it on?
How did you and your parent(s) decide who would buy your clothes, shoes, make-up, entertainment…?

Who makes the decisions about your school subjects; what part-time work you do; going out (who with, where, when, for how long); getting a driver's licence; choosing what to watch on television; listening to own music/how loud can you have it; what you will do after finishing high school - what career, lifestyle?

Would you like your parents to be more or less involved in the decisions you make?
(What things do you and your parents agree on? What about disagree? How would your parents try and change your mind if they disagreed with you? Do you ever lose privileges?).

How important is your family to you?
Would you leave home now if you could? Why/why not?
Where do you see yourself in 5 years time in relation to your family? 10 years?
Do you think you're like you're mother or father? Do you *want* to be like them?

What things are you passionate about?

Can you describe a typical family in Japan? Are Japanese families different from families in China or Korea? Are Japanese families like the ones you see in TV ads?
Do you think of your family as typical? In what way, or how is it different?

Cultural values/views
Do you think you have a culture? What is Japanese culture?
How do you understand (what is the meaning of)
  1. *Wa* (harmony)? Can you give some examples from your own life?
  2. Respect? Who do you show respect to? What does this really mean? Can you give examples?
  3. Ancestors? Do you ask your ancestors for help in living your life? When? When you die, do you expect to become an ancestor to the next generations? How important is the family line to you?
  4. Duty? Do you think it will be important for you to look after your parents in their old age? How else do you have duties?

Age categories
What do you think about the legal age restrictions?
(You can buy a lottery ticket at 16 if you are working; consent to sex at 16; be tried in the adult courts at 16, or punished as an adult at 14 for serious crimes; vote at 20; get a credit card whenever you have a bank account; get the minimum adult wage at 20; marry at 16 (female) or 18 (male) with the consent of one parent; buy alcohol at 20; you are officially an "adult" at 20)
Are these restrictions fair? (logical?)

Is it a problem, not being able to drink, vote, or get the minimum wage? Do your parents let you drink at home? Do your parents let you smoke at home?

When do you think people are able to make their own decisions about gambling? Drinking?

Who do you think should pay for you to go to university/polytech etc? (You? Your parents? The government?)

Do you think these age restrictions affect young women in the same way that they do young men? (e.g. do you think that making a decision about having sex is the same for males and females?)

Interactions between young people and adults

Where do young people mix with adults? (Work-mates, employers? Friends' parents? Teachers? Outside activities, e.g. coaches?)

How would you describe your relationship with these people? (Do they treat you as adults? Do you have a joking relationship with any adults? Do you call any adults by their first name? What do your parents ask your friends to call them?)

How much contact do you think adults generally have with young people?

Do you think adults (in general) have an accurate picture of young people?

Adulthood

Do you think of yourself an adult?

Is this based on how adults treat you, or on how you feel? What terms do others most often use to describe you (Young woman/man? High school student? *Judai* generation?)

Are you looking forward to being an adult? What's good/bad about it?

What makes an adult? What characteristics do you associate with people that you consider are already adults? How would you describe these characteristics?

What does being independent mean? Do you think independence is an important part of being adult? Why (Why not)? Is responsibility important? Why (Why not)?

What things do you think are important? Why?

Gender Issues

Do you think that becoming an adult is the same for boys and girls?

Do you think that young men and young women take responsibility in the same way (or for the same things)?

How does being male or female make a difference to how your parents treat you in different situations? Can you give some examples? Are there differences in opportunities or encouragement to take extra activities (eg. music, ballet, sport)? Or in those for taking extra coaching in school subjects? Are there differences in the number of restrictions parents set when you go out? Or in your parents' ideas about your future? E.g., do they want you to focus as much on career training if you are female?

Ideas about roles and marriage

If in future you get married, at what age would you like this to take place?

Would you prefer it to be an arranged marriage or lovematch?

Recently, the number of people who choose single lives on their own rather than marriage is increasing. What do you think about this tendency?

If you decide to marry, what sorts of things would you look for in partner? (What about academic background; profession; income; age; religion; living together or separately from parents; property of parents; family lineage; being first born or not?)

Would you like to have children?

What do you think of a man's doing kitchen work?
What kind of person do you think a man should be?   What about a woman?
In a marriage that has failed (eg. for reasons of infidelity) do you think that divorce should be an option?
If your mother or father died, would you object if the surviving parent remarried?
When your parents die, who do you think should inherit their property?
Should the eldest son look after his parents? Should the family name be continued even if that means adopting a child? Should the tomb of your ancestors be treasured and passed on to posterity?

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

APPENDIX 11

SHIZUOKA YOUNG ADULT INTERVIEW GUIDE
(Used independently of School Survey. Also used by Japanese Interviewer)

Profile sheet asking for basic information: Age, birthplace, parents' birthplace, number and age of siblings, religious observances kept (a household *kamidana/butsudan*? visits to shrines? celebration of *Sichi-go-san* and *O-bon…*?), celebration at 20 years?

Space/Place
Where are you living? (If away from home) How did you find this place? Who organised it? Why did you leave home? How is flatting… different from home? Is it "home"?
Who are you living with? (numbers, genders, occupations… and the impact of this)
How do you organise duties and events? (doing chores e.g. housework, shopping, paying bills, cooking? And activities such as TV watching, friends staying over, parties?)
How much time do you spend there?

Time
When you're not at home, what are you doing? Work? Study? Socialising? (Where?)
Voluntary activities?
How do you organise your time? How is the weekend different from weekdays?
(If away from home) Do you have more freedom compared with living with your parents?
What demands do you have on your time?
How much time do you spend with your parents? Other family members/relatives? What doing?
Who gets you up in morning? Do you impose any curfews on yourself?

Occupation
    a) *Work*
How did you get the job? Would you do it by choice (Or were there no other options)?
Do you enjoy it? Is it important to you?
How does it fit into your future plans?
How does it compare with school?
Does the job bring status? (In relation to friends? Parents?)
    b) *Study*
Why are you studying?
What are your future plans?
Are you working at the same time?
Are you looking forward to getting a full-time job?
What status do you have as a student? (In relation to parents? Friends who work…?)
    c) *Unemployed*
Did you leave school to go on the dole? (Are you unemployed by choice?)
Do you want a job?
What's it like compared to school?
What are your future plans?
Is there a status/stigma attached to being on the dole?

* Did/do your parents have any plans for your future?

Money
What do you do with your money? (Spending? Saving?)
Who do you spend your money on? In what way? (Gifts? Loans…?) Why?
Do you have enough to live on?
How does your financial situation now compare with when you were living with parents?

Remaining ties to parents
a. Financial ties to parents
      Loans, guarantors for loans?
      Insurance, medical bills (surgery, dentist, optometrist…)?
      Paying for study fees?
      Gifts e.g. car, washing machine, clothes, transport?
b. 'Service ties' to parents
      Do they make doctor's, dentist's appointments for you (or urge you to go)?
      Provide transport?
      Lend equipment, car… ?
      Do you ask for advice? Do they try and tell you what to do/interfere? In what
      areas? How do you deal with this?
c. Emotional ties to parents
      How important are your parents to you?
      How important are you to your parents?
      Who usually initiates contact - you or your parents?
      How is your relationship different since you left home (is it different?)
      How does your relationship with your mother compare with that with your father?

Family
Is there anything you notice about your family compared with others you have now seen?
Have any of your siblings left home? Do they have the same relationship (amount of contact) with the family as you have?
Do you feel a part of your family in the same way you did when living with them?
What things do you do with your family? (Meals? Visits? Family traditions?) Is it an effort to keep this contact?
Do you miss any aspects of living with your family? What don't you miss?
How would you describe your role in the family now?
Do you ever go and stay with your parents? How do you find this? Any difficulties, any surprises?
Have you seen any changes in your parents as you get older?

Age categories:
      - can buy a lottery ticket at 18 if you have a job
      - can consent to sex at 16 (approximately - each city decides)
      - can be tried for crime in adult courts at 16, or even be punished as an adult at 14
      - can vote at 20
      - can get a credit card at
      - can get the dole at
      - can get the minimum adult wage at 16 if left school (wage is negotiable, can
          appeal to a committee)
      - can buy alcohol and cigarettes at 20
      - "adult" ceremony at 20
      - can drive a car at 18, a motorbike at 18, a scooter (depends on prefecture) at 16

How relevant were these age categories to your own experience?
Did your parents' ideas about age boundaries match the legal categories?
What do you think about these age restrictions? Are they fair? (Logical?)
Was it a problem, not being able to drink, vote, get the minimum wage, drive with passengers?
When do you think people are able to make their own decisions about gambling? Drinking? Sex?

Do you think these age restrictions affect young women in the same way that they do young men? (e.g. Do you think that making a decision about having sex is the same for males and females? What about being able to drive? Buy alcohol?)

Do you have more freedom now?
What were the restrictions that you experienced? What restrictions do you experience now?

Being adult
Do you think of yourself as an adult? How do you think you have become an adult?
Is independence important?
What do you think are important signs that a person is "grown up"?
What are you responsible for? Do you feel responsible for anyone else beside yourself?
How do you think the way your parents grew up compares to your experience?

Sense of Self
The following identity questions are trying to understand how people think about themselves, and how they understand themselves. E.g., do they think of themselves in terms of values (I try to be honest….)?   Or through relationships (I try to fulfill duties, not offend, and keep harmony)?   Or through pleasing others and doing things that bring pleasure?   Or through status (I am a scientist…)?   Or gender?   Do people think about having "an identity"?   Do they focus more on interests and relations with people?

Do you have a CV? Are you the person on your CV? If you don't have one, how do you think you would present yourself on a CV? (Do people identify with their work/status/jobs?)
How do you identify yourself?
How would you describe yourself to a stranger?
What is the most the most important thing in your life?
Where do you put most of your resources? Where do you put most of your time? (Are these things the most important things in your life?)

If you look back on your teenage years, what skills, confidences have you developed?

What do you think becoming a man/woman involves? What does manhood/womanhood mean (compared with being a child)?
How is growing up, leaving home… different for young men and young women?
Do men and women take on responsibility in the same way, for the same things?

Marriage/future

If in the future you get married, what age would you like this to take place?
If you get married, would you prefer it to be an arranged marriage or a love match?
Recently, the number of young people who prefer to lead single lives on their own, rather than marry, has been increasing. What do you think about this tendency?

If you decide to marry, what special characteristics you would look for in your spouse to be? What about academic background? Profession? Income? Age? Religion?
Do you think you will eventually have children? Why/why not?
What would you do as a parent that would be different from what your parents have done? (Would you do things the same?).
What do you think about a man doing kitchen work?
What kind of person do you think a man should be? What kind of person should a woman be? (e.g., gentle, independent, competitive, hard working…)

In Japan, if a marriage is not successful, a couple may divorce after a long separation if there are no young children. What do you think of this law?
When parents die, who do you think should inherit their property? (Eldest son? Shared among children equally? The person who looked after parents in their old age…?)
If one of your parents died, would you object if the surviving parent remarried?
What do you think about the following:
    - should the eldest son look after his parents?
    - should the family name be continued even if that means adopting a child?
    - should the tomb of your ancestors be treasured and passed on to posterity?

Do you think there is a difference between your generation and the next generation?
How would you describe these differences?

Cultural values/views

How do you understand (what is the meaning of)
1. *Wa* (harmony)? Can you give some examples from your own life?
2. Respect? Who do you show respect to? What does this really mean? Can you give examples?
3. Ancestors? Do you ask your ancestors for help in living your life? When? When you die, do you expect to become an ancestor to the next generations? How important is the family line to you?
4. Duty? Do you think it will be important for you to look after your parents in their old age? Do you have other duties?

Adulthood

What kinds of qualities would you expect to find in an adult? Can you give some examples?
Do these qualities differ for men and women?
What kinds of qualities do you not admire in adult men? What about in adult women?

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

SHIZUOKA PARENT INTERVIEW GUIDE
(Used independently of School Survey)

Profile sheet asking for basic information: Age, birthplace, parents' birthplace, number and age of siblings, religious observances kept (a household *kamidana/butsudan*?; visits to shrines?; celebration of *Sichi-go-san* and *O-bon...*?), celebration at 20 years?

Household composition and roles
Who make up your family? Are all members currently living in one household? Does job mobility affect where people in your family live? How do your current household circumstances compare with those when you were growing up?
What keeps your family together? What kind of activities do your family members do together? How often? Do you celebrate *O-bon*?
What are the responsibilities of family members? Are husband and wife roles determined by gender? Is work in the kitchen shared? Is the wife responsible for housework? How do work hours and responsibilities affect roles?
Who is the head of the household? Is the household head responsible to ancestors, or is the family unit autonomous (post-war abolition of legal status of head of household)? How do you perceive "family"?

Education
Do you think higher social status is attached to college/university education? Is such ranking important? What educational achievements would you like your children to acquire?
In relation to social ranking, what are general attitudes to ethnic groups? Nationalities? Educational background? Religion…?

Raising Children
Do you have a sense of mission in raising your children? Do you attempt to repeat the pattern of your own upbringing? Do you adjust to fit in with changing times? In what ways? What of *shitsuke* relationships and ideas of a "right way" to behave?
Of the following values - what do you think are the three most important for your children to learn? Why? Are the same values important for boys and girls?

1. obedience   3. leadership   5. responsibility   7. honesty   9. empathy
2. harmony   4. capability   6. success   8. judgement   10. challenging spirit

How "group oriented" are you children? Do they assume more self-direction than in the past? Does conformity with others remain important? Do they speak up and assert themselves more than you did in the past? Do they show respect to seniors as much as you did in the past? Do they use respect terms of address?

Do young people have more freedom when they have access to their own money? Do you think they become more independent? Do your own children have access to more money of their own than you did in the past? Do they have pocket money? Do they have other sources of income? Part-time jobs? Do they save or spend their money? What kinds of things do they spend their money on? How do you decide who is responsible for buying which items?

Interactions with Young People
Where do you meet with young people? Do you want to get to know your children's friends? Do young people confide in you about their problems? Do you think adults today have an accurate picture of the young? Are they familiar with what young people think?

How do you make decisions with your children about controversial issues, such as curfews, or time spent with friends? What about legal age restrictions - are there problems with such things as smoking or drinking? How are these issues negotiated?

Leaving home
Why do young people leave home? What kinds of ties remain with parents? What about loans, insurance, medical payments? The use of a car…? Service ties? Emotional ties?

How long do you consider yourself to be responsible for your children? Until age 20? Until they get a job? Until they marry? Until they have children? Always?

Future roles
Do you expect your children will marry? How do young people meet a partner? Would you try to arrange a marriage for your children?
What kinds of qualities do you think are important for them to look for in a spouse? E.g., academic qualifications? The profession? Income? Age? Religion? Parents' property? Lineage? After marriage, would you prefer your children to live in a nuclear or extended family? What if they choose to remain single?
If your children marry and have children, would you be willing to help by minding your grandchildren? What if both spouses want to work? Would you help them so they could save to buy a house/apartment?
(Attitudes to divorce, death and remarriage, care of parents by children?)

General topics
Some newspaper articles suggest that Japan faces youth problems, such as bullying in schools, school avoidance… , and is losing direction. Would you agree with this assessment? Do you consider the problems minor or major? Are they bridgeable, or will there be major change in society? How do you see the future?

How do you understand "being adult"? When is a person "grown up"? What are the signs of being "adult"? What qualities are associated with being adult? Are they different for men and women? What qualities do you admire in men and women?
Is being an adult citizen (from age twenty) and "being adult" the same thing? Do legal rights erode mature/moral values of adulthood? What *are* the moral values associated with "being adult"? Is there a "right way" that people should spontaneously observe when relating to others? Is competence a measure of adulthood? In what ways? What do you understand by "being independent"?
(Discuss issues of age, equality, and citizenship versus relationships and roles; concepts of duty and obligation.)

What makes the sense of self in a person? How do you identify? How would you describe yourself to a stranger?

Thank you very much for your cooperation.