

Educational Perspectives

Journal of the College of Education / University of Hawai'i at Mānoa



Issues in
Asian American
Education

Volume 40 ♦ Number 1 ♦ 2007

Educational Perspectives

Journal of the College of Education/University of Hawai'i at Mānoa

C O N T E N T S

Interim Dean Donald B. Young
Editor Hunter McEwan
Managing Editor Lori Ward
Graphic Designer Darrell Asato

College Of Education Editorial Board
Linda Johnsrud, Professor
Kathryn Au, Professor
Curtis Ho, Associate Professor
Mary Jo Noonan, Professor
Robert Potter, Professor Emeritus
COEDSA President

The Journal and the College of Education assume no responsibility for the opinion or facts in signed articles, except to the extent of expressing the view, by the fact of publication, that the subject matter is one which merits attention.

Published twice each year by the College of Education,
University of Hawai'i at Mānoa
Individual copies \$25.00
To purchase single copies of this issue contact
Marketing and Publication Services,
Curriculum & Research Development Group
Phone: 800-799-8111 (toll-free), 808-956-4969
Fax: 808-956-6730
Email: crdg@hawaii.edu

Address all communications regarding single copies, subscriptions, manuscripts, and correspondence about editorial material to Editor, Educational Perspectives, College of Education, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Wist Hall Room 113, 1776 University Avenue, Honolulu, HI 96822

Copyright 2006 by the College of Education,
University of Hawai'i at Mānoa

This publication is available in microform from
Bell & Howell, 300 N. Zeeb Road,
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106
and in pdf format at www.hawaii.edu/edper/

International Standard Serial Number
(ISSN) 0013-1849

- 3 **Teaching for Tolerance and Understanding During the Japanese Internment: Lessons for Educators Today**
by Cherry A. McGee Banks
- 7 **Lessons from China and Japan for Preschool Practice in the United States**
by Yi Che, Akiko Hayashi, and Joseph Tobin
- 13 **Between "What I Am" and "What I Am Not": Asians and Asian Americans in Contention and Conversation**
by Heekyong Teresa Pyon, Yan Cao, and Huey-li Li
- 19 **Voices of Sensei: Oral Histories of Japanese American Women Teachers, 1950–2000**
by Julie Kang
- 24 **Developing Curriculum Materials on East Asia for Secondary School Students**
by Linda K. Menton
- 31 **Language and Cultural Maintenance of Hawai'i-born Nisei**
by Hiromi Yoshida
- 36 **The US Occupation and Japan's New Democracy**
by Ruriko Kumano
- 44 **Metaphor and Metonymy in English Language Program Curriculum Discourse in Hawai'i: Towards an Ecological Approach**
by Brian Rugen and Neil Johnson
- 52 **The Impact of Life Stages on Parent-child Relationships: A Comparative Look at Japanese & American University Students**
by Yoshimitsu Takei, Tokio Honda, and Sheau-Hue Shieh
-

Volume 40 ❖ Number 1 ❖ 2007

*Cover layout by Joy Hakoda
Cover photo by Hunter McEwan*

Contributers

Cherry A. McGee Banks

University of Washington, Bothell

Yi Che

Arizona State University

Akiko Hayashi

Arizona State University

Joseph Tobin

Arizona State University

Yan Cao

University of Tennessee

Heekyong Pyon

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Huey-li Li

University of Akron, Ohio

Julie Kang

University of Washington, Seattle

Linda Menton

University of Hawai'i at Mānoa

Hiromi Yoshida

Waseda University, Japan

Ruriko Kumano

University of Hawai'i at Mānoa

Brian Rugen

University of Hawai'i at Mānoa

Neil Johnson

University of Arizona

Yohimitsu Takei

University of Hawai'i at Mānoa

Tokio Honda

Bunkyo University, Japan

Sheau-Hue Shieh

National Chung-Hsing University, Taiwan

Teaching for Tolerance and Understanding During the Japanese Internment: Lessons for Educators Today¹

by *Cherry A. McGee Banks*

There was thunderous applause and shouts of approval as Mary Koura stepped forward to receive her high school diploma. She was an honor student, who had been an active member of the school community throughout her four years at Mount Vernon High School. She was the yearbook editor, a member of the school orchestra, and a class officer during her sophomore, junior, and senior years.

For most students, receiving their high school diploma is a new beginning. This was not the case for Mary Koura who was 68 years old. According to her, receiving her diploma was something she thought would never happen. Japanese American students who were scheduled to graduate from high school on the West Coast of the United State in 1942 were not allowed to participate in their schools' graduation ceremonies.

Following the Japanese attack on the US naval base at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, the nation was thrown into a state of fear and hysteria. While there was no evidence that persons of Japanese descent in the United States were involved in sabotage and espionage, there was concern that the Pacific coast could soon be under attack. Responding to those and other concerns, President Roosevelt issued Executive Order No. 9066 on February 19, 1942. Executive Order 9066 resulted in more than 120,000 persons of Japanese ancestry being either interned in relocation centers, drafted, or imprisoned.

By the time their graduation day arrived, Mary Koura and numerous other students of Japanese descent had been interned. Many of the students received their high school diplomas at informal ceremonies organized by their parents in their internment camps. But being excluded from her actual high school graduation ceremony haunted Mary Koura for the next fifty years.

In 1992, John Summers, a teacher at Mount Vernon High School told his students about Mary Koura. After learning about her story, the students insisted that she be invited to march at their graduation. Mary Koura's first reaction was concern that her presence might detract from the seniors' "big day." However, after being assured that this was what the seniors wanted, she agreed to go back to Mount Vernon and take part in the high school graduation ceremonies.

By participating in the graduating ceremony, Mary Koura taught the graduating seniors at Mount Vernon High School a valuable lesson about democracy and diversity. She taught them that the past is linked to the present and that people who were not viewed as an integral part of a nation's identity at one time could at another time be viewed as a unifying element of a school and community's identity. By inviting Mary Koura to participate in

their graduation ceremony, the students at Mount Vernon High School were in essence grappling with the tension between unity and diversity and taking action to reduce it. The action that the students took gave them an opportunity to demonstrate their willingness and understanding of their responsibility to be engaged citizens in a pluralistic democratic society.

The lessons that Mount Vernon High School students learned in 1992 about democracy and diversity are lessons that were missing from the school curriculum in 1942. Instead of critiquing Executive Order 9066 and engaging their fellow citizens in discussions that could highlight how and why the executive order undercut democratic values and institutions, most Americans responded to the executive order with a combination of fear, greed, silence, and uncritical acceptance.

Bainbridge Island, located near Seattle in Washington, was the first place in the United States from which the evacuation of people of Japanese descent occurred. There were about 227 people of Japanese descent on Bainbridge Island in 1942. About two thirds of the group were born in the United States and were US citizens. Of the remaining third, most were Japanese immigrants who had lived in the United States for over 30 years (Kitamota, 2002). Sadayoshi Omoto was born on Bainbridge Island and graduated from Bainbridge High School where he was class president in 1941. On March 30, 1942, as Sadayoshi Omoto waited to be taken to an internment camp he questioned the meaning of lessons about democracy, tolerance, and brotherhood, that he had been taught in his civics class. He wondered why these ideas about freedom, justice, and equality could be so disconnected from the reality of what was happening. Omoto reflected, "Only a day previous we were friends and classmates and now we were the enemy. Did President Roosevelt have the right to deny my Nisei classmates and me those rights guaranteed to all citizens?" (Omoto, 2001, p. 2).

Gena Clinton Ritchie, a student who lived on Bainbridge Island went to the ferry dock to say goodbye to her classmates. She described that day in a poem entitled "The Saddest Day of My Life." With the signing of Executive Order 9066, according to Ritchie, people who had been friends since first grade were transformed into "the Japs" (Banks, 2005). Frank Kitamoto was also at the ferry dock that fateful day in 1942. He thought about how the democratic values that he had been taught clashed with the reality that he and his friends and family members experienced when they were interned. He said, "As we marched down this road, we were in shock, [and] disbelief. We didn't know where we were going, we didn't know how long we would be away, we didn't know if we would ever come back. Heads of families had already

been taken away. It fell to the Nisei, all in their 20s to make family decisions. The tough New Jersey soldiers with their rifles, fixed bayonets, and funny sounding accents were carrying luggage for women, [and] carrying children. The soldiers had tears in their eyes that rolled down their cheeks” (Kitamoto, 2002, p. 1). Like Omoto, Kitamoto, and Ritchie, the young soldiers’ civics classes had also not prepared them for Executive Order 9066 and the day that, as soldiers in the US Army, they would be ordered to force US citizens from their homes.

The recollections of people who were witness to that tragic day on Bainbridge Island point out the extent to which the demands of balancing unity and diversity is a complex undertaking. In communities throughout the Western part of the United States, lessons about democracy, tolerance, and brotherhood were mediated by the reality of the Japanese internment. Students could not ignore the empty seats in their classrooms that only weeks before had been filled by Japanese American students. The empty seats carried a powerful though unspoken message about the fragility of democratic principles and values in the face of politically legitimized prejudice and intolerance.

Mixed Messages to Students and Teachers

The internment of Japanese Americans during World War II at the same time that students were being taught about democracy, intolerance, and brotherhood is an example of the mixed messages that were given to students and teachers. Students in the Seattle School district, like students throughout the western part of the United States, had to grapple with those mixed messages.

Some Seattle educators were concerned about the negative attitudes that were being expressed toward Japanese Americans and encouraged their colleagues to maintain a tolerant attitude towards them and to encourage their students also to remain tolerant. Teachers at Washington Elementary School, under the leadership of their principal A. G. Sears, accepted that challenge and began to prepare their students for the day when the Japanese American students in their classes would be taken away. Washington Elementary School had a very multiethnic student body. It included David Foy, who was born in Canton, China; Michael Sidermann who was from Hamburg, Germany; and Judith Kahin, a Rabbi’s daughter from Munich, Germany. Thirty-three percent of the students at the school were Japanese Americans.

To prepare their students for what was coming, teachers asked their students to write compositions about how they felt about the Japanese evacuation. The students who were not Japanese American expressed regret about losing their friends and talked about how studious, punctual, and cooperative they had been. They also mentioned how their Japanese American classmates had served on the Seattle Junior Safety Patrol, made contributions to the American Red Cross and the Junior Red Cross, and participated in the War Bond Campaign and the Conservation Waste Paper, Tinfoil, and Metal Tube Drives. Japanese American students also wrote compositions. One student wrote about how hard it would be for her to leave the trees in her yard. Her grandfather had planted them in

1893. Another Japanese American student ended her composition with a prayer which read, “Please keep my family together for the duration, and then make it possible for me to come back to my school, my home, and my friends” (Mortenson, 1942, p. 7).

With people of Japanese descent interned and the nation at war, civics education in many schools throughout the country became a subject in which patriotism was equated with blind support for the United States and the demonization of America’s enemies. However, even during this time of great unrest and fear, there were educators who worked to reduce intergroup tensions and speak out against undemocratic actions. They continued to believe that schools could make a difference and that schools were one of the few places where young people could be taught to think critically and learn to distinguish fact from opinion and propaganda. Working with John E. Wade, the superintendent of schools in New York City, a number of “intergroup educators” composed of teachers, scholars, and social activists planned and implemented curricula to reduce prejudice. Commenting on the need for such curriculum, Wade said,

No longer can we afford to ignore or minimize the danger that will inevitably follow if prejudice is allowed to spread unchecked. Enemies of democracy at home and abroad neither minimize nor ignore it, but utilize every opportunity to widen the gap that exists between the racial, religious, and nationality groups in American life. Let us learn to bridge the gaps between groups and in so doing defeat the enemy and strengthen democracy. (Covello, 50/4)

The National Education Association (NEA), which had over 775,000 members at that time, maintained a similar position. They argued that schools should not teach students to hate the enemy. In a policy statement entitled “What the Schools should Teach in Wartime,” the NEA took the following stand.

We shall not attempt to state whether it is either desirable or necessary for a soldier in combat to be motivated by hatred and revenge. However, if such emotions are in fact necessary or desirable for soldiers, we believe their cultivation is a responsibility that should be assumed by the Army rather than by the schools. We especially deplore the cultivation of such traits among the younger children and others who are not likely to see military service. The spiritual casualties of war will be great enough and lasting enough without any help from the teaching profession. (Covello 50/4, MSS 40)

The war years were particularly challenging for educators who understood the irony of fighting Nazism abroad and addressing racial tensions at home.

Democracy and Diversity in the 21st Century

The issues and groups have changed since World War II, but educators today continue to face the challenge of helping students

understand and develop the skills, knowledge, and habits of heart to be effective citizens in pluralistic democratic society. Balancing unity and diversity is a critical component of that challenge. Gandhi captured the essence of that challenge when he said, “The ability to reach unity in diversity will be the beauty and the test of our civilization” (Banks et. al, 2006).

From a historical perspective we know that it is possible to achieve unity without paying close attention to diversity. Achieving national unity had primacy during the war years. Unity was emphasized to the exclusion of diversity. People were encouraged to believe that loyalty to the nation, meant that you had to be 100% American. Ethnic, language, religious, and other differences were viewed with suspicion. While this kind of perspective may have given the illusion of unity, diversity didn't disappear. Both unity and diversity are important. Masking important elements of diversity is problematic. James A. Banks (2006) argues that unity without diversity results in hegemony and oppression, while diversity without unity leads to Balkanization and the fracturing of the commonwealth, which alone can secure human rights, equality, and justice. In pluralistic-democratic societies, it is important for young people to grapple with the idea of balancing unity and diversity because it will be a critical part of their ability to create nation-states that recognize and incorporate the diversity of their citizens and provide opportunities for diverse populations to embrace an overarching set of shared values, ideals, and goals to which all citizens are committed. Yet balancing unity and diversity is not a simple matter.

Unity and diversity are complex ideas that have multiple, contested, and often transitory meanings. Readers may wish to refer to *Democracy and Diversity*, a publication produced by the Center for Multicultural Education at the University of Washington in Seattle, for useful background information on the themes of unity and diversity, and to learn about other key concepts that can be used in civics, social studies, and other citizenship education classes to help students understand the complexity of citizenship in a pluralistic democratic nation-state. In *Democracy and Diversity* unity is defined in terms of the common bonds that are essential to the functioning of the nation-state. Diversity is defined as the internal differences within all nation-states that reflect variations in factors such as race, class, ethnicity, religion, language, gender, disability, and sexual orientation.

Once one understands how unity and diversity can be defined it is easy to see why they are in tension. That tension is one of the reasons that the task of balancing unity and diversity is so complex. The tension between unity and diversity can most easily be seen in the conflict between appreciating diversity and the longing for unity. It is not uncommon for people to voice verbal support for diversity and to make positive comments about the contributions that members of different ethnic and racial groups have made to their society. People are generally very comfortable talking about women being able to fully participate in all avenues of our society. People are also very proud of the historic roots of religious freedom in the US. Popular television programs feature women and minori-

ties in leadership roles and characters who are gay. These are all examples that can be used to illustrate the extent to which diversity is accepted and appreciated in the United States. It is important to note, however, that these and similar examples have one thing in common. They allow people to appreciate diversity at a distance and often in the abstract. For many people diversity is much more difficult to live with on a daily basis—in their jobs, in their neighborhoods, and at school—than it is to talk about. Efforts to insure diversity in our institutions such as affirmative action and school bussing have been consistently and rigidly opposed. Our inability as a society to link our “talk” and our “walk” with respect to unity and diversity is a powerful example of the inability of some people to negotiate the tension between unity and diversity. This tension will only increase as the issues of diversity demand more from us.

As economic, linguistic, religious, racial, ethnic, and other variables in human diversity increase, the gap between our willingness to struggle with the difficult questions and issues involved in trying to balance unity and diversity will become even wider. The global flow of ideas, workers, executives, students, products, and services and the influence of powerful governments increasingly are giving rise to issues related to unity and diversity both globally and within nation-states. Continuous advances in transportation and communication mean that questions of diversity are likely to occur with increased frequency in the future. The United States, for example, is experiencing its highest level of immigration since the turn of the twentieth century. The number of US immigrants from 1991 to 1999 was almost identical to the number of immigrants who arrived in the US from 1901 to 1910. A major difference between the two groups of immigrants is that at the beginning of the twentieth century US immigrants were primarily from Italy, Russia, and other European nations. However, at the end of the century they came primarily from the Caribbean, Central America, South America, Mexico, and Asian nations such as China, India, and the Philippines. Policies and newly created laws related to immigration, such as building a 700-mile fence on the border between the US and Mexico with individuals who patrol the border to prevent Mexicans from illegally crossing into the United States, are not helping to resolve the tension between the appreciation of diversity and the longing for unity.

The tension between unity and diversity can, to some extent, be reduced when there is a clear, constant, and well-articulated commitment to democratic values such as *human rights*, *justice*, and *equality* by authorities such as parents, teachers, and school administrators as well as civic and political leaders. Such a commitment can serve as an on-going reminder of the overarching values that unify the nation, help secure the liberties of cultural, ethnic, language, and religious groups, and enable people from diverse groups to experience freedom, justice, and peace. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights states that “recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice, and peace in the world.” This powerful statement calls attention to the importance of both unity and diversity.

During the Japanese internment, there were very few individuals who spoke out in support of freedom, justice, equality, and human rights for their fellow citizens of Japanese descent. This occurred for many reasons. However, if more schools like Washington Elementary School taught students to see individuals who were defined as “the enemy” as fellow human beings, it would be a good beginning. The perspectives about democratic values that were taught in 1942 to students at Washington Elementary School amounted to a small step in one community to create an informed citizenry. By building on those ideas, teachers today can help students develop a deep appreciation of and a commitment to American Creed values and human rights. Walter Parker (Banks, et al., 2006) argues that “Citizens who understand the tension between unity and diversity and who have the skills and knowledge to act accordingly do not materialize from thin air; they are educated for it.”

Schools have an important role to play in helping to resolve the tension between unity and diversity. Teachers can help students understand that the American Creed values of freedom, justice, and equality are often pitted against other important cultural values and goals related to economic and physical security. Giving students the opportunity to grapple with real questions and issues that give prominence to the tension between diversity and unity can help them understand that there are no easy answers and that while they may not find immediate solutions they can help create an environment where the issues can continue to be explored and ultimately resolved. The issues that students grapple with can be local or national, and they can be historical or contemporary. Students can also engage in comparative analysis of those same issues by looking at how they are framed and addressed or not addressed in different nation-states. Students can investigate the meaning of concepts such as tolerance, justice, equality, respect, democracy, inclusion, human rights, race, patriotism, cosmopolitanism, democracy, and security. In doing so, they can raise questions about why the concepts were constructed and the various meanings associated with them. They can also investigate how different groups in society respond to the concepts. People of Japanese descent who were interned may have a very different understanding of how concepts such as evacuation, justice, and security were applied in World War II than people who supported Executive Order 9066. A somewhat similar current issue that illustrates the fundamental difference in perspective between people is the 700-mile fence that is being built on the US Mexican border. Many Anglos living in the US near the fence believe it will reduce illegal immigration and increase their security. Mexicans living on the other side of the border will tend to agree with Mexican president Vicente Fox who denounces the fence, saying it could make the border less secure. Understanding how concepts are used and the meanings that different groups attribute to them is important. Issues that divide our society can be difficult to understand when they are cloaked in terms that mystify and officiate important elements of the issue. It is hard to resolve an issue when you never get to discuss its most important elements.

The US population has surpassed the 300 million mark making it the third nation after China and India to reach that number. This

growth in population will have the effect of making diversity an even more a salient characteristic of U.S society in the future than it is today. In addition to increasing racial and ethnic diversity, demographers also project there will be a decline in household size, an increase in the number of women in the labor force, a larger number of people who speak a language other than English, and rising rates of child poverty (Smith, 2006). The changing demographic profile of the US population makes learning to balance unity and diversity less of an option and more of an imperative. The students at Mount Vernon High School illustrate that such learning is possible. By learning from history, recognizing the ways in which elements of history continue to be present in contemporary society, and taking action to right an old wrong, they gave us a glimpse of how schools can educate students who understand the unity-diversity tension and act accordingly.

REFERENCES

- Banks, C. A. M. (2005). *Improving multicultural education. Lessons from the intergroup education movement*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Banks, J. A., Banks, C. A. M., Cortés, C. E., Hahn, C., Merryfield, M., Moodley, K., Osler, A., Murphy-Shigematsu, S., & Parker, W. C. (2006). *Democracy and diversity: Principles and concepts for educating students in a global age*. Seattle: Center for Multicultural Education.
- Covello, L. Covello Archives. Balch Center Institute Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- Smith, R. (2006). *Population Mark Underscores Change, Diversity*. [Electronic version]. Retrieved October 31, 2006, <http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=6278278>
- Kitamoto, F. (2002). Speech given on the occasion of the Nikkei Internment and Exclusion Memorial and Dedication Ceremony. Bainbridge Island, Washington. Archival Papers of Carol Kubota.
- Omoto, S. (2001, September 1). Comments on Executive Order 9066. Archival Papers of Carol Kubota.
- Mortenson, M. C. (1942). War and the children. *Seattle Principals Exchange*, 6 (7), 7.

ENDNOTES

- ¹ The article is adapted from and includes excerpts from, *Improving Multicultural Education: Lessons From the Intergroup Education Movement*.

Lessons from China and Japan for Preschool Practice in the United States

by Yi Che, Akiko Hayashi, and Joseph Tobin

For the past six years we have been working together on a major study of early childhood education in China, Japan, and the United States. This study, “Continuity and Change in Preschools in Three Cultures,” is a sequel to *Preschools in Three Cultures*, a book by Joseph Tobin, David Wu, and Dana Davidson that was published in 1989. In the new study, as in the original one, we have found major differences in how these three countries approach the education and care of young children. In this paper we present examples of preschool practices from China and Japan that we suggest can be used to improve early childhood education in the US. We call these examples lessons for the US, but we are not suggesting that American early childhood educators should copy these approaches. It rarely works to take an educational practice from one context and stick it into another without adapting it. Our belief is that understanding how educators in other cultures handle familiar educational situations in different ways can improve our practice by challenging assumptions that are often taken for granted and expand our thinking about what is possible and desirable to do with young children in preschools.

The method of the *Preschool in Three Cultures* studies is straightforward: we shoot videotape of typical days in preschool classrooms in three countries, edit these videos down to twenty minutes, and then show the videos to the classroom teachers where the video was made, asking them to explain the thinking behind their practices. We then show the video we made, for example, in Kyoto to early childhood educators in other cities in Japan, and then in China and the US. Each showing of the videotapes is followed by a focus-group discussion, in which we ask teachers to reflect on what they like and don't like about the approaches seen in the video and why.

In this paper we present three examples from China and three from Japan of practices in preschool classrooms that differ from American notions of best practice. The practices we discuss include approaches to dealing with fighting, self-esteem, mixed-age play, fantasy play (including policeman armed with toy guns), and the use of materials and toys in the classroom.

China

We present three scenes from a day we videotaped at Sinan Road Kindergarten in Shanghai:

Giving and Accepting Critical Feedback

After lunch the twenty-two four-year olds gather on the floor for a story-telling activity named “Story King.” One boy, Ziyu, stands in front of his classmates and tells them a rambling story about some animals and a strange noise from a pond. After Ziyu finishes his story, one of the two classroom teachers, Ms. Wang,

asks the children questions about what they heard, and she makes some comments on the descriptive words Ziyu used in his story. Ms. Wang then asks the class whether Ziyu should be given the title of “Story King.” Some children call out “yes,” others “no.” The children then vote by raising their hands, with eighteen of twenty-two children voting yes. “Great. We'll make him the Story King today,” says Ms. Wang. “However, some children didn't raise their hands. Let's hear what they have to say.” A child remarks, “Some words I could hear, but some I couldn't.” “I don't think his voice was loud enough,” says another child. Ms. Wang turns to Ziyu and asks if he agrees with the critiques and he nods in agreement. Ms. Wang then says, “Next time, he will be loud and clear.” The lesson ends with Ziyu selecting the next day's storyteller.

What Americans find most striking about this scene is the teacher's encouragement of children giving critical feedback to a peer. Early childhood educators in the US emphasize protecting and promoting children's self-esteem, believing that it is essential to create a positive and supportive atmosphere in the classroom and to avoid situations in which children are subjected to criticism. Most American preschool teachers do not correct children's mistakes, especially during such “self-expressive” activities as painting, story telling, and dramatic play. In the language of the guidelines of the National Association for the Education of Young Children, it would be developmentally inappropriate for a teacher to put a child “on the spot” by subjecting him to peer criticism, as we see in this Story King activity. After watching the Chinese preschool video, some American teachers were disturbed and made comments like “I didn't like letting the children critique each other,” “They seemed kind of young for that kind of thing,” and “I'm amazed how well that boy handled the criticism. I'm an adult and I think I would cry if people criticized me like that in front of a group!”

When our research team went back to Sinan Road preschool to show the two classroom teachers the edited version of the videotape, we asked them to explain more about the genesis and goal of Story King activity. Teacher Wang went first:

People may think that four-year-olds are not capable of giving criticism. So when we first started the Story King activity, one child each day would just tell a story and the others would just listen. But there were several children who couldn't help but comment on what they liked and didn't like about their classmates' stories. Gradually, more children got involved, and we let them express their opinions. I often found the children's critical comments to be unexpectedly accurate.

We followed up by asking, “Are you at all concerned about the activity hurting children’s feelings or lowering their self-esteem?” Ms. Chen replied,

In our class, it’s very unlikely to happen that way. We’re now into the second time going around the class. Everyone has had a turn and so far none of the children have expressed or shown any discomfort. They learn from each other. If one child sees that the previous story teller made a mistake such as saying ‘and then, and then’ throughout his story, she will be careful to not make this mistake when it is her turn. She will try her best to tell her story more smoothly.

Ms. Chen emphasized how criticism from peers can work to improve children’s ability and performance. As some of the American teachers who watched the video also pointed out, those children’s comments were “constructive criticisms” that were on topic, fair, said matter-of-factly, and therefore not likely to be detrimental to children’s self-esteem. As Ms. Wang pointed out, the idea of offering critical feedback came originally from the children themselves and for the most part the comments were accurate, so that the story tellers took their classmates critiques as well-intended constructive advice. Many American teachers, although disturbed by the criticism, were impressed by the “language development aspect of [this activity]” and the fact that those children “were so able to clearly explain themselves” with “a lot more logic than I expected.”

The Chinese teachers’ comments suggest that young children’s self-esteem may not be as fragile as US educators assume. This perspective can serve as a constructive criticism for American educators, and push them to consider that rather than giving empty praise and avoiding any critique of their young students’ performance, teachers ought to encourage children to think critically and react to critique undefensively. Young children can be encouraged to listen to their classmates’ feedback, even if it is not all complimentary. Teachers can help young children develop true self-esteem not by being praised, but by accomplishing things and improving through a process of giving and accepting critical feedback. Consistent with the Chinese approach, some American educational researchers have viewed self-esteem as an outcome rather than a cause of successful performance (Twenge, 2006). Merely boosting children’s self-esteem does not lead to improved school performance. Instead, good school performance leads to higher self-esteem (Baumeister, 2005; Seligman, 1996). Self-esteem built on empty praise is an illusion that can easily be shattered. Chinese educators suggest that it is better to push young children to develop their full potential so that more robust self-esteem, based on actual accomplishments and abilities, can develop.

Avoiding Conflict

At 10 a.m., Ms. Chen leads a group of children to play outside. After a while, one boy, Keke, comes up to Ms. Chen, asking for help because his play partner, Ziyu, has refused to play ball with him. Ms. Chen turns to Ziyu and says, “Keke wants to play with

you. Why don’t you want to play with him?” Ziyu answers, grumpily, “He kept snatching my ball and when I fell down, he laughed at me.” “No, I didn’t laugh at him. Never!” Keke retorts. Ms. Chen repeats Keke’s words to Ziyu, but Ziyu, not satisfied, insists that Keke had laughed at him, “I’ve remembered that in my head.” Ms. Chen replied, “Then, have you forgotten it? Forget it and you will be OK.” She turns back to Keke, “Okay, he seems to need a little while to forget. While you wait for him to forget, can you play with me for a bit?” Ms. Chen plays with the ball with Keke for few minutes. Then she suggests to Keke that he invite Ziyu to play again.

Some American teachers who watched the video criticized the teacher for failing to address not only the conflict but also the children’s feelings. As one teacher from Tennessee commented, “She didn’t go to bat for [the boy who thought his friend was laughing at him] at all. It was ‘No, you’re fine’.” Generally, American early childhood educators favor an approach to dealing with children’s disagreements in which they mediate, urging first one and then the other to express their feelings in words and to negotiate a solution.

We wondered how Ms. Chen would explain her approach to dealing with the boys’ conflict and secondly what other Chinese early childhood educators who watched the videotape would say about Ms. Chen’s approach. When we asked her, “Is this your usual way of dealing with children’s conflicts?” Ms. Chen responded, “Usually that’s how children’s conflicts go.” To interpret Ms. Chen’s short, limited, and incomplete response, we need to pay attention not only to what she says but also to how she says it and to the things she leaves out of her response. Of all the activities captured on our videotape, Ms. Chen regarded this conflict as among the least significant. Her response suggests that she tries to ignore or downplay such conflicts among children and instead to emphasize the value of harmonious relationships. To fully understand her perspective, we need to see it in the context of Chinese culture and society.

Scholars evoke Confucianism to argue that valued Chinese social practices such as filial piety, friendship, and superior-subordinate relationships are key components of social harmony (Hsu, 1981; Ho, 1994; Yang, 1997). From this perspective, maintaining social harmony becomes an essential task of child socialization and interpersonal conflicts are to be avoided. Teachers strive to avoid interpersonal conflicts by downplaying them. Unlike American early childhood educators, they generally do not view such conflicts as “teachable moments.” Chinese teachers discourage children’s conflicts by treating arguments and fights as “trivial” and “insignificant” behaviors where no one is right or wrong. What matters is to teach children how to get along with each other, “to be friendly to people,” and “to love their parents, their teacher and peers, their hometown, and their motherland” (as stated explicitly in the 2001’s Chinese Governmental Guidelines for Preschool Education). In this approach, compromise solutions are preferred to judgments on behalf of either side, and angry emotions and bad feelings are ignored, or, more precisely, discouraged by being ignored.

Ms. Chen’s approach to dealing with children’s conflicts was endorsed by Professor Zhu from East China Normal University.

After watching how Ms. Chen dealt with the two boys, Prof. Zhu paused the video and commented

There was a conflict between two children. It is not necessary to argue about who is right and who is wrong in such conflicts. Everyone should concede a little bit. Then there's nothing serious if you forgive it. That's how things happen between human beings. If you insist to find out the reasons, the right and wrong ones, you can't find anything out in the end. So I like how the teacher dealt with this situation. She ignored the conflict and redirected it.

Finding out who is right and who is wrong in any interpersonal conflict emphasizes black and white thinking, lacks moral complexity, and risks making a big deal out of small things. Do American educators have too much faith in the positive effects of confrontation between people and the expression of heated feelings?

Playing Policemen

After lunch, children arrange the classroom for dramatic play. With some help from the teachers, they rearrange tables and take props out of boxes to create centers such as a hospital, a MacDonald's, and a hair salon. In the hallway, two boys play policemen with police caps on their heads and toy pistols in their hands. Several minutes into this extended dramatic play activity, one of the policemen is called to the hair salon to deal with a dispute between the hair stylist and the hair washer. The hair washer is crying because the stylist did not let her comb the customer's hair and then squeezed her wrist when they were struggling for the control of the comb. The policeman decides to fetch his partner, who comes over and asks the hair salon employees about what has transpired. He then commands the hair stylist, "Give her the comb, or we will arrest you." Although the tension is still high, the two policemen seem satisfied that they have gotten their message across and they compare guns as they leave the hair salon.

Although generally impressed by the complexity of these children's dramatic play, many of the US educators who watched our video expressed surprise and disapproval of the presence of the toy guns in the classroom. In US preschools, worried that play with guns in childhood will make violence more likely in later life, teachers tell children that guns hurt people and that even pretend guns (including pointed fingers and banana and Lego guns) are not allowed at school.

Why are Chinese teachers not concerned with children's gun play? When we told Ms. Chen and Ms. Wang about the American concern and asked them why they allow toy guns, Ms. Wang replied, "It seems, for the children, that carrying guns is just like playing with any other toys. It's a prop for the policeman. They are fighting with bad guys and they feel proud of their role." Ms. Chen added, "Boys, especially, like toy guns. They know the guns are not real. They are just toys." After pondering for a few more seconds, Ms. Chen spoke up again, "In Chinese society, there's no place they can get real guns after they grow up."

Ms. Chen's final comment reveals an irony. In China, children can play with toy guns but adults (other than the army and police) are prohibited from possessing real guns. In the US, children in preschools are not allowed to play with toy guns but adults have easy access to real guns in the real world! Apparently, it is not the toy guns per se that makes American parents and teachers nervous and scared; it is the larger social context in which we live. Is the banning of children's toy gun play an overreaction to real world violence? As Sutton-Smith (1988) and other play researchers have found in their research, young children do indeed know the difference between pretend and real aggression. On the other hand, adults are generally more likely to feel anxiety when we see our children having fun with something that we deplore (Jones, 2002).

In his book *Killing Monsters*, Gerard Jones calls for a more benign view of make-believe aggression, which he views as an essential tool for children to work out their fears and frustrations and to feel powerful in a scary and uncontrollable world, and he appeals to us "to look beyond our adult expectations and interpretations and see them through our children's eyes" (Jones, 2002). We suggest that the Chinese teachers' attitude towards children's gun play is a good example of what Jones would call "seeing things through children's eyes." When we told a group of Chinese preschool teachers that many American educators were critical of the toy guns in the classroom at Sinan Road, one teacher responded, "The children know that real policeman and real soldiers carry guns. And policeman and soldiers are good forces in society, so what's wrong with children wanting to emulate them?" We are not suggesting that we should introduce pretend gun play into the US preschool curriculum. But the Chinese case suggests that playing with toy guns does not necessarily lead to making children violent and in some cases can be a form of pro-social development.

Japan

The Japanese examples come from Komatsudani Hoiken (daycare center) in Kyoto.

Non-intervention in Children's Disputes

One of the key scenes in our video shows Mao, the youngest girl in the class, fighting over a teddy bear with three other girls. The teacher, Morita-sensei, is in the room but does nothing to stop the fight other than at one point to call out, "Kora, kora" ("Hey"). When we showed the videotape to Morita-sensei and asked her about the fight scene, her comments suggest that fights have value for children and that teachers should hesitate to intervene. Not intervening does not mean being negligent. She carefully observes children's fighting, watching for indications of whether it is necessary for her to intervene, and even then, to the least degree necessary:

When there's a fight among children, I watch and try to decide if they are really attempting to hurt each other, or if it is just rough play. Sometimes it is hard to tell. If it looks like it's getting too rough or might get out of control, I tell them to be less rough, but I don't tell them to stop.

This approach requires skill. Morita needs to know the children well enough to anticipate when and where a situation has the potential to become dangerous or to spin out of control. Morita emphasized that by not intervening, she gives children time and space to work issues out on their own. Fighting is part of social development. If teachers intervene too readily in their children's fighting, children lose the chance to experience social complexity and learn valuable social lessons. Fights give children the opportunity to experience a range of emotions, to empathize, and to learn to function as members of a group:

The person who does something and the person who has something done to her are always changing. One day, one girl might hit somebody, but on another day, the girl might be hit by somebody. During this process, children change their positions, and come to know a range of feelings. People can't understand these feelings without having direct experience.

Morita emphasized that many children these days lack the opportunity to experience social complexity and to develop empathy at home:

These days, many children don't have siblings and they don't have the chance to play with other children in their neighborhood. As a result, they don't know how to interact physically with other children. Sometimes, they hit other children too hard because they don't realize what it feels like.

Another Komatsudani teacher, Nogami-sensei, added, "Children learn about pain when they fall down. Children know when something hurts them and they show it. If they feel sad, they cry." Intervening too quickly robs children of the chance to experience these feelings. As Morita-sensei explained,

If I intervene and tell the children to do this or not do that, it would be easy and quick. But it's important for children to think by themselves. Children create their own rules during interactions in fights. For example, one girl says OK, "I'll let you have this today, and you let me have it tomorrow." The important thing here is not "Who started the fight?" "Who is right?" but how to solve the problem on their own.

Morita-sensei emphasized that developing the ability to solve social problems is one of the most important things for children to learn in preschool. Teacher non-intervention in children's fights gives children a chance to develop this skill.

We are not suggesting that American teachers switch to a non-intervention strategy in children's disputes. There are good reasons American teachers follow a strategy of intervening in disputes and helping children express their feelings with words rather than with hitting. The art of teaching preschool in Japan, as well as in the US,

lies in deciding when to intervene and when to hold back and see if the children can work a problem out on their own. When faced with a situation where children are beginning to argue over a toy, American teachers might benefit from asking themselves two questions raised by the Japanese approach: Is my intervention here necessary? And, if I intervene, what opportunities will be lost for children to work problems out on their own?

Mixed-age play in preschool

Each day at Komatsudani, when naptime ends, five of the children in the oldest class put on aprons and head downstairs to help care for the infants and toddlers. In our video, we see five-year-olds changing infants' and toddlers' shirts, feeding them snacks, encouraging an eleven-month-old to take his first steps. Perhaps the cutest and most dramatic of these scenes is when a five-year-old boy gives a two-year-old a lesson on how to pee into and then flush a urinal. We see five-year-old Kenichi take two-year-old Nobuo to the bathroom. Positioning Nobuo in front of the urinal, Kenichi commands, "Pee, please." Noticing that Nobuo is oblivious to the position of the tail of his dangling pajama top, Kenichi reaches over and pulls up the top, keeping it clear of the stream of urine. "Is it coming out?" asks Kenichi, and a few seconds later, "Nothing left in your pee-pee?" Reaching up and pushing the button on top of the urinal, Kenichi says, "Now I'm going to flush." Noticing that the roar of the flush is both exciting and a bit scary to young Nobuo, Kenichi puts on a look of exaggerated surprise, opening his mouth wide and cupping his face in his hands. Nobuo, laughing, points at Kenichi's face. Kenichi, turning toward the camera, rolls his eyes in a gesture of mock-irritation, suggesting amusement, affection, and intimate knowledge of simple pleasures and concerns of two-year-olds.

Nozawa-sensei, the teacher of the five-year-old class, explained that the practice at Komatsudani of having older children care for the toddlers and infants on a rotating basis evolved gradually, based on his and the other teachers observations of the children:

We noticed that the older children really like taking care of the younger ones, but that some of the children did this more than others. So I got the idea that we could get more of the children involved if we established a *toban* (monitor or helper) system—we already had children taking turns being *toban* for other classroom duties. We just added helping out with the small children to the responsibilities of the older ones. We don't make anyone do it who doesn't want to, but generally they all want to do it.

Komatsudani's Assistant Director, Higashino-sensei, emphasized that Japan's falling birthrate makes it critically important that older children get a chance to care for younger ones at preschool:

This activity is especially valuable for the older children, most of whom don't have younger siblings, because it gives them a chance they might not otherwise have to develop

empathy [*omoiyari*] and to learn how to know and anticipate the needs of another [*ki ga tsuku*].

Higashino's logic here suggests that children who grow up without younger siblings and without opportunities to care for infants and toddlers are at risk of failing to develop empathy. In human societies for thousands of years for much of the day little children were cared for by older ones. This tradition has disappeared with modernization. Children are highly age-segregated in modern school systems. And in countries with a very low birthrate, the majority of children do not have younger siblings who they can help care for at home.

The birthrate in the US isn't as low as it is in Japan or in China. But many American children do not have younger siblings and all American children could benefit from increased opportunities to develop empathy. Many American teachers who watched the Komatsudani videotape said that their favorite scene was the pee lesson and that they wished the children in their preschool could have such experiences. They then quickly added that couldn't allow older children to care for younger ones in this way out of fear of liability and litigation. They also pointed out that few early childhood settings in the US have children aged zero to three as well as older children. For these reasons, four- and five-year-old children caring for infants and toddlers is unlikely to happen in US preschools. But the Japanese example here can push us to work harder to give children experiences of mixed aged play including, perhaps, some supervised experiences caring for infants and toddlers.

Reducing the number of toys

At Komatsudani Hoikuen, we see very few toys either in the classroom or on the playground. In our video there is the big fight among the girls over the teddy bear and in the afternoon two others girls pull and push over a shovel in the sand box. We could speculate that these fights could have been avoided if there were more bears in the classroom and shovels in the sandbox. Principal Yoshizawa agreed with this logic, but turned it around, explaining to us that at Komatsudani they provide few toys in order to give children ample opportunity to experience and work out conflicts. If there are enough toys to go around, children do not need to communicate with each other. They can engage in solitary play, as they often do at home. But the purpose of preschool is to give children experiences they cannot have at home. It is through experiencing conflicts with peers that children develop social skills, individually and collectively. In our video, we see the girls who pull and push over the shovel have a long conversation and then eventually resolve their dispute by doing *junken* ("rock-paper-scissors") to solve their problem.

Principal Yoshizawa also offered another rationale for not having many toys: Japanese children are growing up in a society of rampant materialism and preschools should provide an alternative experience. After watching the videotape we made in an American preschool that had large rooms full of a variety of toys and learning materials, Principal Yoshizawa (who is also a Buddhist priest) said to us

American is so rich! The children are fortunate to have such a wonderful place to play. . . .They have so much space, and so many things for children to do. But that's not necessarily good for children, is it? We Japanese have grown rich, too, just like Americans. But children these days don't appreciate what they have. They lose their ability to play on their own without special things to play with, like in the old days. The more you have the more you waste and the less you appreciate it. (Tobin, Wu, & Davidson, 1989, p.157)

Principal Yoshizawa said this to us fifteen years ago, when we conducted the original *Preschool in Three Cultures* study. But if anything, his point about materialism has become even more true, and more widely shared among Japanese early childhood educators. For example, a preschool teacher from Tokyo commented critically on a scene in our American video tape where boys in the dramatic play area put on police and fire fighters hats and girls cook on a wooden stove: "Don't they have imaginations? Can't you pretend to be cooking without having a stove?"

The most dramatic example we saw of this logic came on a rainy day in Kyoto, when Director Yoshizawa took the children and teachers to an empty, muddy lot to do their morning exercises. After the children completed their exercises, without the benefit of the usual recorded music, they stood there, wondering what to do next. Yoshizawa said simply, "Play." Gradually, children found things to do. Several boys discovered empty soda cans and filled with muddy water. Other children then joined in throwing rocks and sticks at these cans. Some children started a game of jumping across a muddy puddle, many failing to make it to the other side, and splashing in the muddy water. Later that day, Yoshizawa explained the morning activity:

These days children only know how to play if they are given special toys and playground equipment. I took them to that field so they could learn how to play without special equipment. The idea was for them to discover that they can have fun even on an empty lot.

Conclusion

These examples from Chinese and Japanese preschools challenge American taken-for-granted assumptions about the education of young children. Core American beliefs about self-esteem, toys, children's disputes, mixed-age interaction, and dramatic play are challenged by the Chinese and Japanese approaches. We're not suggesting that American teachers should imitate these approaches. Instead, we are hoping that American teachers who have read this paper and had the opportunity to reflect on the logic of the Chinese and Japanese approaches, will find that they have a new way of thinking about their practice. We hope that the next time these teachers find themselves having to deal with a situation such as a classroom dispute, a question of how to promote children's self-esteem, or a decision about how many toys to have in their classroom,

that they will consider the Chinese and Japanese perspectives and perhaps adjust their response. Good teachers get even better as they are exposed to new ways of thinking about their teaching. For the past ten years many new ideas on early childhood education have been coming from the Reggio Emilia preschools in Italy. We believe that in the contemporary field of early childhood education, there are also excellent new ideas to be found in China and Japan.

REFERENCE

- Baumeister, R. (2005). The lowdown on high self-esteem: Thinking you're hot stuff isn't the promised cure-all. *Los Angeles Times*, January 25, 2005.
- Ho, D. Y. F. (1994). Cognitive socialization in Confucian heritage cultures. In P. M. Greenfield & R. R. Cocking (Eds.), *Cross-cultural roots of minority child development* (pp. 285–314). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Hsu, F. L. K. (1981). *Americans and Chinese: Passage to difference* (3rd ed.). Honolulu: University of Hawaii.
- Jones, G. (2002). *Killing Monsters: Why children need fantasy, super heroes, and make-believe violence*. New York: Basic Books.
- Seligman, M. (1996). *The Optimistic Child*. New York: Harper Perennial.
- Sutton-Smith, B. (1988). War toys and childhood aggression. *Play and Culture*, 1, 57–69.
- Twenge, J. M. (2006). *Generation Me*. New York: Free Press.
- Tobin, J., Wu, D., & Davidson, D. (1989). *Preschool in three cultures*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Yang, K. S. (1997). Theories and research in Chinese personality: An indigenous approach. In H. S. R. Kao & D. Sinha (Eds.), *Asian perspectives on psychology: Cross-Cultural Research and Methodology Series* (Vol. 19, pp. 236–264). New Delhi, India: Sage.
-

Between “What I Am” and “What I Am Not”: Asians and Asian Americans in Contention and Conversation

by Heekyong Teresa Pyon, Yan Cao, and Huey-li Li

In the age of globalization, “Asian” and “Asian American” have emerged as popular terms to refer to a diverse populace originating in many different parts of the vast continent of Asia. As recent Asian arrivals in the United States, we have gradually come to accept the terms “Asian” and “Asian American,” as our group identity in spite of our different national origins and cultural upbringings. However, we continue to engage in a mutual interrogation with the dominant culture that endorses individuality as a key value, yet imposes group identities on its marginal constituencies. While the multicultural education movement has raised awareness of the complexity and diversity of racial and ethnic identity formation, the educational experiences of Asians and Asian Americans remain under-explored. More specifically, in spite of this greater awareness of diversity, there is a persistent inclination to overgeneralization and ethnic stereotyping of Asians as a group.

Our aim is to examine “the complex processes of identity formation among Asians in America” by means of a narrative self-inquiry that explores the formation our own multilayered identities. We do this by telling a story of becoming Asians and/or Asian Americans. We start with Heekyong Teresa Pyon’s narrative of becoming an “in-between generation Korean American.” Next, Yan Cao undertakes a critical inquiry into her identity formation during a cross-cultural academic journey in the U.S. Finally, Huey-li Li recalls and reflects on her struggle with the labels of “Asian” and “Asian American” in shaping her political identity in the academy. Through the stories that we tell, we hope to explicate the intersection between individual identities and group identities and affinities in order to stimulate cross-cultural dialogues and conversation about coexistence, reconciliation, recognition, and multiculturalism.

Korean, American, and Korean-American: Looking for a 1.5 Generation Identity—by Heekyong Teresa Pyon

My first nephew, Joshua, was born in the U.S. four and a half years ago. Since his parents came to the US when they were in middle school, Joshua became the first official “second-generation Korean-American” in my family. Joshua’s first language is Korean, which is the main language at home. He speaks mostly Korean with his family, but lately, as he entered his day care program and started learning English, he is using more English words in his conversation with others.

My mother, who lives three hours away from him and cannot speak much English, is worried that Joshua will lose his Korean when he grows older. She says to Joshua, “Joshua. You must speak Korean even when you grow up because you are a Korean. You need to speak Korean so that you can talk with me even when you are older.”

Just the other day, my mother visited Joshua, and again she told Joshua that he needs to speak Korean when he grows up. This time, however, Joshua gave my mother an unexpected answer. “Grandma. There is an older brother in my church. He speaks little Korean and a lot of English. I think I am going to be like him later, and I am going to be an American when I grow up.” Surprised, my mother told him, “No, Joshua, you are still a Korean even when you grow up.” “No,” insisted little Joshua, “I am going to be an American!”

Unlike my nephew, I was certain that I would never become an American when I was new to the country. I came when I was a high school sophomore. I still remember the first day that I walked into an American high school. The buildings looked so big and foreign, they scared me. The image of the American that I held was of someone with white skin and perfect English fluency. It took me a while to understand the great racial, ethnic, and cultural diversity among Americans.

Soon, I noticed that there was a group of Asian students, who, although they were Asian looking, spoke perfect English without any accent and mostly associated with **white students**. Then I learned about the term “Asian American,” and more particularly, “Korean-American.” Korean-Americans were very different from me in many ways. I learned that they were either born in the U.S. or immigrated to the U.S. when they were very young. Most of them could not speak Korean or at least they did not speak Korean at school. They did not seem to care much about Korean students like me who could not speak English well **and did not have the** same dress code as the American students. In school, I was glad to see the Korean American students—rare Asian faces in a mostly white school; but at the same time, I felt even more distant from them than other American students because though they looked like me, they were very different from me. So I learned that there are Americans and there are Asian Americans—two groups of which I felt I could never be a part. The people in each group were so different from me—there was no way that I could be like them. Therefore, there was no identity crisis for me at the time: I was simply a Korean.

It is interesting that I started questioning my Korean identity when I met other Korean students from Korea. I was starting my graduate program in Seattle at the time, and for the ten years before that, I had never doubted my identity as a Korean. However, my strong Korean identity started falling apart as I got to know my new friends. As I studied and spent time with these Korean students, I realized that there were some differences between us. Though I could communicate with them perfectly and shared Korean culture with them, I sensed that I was not exactly the same as they were.

Somehow I felt that I was not Korean enough when I was with them because I did not have the memories they shared and the

experiences they had in Korea. For the ten years that I had lived in America I had stored up different sets of memories and experiences. I appreciated my friendship with my Korean friends very much, but at the same time, I felt confused about who I was whenever I noticed the subtle differences between us.

The realization of difference came as a shock to me. I felt that my sense of identity was completely crumbling away, because I had been thinking of myself as a Korean, but now I had to reconsider myself as someone other than simply a Korean. I asked: "Then, who am I?" For the first time, I reflected upon my changing identity. Though I could not see it, I had gradually become someone different from who I thought I was before, and I could not define who I was anymore. I was not an American, I was not a Korean-American and now I was not even a Korean.

For the next two years, I struggled with this loss of identity, but I could not come up with a clear answer. After a while, I tried to ignore the question entirely and to avoid any situation that made me think about my identity. Finally, a moment of decision arrived. I was sitting in my cultural psychology seminar one afternoon. My professor, who had visited and stayed in Japan for a year, was giving a lecture on culture and different pedagogies. Something he said stirred me to think about my identity again. I was not listening to my professor any more; all I could do was to puzzle over the question, "Who am I?" I could not let go of that question any longer. I was staring at my notebook for the longest time as if I was taking a final exam and needed to put down the right answer.

Slowly, I wrote down the word "Korean-American." I had to accept my Korean American identity, which I had been denying for a long time. I was, in fact, a Korean living in the US and I had become an American whether I had been consciously aware of it or not. I finally accepted my new identity. However, I was not really writing the word. I could not write the word "Korean-American" with solid strokes. Instead, I marked hundreds of dots to write up the word "Korean-American." I could not express myself in any other way. I was a Korean-American, but I was still not a solid Korean-American; I was a Korean-American with the dots.

Once I had accepted this new dotted Korean-American identity I began to think of myself as a 1.5-generation Korean-American. I remember how I disliked the idea of 1.5 when I was first introduced to the term because it was not one or two, but "in-between"—a decimal point; not even a whole number. But I had now acknowledged that I was one of the "in-between-generation of Korean-Americans." Although 1.5-generation Korean-Americans are defined in various ways, in general, they are understood as the bilingual and bicultural Korean-Americans who are between the first- and second-generation immigrants (Koh, 1994, p.45).

Because they are bilingual and bicultural, the 1.5-generation Korean-Americans are often viewed as the "bridge builders" who can connect the first generation Korean immigrants with mainstream America (e.g. Park, 1999). At the same time, however, because they are not quite first or second generation, many of them feel that they are "neither 'Korean,' 'American,' nor 'Korean-American,' while at the same time all three" (Park, 1999, p.142). It

was this ironic duality of being neither and being all that confused me the most and eventually created a new challenge for me.

Ever since I accepted my new 1.5 identity, I have tried to view myself as both Korean *and* American. However, I often face situations where I am not quite *both* Korean and American but *neither*. For example, although I usually communicate in Korean when I am with Korean graduate students at school, they do not perceive me as a Korean because they know that I am a U.S. citizen and that I have been living in the U.S. for a while. From time to time, I hear remarks such as "...but you are an American." This remark, which is correct, reinforces the fact that I am different and no longer a Korean in the eyes of other Koreans in spite of the sense of Korean-ness that is a big part of me.

At the same time, I am not really perceived as an American, either. A fellow graduate student in my department told me the other day that from now on, he would call me "Oregon," because he thought that I was an international student for the previous four years and felt bad that he asked me if I was going home to Korea for the break. He said he would call me Oregon so that he would remember that I am from there.

Because there are many graduate students from Korea in my college, it was perfectly natural for him to think that I was an international student. At the same time, I also wondered if I would ever be considered an American by mainstream society. Whatever made him think that I was Korean and not American, whether it was my Korean culture, my accent, or my appearance, my Korean-ness is a part of me and will stay in me. Similarly, whatever made Korean students think of me as an American—my legal status, my Americanized attitude, or my lifestyle choices—are also part of me. If I want to be both Korean *and* American, am I wanting too much? Am I supposed to choose one or the other? As Park (1999) observes, I often find myself situated as "the other" by both groups—being sometimes both and sometimes neither.

This feeling of being "the other" leads me to the next question: how much of my identity is my personal choice and how much of it is shaped by the society? If I choose to be a Korean *and* an American, will I be perceived as both by others? Does it matter to me? If I call myself a 1.5-generation Korean-American, but I am viewed as neither, then what does it make me? Who am I becoming?

I think about my nephew, Joshua who believes that he will one day become an American who speaks a lot of English and less Korean. Will he become an American as he wishes? In this country where Asian Americans are often viewed as "perpetual foreigners" rather than Americans, (Danico, 2004, p.10) will my nephew be seen as American if he chooses to be? Or will his yellow skin be a barrier for others to consider him an American? How will he face a stranger coming up to him and saying—"Hey, your English is so good, where are you from?" (Chon, 1995)—as my roommate, who is a Taiwanese American born in Virginia, often experiences. If Joshua, as he told my mother, speaks little Korean and does not know enough Korean culture, will he be considered a Korean? Will his identity be shaped solely by his choice, or will it be constructed and determined by what others in society see him to be? The fol-

lowing excerpt from Alex Hull, a Korean-American who came to the US at the age of eleven and went to a mostly white high school, brings out this issue more clearly:

Then in my junior year, I ran for student body president, and the issue of race came out openly in the election debate. There were three candidates: one white female, one white male, and me. . . . I thought I was the most popular of the candidates. After my speech, during the question and answer session, one student stood up and said, "Alex, do you perceive any racial tension in this school?" My supervisor tried to protect me and said, "You don't have to answer that." Until that moment, I thought I was white, because my buddies were white and they treated me like I was white. I didn't think I was perceived as a minority, an Asian, or someone different from them. At that moment, it all clicked: maybe I am Asian. (Kim & Yu, 1996, p.224)

Goodson and Sikes (2001) argue that the wider cultural milieu in which we grow up provides "the script for the way we story our lives" (p.77). They state that the way individuals view and structure their life stories is developed from their social and cultural surroundings. In this sense, when we hear a person's story, it is not just that particular individual's voice that we hear but also "the wider cultural imperatives" (p.77). There are bigger institutional influences and ideologies that shape our own thinking and the way we perceive ourselves and our lives (Denzin, 2002). Meditating on this point, I ask myself how my identity was shaped and influenced by the wider society, and I think about the role school played in this process since it was one of the major sites of my social interaction.

I ask why I thought that I had to be one or the other and did not think that I could be *both* Korean and American early on. Why did I assume that I could not be a part of others who are different from me, and why did I think that I was so different from them? Was it something that I learned in school or was it something that I did not learn in school that made me think in such a way? What if I had a chance to talk about these issues with my teachers and my classmates rather than handling them all by myself? If I had those opportunities, could I have learned that difference does not need to be the reason for separation? Why does school, as it was for me and for Hull, have to be a place where we experience isolation and conflict rather than inclusion and appreciation of differences?

I think about what will happen to Joshua when he goes to school. I wonder what he will learn and experience as he grows up as a Korean and an American. I hope the story he tells us about his identity is different from mine. I hope Joshua will not have to struggle to define who he is when he sees the differences between himself and his classmates. I hope he learns to appreciate who he is as he is, and that he can joyfully share his unique experiences with his friends. Will he be able to tell us a different story? I know this is a very complex and exceedingly difficult question, and there is no easy answer. But again I hope, when Joshua goes to school, he finds school to be a place where he and his friends can communicate their

experiences, frustrations, and confusions, and freely discuss what it means to be different from one another and how to deal with those differences among themselves. Then, at least, Joshua may not have to feel that he is alone and has to deal with this heavy task all by himself as I did. Perhaps, that may be one small thing that can be done in order to **hear a different story from Joshua and his friends.**

Self as a Stranger: An International Student's Academic Journey—by Yan Cao

Like many international students, I have come to realize that overcoming language barriers is a formidable task in my cross-cultural, academic journey. Even today, I vividly remember my feeling of dizzy confusion when I attended my first seminar. I had so many questions about the issues and topics that my professors and classmates brought up in discussion. Yet, very few of them made efforts to provide me with background information. Most of my American-born professors and classmates seemed to assume that everyone, including international students like me, should possess the requisite prior knowledge to engage in the issues under discussion. I felt left behind all the time. However, my inner frustration and feelings of dissatisfaction motivated me to make progress in understanding what was going on. As I strove to improve my proficiency in English, I also endeavored to participate more actively in the discussion. However, I remained as a spectator for most of the time. To me, the seminar was like an exciting basketball game in which my professors and classmates eagerly passed the ball from one person to another. I wanted to touch and play with the ball, but no one passed the ball to me. As a benched player, I could not help but wonder why my "native-born" professors and classmates showed no hesitation in hogging the ball, and keeping it away from me.

Gradually, I learned to contribute my own educational viewpoints in the seminar. In seminar discussions concerning comparative and international education, I found that some professors and students showed a tendency to over-generalize about various educational systems in Asia. In particular, they appeared to regard the Japanese education as the epitome of the educational systems of Asian countries. Nevertheless, my presence in the seminar did influence my professors and classmates more or less to recognize the existence of a Chinese educational system. But their perception of Chinese education not only appeared to dwell on the rural education of the 1970s but also reflected the cold war ideology. It was a struggle for me to attempt to call their attention to the specific geographical, historical, economic, and political contexts of the Chinese educational practices under discussion.

As a female international student from China, I care about issues related to Asian American women. Unfortunately, multicultural education courses I took, to a large extent, included few Asian or Asian American's academic works, especially those of Asian American women. Most reading materials were skewed in the direction of the educational experiences of European Americans, African Americans, Native Americans, and Latino Americans. The contribution of Asian immigrants and the historically unjust treatment of them were marginally dealt with in the readings. I was

especially surprised that some professors and classmates had never learned about the Chinese mass immigration to America during the 1840s and the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882. Neither topic was brought up in any discussion until I mentioned them.

To some of my professors and classmates, I am still merely one of the “Asians” or “Asian Americans,” even though they have known me for years. On one occasion, I was mistaken for another Chinese woman in the same department, and on another occasion for someone else they met before. Chinese names appear to many Americans to be indistinguishable. An important personal letter was once sent to another Chinese person in a different department. Occasionally, some colleagues have shown interest in my origins—in whether I came from Beijing or Shanghai. Unfortunately, after I had told them that I did not come from either of these two famous metropolitan cities, they had no further interest in knowing more about my home city—even though I was more than eager to tell them about it.

Beyond the academy, the images of Chinese women as portrayed in Hollywood and Disney cartoons seem to influence how my American-born classmates, students, and friends perceive Chinese women. In these movies and cartoons, the imaginary Chinese women can be divided into two categories: the ultra feminine and the agile woman warrior. The sexy, simple-minded, beautiful, cute, passive, and fragile concubine played by a famous Chinese actress, Li Gong, in the movie *Raise the Red Lantern* represents one such ultra feminine Chinese woman. After viewing this movie, one of my American friends even asked me whether Chinese women still bound their feet! On the other hand, the image of Ziyi Zhang in the movie *Crouching Tiger, Hidden Dragon* and the image of a female killer played by Lucy Liu (Yuling Liu) in the movie *Kill Bill* shaped the popular perception of the Chinese woman as an agile warrior. Remarkably, these two polarized images brood over Chinese women’s “bodies” rather than their minds. The idea that Chinese women might possess agile minds is not an image in the popular mind. As the co-chair of a regional conference, I received numerous conference proposals with the salutation of “Mr.” If they were unsure of my gender, they could have chosen “To Whom It May Concern.” I do understand that cultural and linguistic barriers can easily contribute to misidentifying a person’s gender, but I cannot help question why it seems to be “acceptable” or “legitimate” to assign a male gender to any person with a Chinese name.

In addition to the problematic stereotypes conveyed in the popular media about Chinese women, it is not uncommon to perceive Chinese students, particularly women students, as a silent group, especially in U.S. graduate school settings. Belenky (1993) points out that the silent knower often is thought of as “deaf and dumb, little ability to think, survives by obedience to powerful, punitive authority and little awareness of power of language for sharing thoughts, insights, and so on” (p. 395). However, Patrocino P. Schweickart (1993), a Philippine feminist, argues that silence is highly valued in her culture and related to the symbol of wisdom and respect. She goes on to claim that her silence in classroom settings does not indicate a lack of intellectual engagement. Similarly,

from a Confucian standpoint, an educated person should be a good listener in order to show respect to others. Nevertheless, despite the advocacy of “internationalizing” higher education in the U.S., I have yet to see evidence of any pedagogical changes that could facilitate more inclusive participation from “silent” Asian students.

In brief, self-estrangement seems to sum up my cross-cultural academic journey. I view my self-identity in conflict with images of group membership that have been assigned to me or imposed on me, and these have led to bewilderment and discontent. I do not, however, intend to tell my story as one of protest. Rather, I hope that my story will illuminate the hidden or null curriculum that impedes the establishment of more inclusive multicultural learning communities.

In Between Asians and Asian Americans—by Huey-li Li

As a late baby boomer growing up in Taiwan and pursuing a teaching career in the U.S., I find identity formation is forever unsettled. Like Heekyong, my ethnic identity differs from that of my parents. Under Japanese colonial rule in Taiwan, my parents’ proficiency in Japanese was comparable to the native Japanese speakers. However, while my parents were proud to speak Japanese without an accent, they never identified themselves as Japanese. At the same time, they also refused to claim their Chinese ethnicity despite their full knowledge of their ethnic roots in mainland China. To them, the Chinese were the outsiders who moved to Taiwan after 1949. More specifically, although they never made efforts to claim Taiwanese identity, it was very clear that they considered Kuomintang (KMT), the ruling party in Taiwan from 1945 to 2000, as another colonial power. In contrast, my experiences of formal schooling in Taiwan as prescribed by the ruling party compelled me to become a patriotic Chinese who was supposed to endorse the official anti-Communist ideology and a commitment to re-claiming Chinese civilization, which had been under attack by Western imperialism since the Opium Wars. As a zealous patriot, I made efforts to speak Mandarin without a Taiwanese accent and chose to major in the Chinese classics when most college students in Taiwan were proud to read books written in English. Yet, after teaching for four years at a Taiwanese parochial high school geared to prepare students for the College Entrance Exam, my patriotism ironically did not stop me from eventually reading English texts and pursuing graduate degrees in the U.S. I had launched myself on a journey that distracted me from further study of the Chinese classics.

When I came to the U.S., I found, like Yan Cao, that the cultural and linguistic barriers were an ongoing challenge in my cross-cultural journey. I took note of the irony in the coexistence of a pervasive prejudice against non-native English speakers and an unbounded sympathy for English-challenged international students. When participating in seminars or making presentations, I felt compelled to call my audience’s attention to my accent. Often, I started my talk with apologetic statements such as “As you may notice, I speak English with a strong but charming accent. My accent might have reminded you of Henry Kissinger....” Hearing laughter

from my peers, I then felt released to “talk.” On the one hand, my heightened sensitivity to my accent revealed my genuine desire to “master” English in order to communicate with my audience. On the other hand, I seemed to claim a special right to talk and to oblige my classmates to listen. At the same time, I could not help but become aware of the differentiated attitudes toward non-native English speakers with different accents. More than once, I heard native English speakers praising the accents of my colleagues/friends from Europe, Australia, and New Zealand while paying no special attention the accents of my Asian colleagues/friends from India, Singapore, Japan, and Korea.

Gradually, I became more aware of the unspoken divide between Europe and Asia and came to accept the label of “Asian” as my ethnic affinity. Still, I often joke about the fact that “Asians” only exist outside Asia, even though I am fully aware that “Asia,” originally a geographical regional designator, **has been converted into a political, cultural, or even genetic denominator identifying** a diverse group of peoples from other smaller groups. I especially lament that like Columbus who discovered “India” in America, I discovered myself as an Asian in the US academy.

As an Asian studying and teaching in the sheltered academy, I more or less have transformed myself into an imposter who wants to speak and write like native English speakers/writers. I even voluntarily enrolled in speech therapy sessions in order to reduce my not-so-charming Asian accent. During one therapy session, my therapist in training took note of my linguistic habit of omitting the distinctions between the singular and the plural. **She then showed** me one photo of one car in juxtaposition to **a photo of two cars** to instruct me to attend to the differences between one car and two cars. While I found her therapeutic efforts to be amusing, my imposter’s ambition **eventually turned into missionary zeal to convert** my American-born students into multicultural educators. As a matter of fact, I frequently relate the aforementioned case to illustrate how professional educators must develop multicultural pedagogical competence in a culturally and linguistically diverse society.

As an Asian, I **used to feel obligated to respect the U.S. foreign policy**. Yet, after living in the U.S. for over twenty years, I **find that I can no longer be a diplomatic spectator and must speak out when** my conscience cannot accept troubling foreign policies. Notably, while Asians in America may find the label of foreigners acceptable, U. S. born Asian Americans branded as “forever foreigners” cannot help but lament their subjection to an eternal xenophobic gaze. When watching the film *Joy Luck Club*, I questioned why a Chinese American woman, in confronting racial prejudice against Asians during the Viet Nam War **had to object, “But, I am an American!”** I even made a snappy comment that in making the claim to be “an American” she implied that non-Americans deserve racial discrimination. My resistance to the temptation to claim Americanness for myself also led me to question many Asian Americans’ efforts to re-claim their silenced historical contributions to the building of the U.S.—the re-appropriation of Asian’s contributions in rail road building, gold mining, and military service. From my standpoint, the commemoration of early Asian

Americans’ struggles does not necessarily raise awareness of the historical exploitation of Asian coolies, sailors, and settlers. Rather, it somehow suggests that Asian American’s entitlement to their presumably “inalienably rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness” is based on their contributions to building the U. S.

In summary, my identity has changed from “Chinese” to “Asian,” and from “Asian” to **“something between Asian and Asian American.”** Undoubtedly, my chameleon-like ability to form new identities is adaptable and varies according to the context. Echoing Paul Gilroy’s **effort to locate the “black essence” through “routes”** rather than “roots,” I will continue to reflect upon my changing identity and anticipate emerging identities **to come (Gilroy, 1993).**

Conclusion

We are a group of Asian and/or Asian American women academics who are eager to clarify who we are and who we are not, both individually and collectively. We hope that our stories point to the fact that Asians and Asian Americans are active participants in the process of forming and thinking through our identities. However, to a considerable degree, our experience of the processes of identity formation and our negotiation with mainstream culture show that we are not “equal partners in cultural production” (Said, 1993). **The dialectic interplay between racialization and diversification** especially indicates that Asians and Asian Americans are not fully in control of their identity formation. In analyzing the hegemonic force of dominant culture, Edward Said (1984) notes that while marginalized groups are given “the permission to narrate,” their voices can be easily dismissed. While we recognize the hegemonic forces of the dominant culture, we playfully question: Does one need “the permission to narrate”? Who is in the position to give permission? Our telling stories originated from our yearning for sharing our experiences of becoming “Asians” and “Asian Americans.” Unreservedly, we render ourselves permission to present and to listen to Asians’ and Asian Americans’ cultural, educational, and political narratives.

We hope that our stories bring to light that we are not “objectified” victims doomed to accept “designated” identities without negotiation or resistance. Lisa Lowe (1999) points out that “heterogeneity, hybridity, and multiplicity” capture the distinguished characteristics of Asian Americans’ identity formation. **Our destabilized and shifting individual and collective identities** reflect what Kathy Ferguson (1993) terms “mobile subjectivities.” With our “mobile subjectivities,” we tend to endorse flexible “standpoints of a sort, places to stand and from which to act” (p. x). At the same time, we agree with Wimal Dissanayake (1996) that “Human agency, so far being the product of atomistic and isolated persons, can be the outcome of a group-centered ethos and orientation” (p. xiv). We are also aware that such “a group-centered ethos and orientation” renders individual privileges invisible. After all, our aim in pursuing academic degrees is based on our strategic calculations to access symbolic resources in the academy. Thus, our narratives by no means aim at what Rey Chow (1993) calls “self-subalternization.” In other words, we do not intend to elevate our “marginalized”

ethnic identity while disregarding our class privilege that permit us to find a niche in higher education. Instead, we simply want to call attention to the fact that the construction and consumption of otherness have disciplinary effects on determining marginalized groups' educational experiences.

Furthermore, the dominant liberal democratic model of multicultural education focuses on political inclusion of marginalized groups, with the underlying belief that political inclusion will pave the way for the reconstruction of oppressive social institutions and cultural practices. To a certain degree, such political inclusion stresses equal representation and recognition of all individuals rather than groups. Multicultural education also embraces generalized ethnic group affiliations such as Asians and Asian Americans. By addressing the intersections between individual identities and group identities and affinities, we hope that our narratives offer a pointed critique of the **liberal democratic model of multicultural education**. Multicultural education is not a celebration of marginality. Nor should multicultural education endorse cultural hybridization without undertaking a critical and reflective inquiry into the complexity of identity formation.

In conclusion, our narrative inquiry into our shifting identity formation reveals that globalization does not necessarily result in a singular unified cultural formation. Nor does globalization foster a coherent singular identity formation. Hence, any pedagogical attempt to shape identity formation must attend to the variation of human agencies as they encounter contradictory economic, cultural, and ideological forces.

REFERENCES

- Belenky, M. F. (1993). Public homeplaces: Nurturing the development of people, families, and communities. In N. Rule Goldberger, et al. (Eds.), *Knowledge, difference and power: Essays inspired by women's ways of knowing* (pp. 393–430). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Chon, M. (1995). On the Need for Asian American Narratives in Law: Ethnic Specimens, Native Informants, Storytelling and Silences, *UCLA Asian Pacific American Law Journal*, 3, pp. 4 & 6.
- Chow, R. (1993). "It's you, and not me: Domination and "othering" in theorizing the "Third World." In L. S. Kauffman (Ed.), *American feminist thought at century's end: A reader* (pp. 195–106). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Danico, M. Y. (2004). *The 1.5 Generation: Becoming Korean American in Hawai'i*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Dissanayake, W. (1996). **Agency and cultural understanding: Some preliminary remarks.** In W. Dissanayake (Ed.), *Narratives of agency: Self-making in China, India, and Japan* (pp. ix–xxi). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Goodson, I. & Sikes, P. (2001). *Life history research in educational settings: Learning from lives*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Denzin, N. (2002). Interpretive process. In A.M. Huberman & M. B. Miles (Eds.), *The Qualitative researcher's companion*. (pp. 349–366). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Ferguson, K. E. (1993). *The man question*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gilroy, P. (1993). *The black Atlantic: Modernity and double consciousness*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kim, E. H. & Yu, E. Y. (1996). *East to America: Korean American life stories*. New York: The New Press.
- Koh, T. H. (1994). Ethnic identity in first, 1.5, and second generation Korean-Americans. In Kwon, H. Y. (Ed.), *Korean Americans: Conflict and harmony* (pp. 43–54). Chicago: North Park College/ Covenant Publications.
- Lowe, L. (1999). **Heterogeneity, hybridity, multiplicity: Marking Asian American**
- Differences. *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies*, 1(1): 23–44.
- Park, K. (1999). I really do feel I'm 1.5!: The construction of self and community by young Korean Americans. *Amerasia Journal*, 25(1), 139–163.
- Said, E. W. (1993). *Culture and imperialism*. New York: Knopf.
- Said, E. W. (1984). The permission to narrate. *Journal of Palestine Studies*, 13(3): 27–49.
- Schweickart, P. P. (1993). Speech Is Silver, Silence Is Gold: The Asymmetrical Intersubjectivity of Communicative Action. In Goldberger, N. R., et al. (Eds.), *Knowledge, difference and power: Essays inspired by women's ways of knowing*. (pp. 305–328). New York: Basic Books.

Voices of Sensei: Oral Histories of Japanese American Women Teachers, 1950-2000

by Julie Kang¹

Introduction

“For low income women of color, class/gender/race act as a ‘triple strike’”

(Prismatic Metropolis: Inequality in Los Angeles, 2002)

As a woman of color from an immigrant family in Los Angeles, I never considered teaching as a profession. Although I enjoyed working with children and had been a tutor since sixth grade, teaching was not an option I considered because I never had a teacher who looked like me or who encouraged me to become a teacher. Growing up where I did, there were no Asian American teachers to act as role models; that is, until I began volunteering at a large urban school in Los Angeles. The teacher shortage in Los Angeles Unified School District during the 1990s influenced my administrator’s decision to recruit and hire teacher candidates like me.² I was placed in a bilingual classroom to fulfill the requirements of the Title VII Legislation, the “Bilingual Education Act,” which was signed in 1964 (Crawford, 2004).

This teaching opportunity encouraged me to graduate from college during my junior year so that I could teach full time. During the day, I taught thirty-two bilingual children. At night, I went to graduate school to study for a master’s degree in teaching. During my years as a teacher in an urban school district, I did not feel that the “triple strike” of class, gender, and race was applicable to me. In fact, even though I grew up under the guidance of a single parent who worked twelve hours a day to make ends meet, I was able to achieve the “American Dream” through education and teaching.

It was not until I began interviewing teachers of Asian descent in Washington state that I came to understand the quotation at the beginning of this article. The oral history interviews that I conducted of Japanese American women teachers in their seventies and eighties helped me understand that the triple strike did exist for women of color prior to the civil rights movement.³ The Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibited racial discrimination in public places, such as schools, and required employers to provide equal employment opportunities to all teacher candidates. But prior to the 1960s, teachers of color in search of jobs had a different experience from the one that shaped my perspective. I wanted to know who these pioneer teachers of color were and to explore when and how they entered the teaching profession.

Data from the Washington State Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction show that Asians are the largest non-European teachers group teaching in Washington (2004). One thousand, three hundred, and thirty-three, full-time classroom teachers identify themselves as Asian. In Washington classrooms, there are more

Asian teachers than Black teachers (818) or Hispanic teachers (1,175). But despite the large numbers of Asian teachers, Asian Americans have been greatly neglected in studies of the lives and work of US teachers. Most research on teachers’ lives and work explores the identities of teachers of European descent (Alsup, 2006; Casey, 1993), and, in a few instances, the lives of African-American teachers (Walker, 2001; Foster, 1997).

This study aims to add to the research on Asian American teachers by collecting the oral histories of one Asian subgroup, seven Japanese Americans women in the Pacific Northwest. Drawing on oral history interview data and historical records, I was able to explore how they became teachers and how they contributed to student learning.

I will begin with an overview of the existing literature on issues relating to the hiring and placement of teachers of color in order to provide readers with the background and context in which these teachers were hired and placed in Seattle schools. The experience of African American teachers, who were also marginalized, provides a useful historical foundation for understanding the experiences of Japanese Americans in the teaching profession. Following this review of the literature, I will describe the intersectional framework that guides this study. Finally, I will discuss oral history research methodology and present some of the findings of this research.

Historical Background

Although considerable literature exists that addresses the hiring and placement of African American teachers (Dougherty, 2004; Walker, 1996) and teachers of Mexican descent (San Miguel, 2001), no studies specifically focus on the hiring and placement of Asian American teachers in the US. This lack of research is also the case in Washington, where Asian American teachers are the fastest growing racial minority and the largest group of nonwhite teachers (Taylor, 1994).

The struggles of Japanese American teachers for employment in public schools in Seattle and the discrimination they once experienced following the Executive Order 9066 during the Second World War, cannot be ignored. Executive Order 9066 triggered the Seattle School District to forcefully ask Japanese Americans to resign because their employment was a “determent to the school district” (Shimabukuro, 2001, p. 91). At this time, there were no teachers of Japanese ancestry, but some were employed in clerical positions. Yet these employees were American citizens by birth, so their dismissal in 1942 was wrong.

Taylor (1994) claims that white prejudice in many areas of the Pacific Northwest was stronger against African Americans than against Japanese Americans. Yet, in Seattle, the first African

American teacher was hired before any Japanese American teacher (Taylor, 1994, p.174). According to Taylor, Seattle School District hired Thelma Dewitty and Marita Johnson in 1947 as its first black instructors. Four other African American teachers were hired in 1948 (185). The causes of the hiring and placement of teachers of color in the US are complex, but there is no doubt that one reason is due to the labor shortage caused by WWII. Walker (2001) explains that many white teachers in northern cities left the classroom for the more lucrative wages they could obtain in performing war-related work. In Seattle, the war also created teacher shortages. However, in spite of the lack of qualified teachers, discrimination in employment continued, especially against African American women who “continued to face gender and racial discrimination and remained an underutilized work force” (Taylor, 1994, p.165).

Where are the voices of Sensei?

According to the 2000 census, Asian Americans as a group have done very well socially and economically in the US. Compared with other racial/ethnic groups in this country, Asian Americans earn more college degrees, including advanced degrees (professional or Ph.D.), have higher median family incomes, and are more employable in the labor force (US Census Bureau, 2003). In these categories, Asian Americans even outperform Whites. Asian Americans seem to have done so well that they are often referred to as the “model minority” in the United States (Lee, 1996). While some Asian Americans attempt to validate the “model minority myth” by working hard and “acting white” (Lee, 1996), these attempts are not always successful since there is a cultural dimension of being Asian American that is not easily ignored. This study aims to explore some of these cultural dimensions as well as other aspects of identity by closely examining the experiences of Japanese American retired women teachers in Washington State.

Theoretical Framework

Intersectional framework

According to Collins (1990), the use of an intersectional framework as a means of examining gender, race, class, and other markers of differences simultaneously has gained much scholarly attention in the 1990s. Intersectional framework approaches have previously been used by scholars to explore interconnections among systems of oppression for African American women (Crenshaw, 1996; Collins, 1990). However, it has also gained attention in Asian American studies as Asian American scholars have come to recognize “women’s lives as sites of ‘multiple intersections’” (Kim, 2000). I have, therefore, used an intersectional framework to guide this study because it provided an “inclusive method of examining how identity and societal structures crisscrossed” (Kim, 47). Krane, Oxman-Martinez, and Ducey (2001) also recommend using an intersectional framework because it “allows for an exploration of the multi-aspect context of people’s lives” (2). They also comment on its usefulness as a method of capturing some of the implications that may rise when we focus on the complexities of women’s lives.

Asian American scholars like Choy (2003) have used an intersectional framework to study a group of Filipino nurse migrants and the roles they played in the United States. Choy includes gender as a category of analysis so that her study “engages with and hopes to expand and reconceptualize Asian Americans.” She writes, “the ways in which race, nationality, gender, and class have shaped the experiences of Asian professional immigrant women have been virtually ignored in both ethnic and women’s studies” (8). Because I also focus on lives of Japanese American teachers, an intersectional framework provided a lens to explore their multiple identities marked by categories, such as race, class, gender, and age.

Methods

This study began with a series of oral history interviews of retired Japanese American teachers in the Pacific Northwest. Each of the seven teachers was interviewed for three to six hours about their personal and professional identities.

Methodological orientation

In *Asian/Pacific Islander American Women*, Shirley Hune (2003) claims that oral history “can empower women by granting them a voice in the writing of Asian/Pacific Islander American women’s history” (9). While “traditional historical methodologies, with their attention to big events and standard practices of documentation, tend to silence “ordinary people,” oral history can provide a “new terrain for doing research and can yield rich historical details and first-hand observations whereby women, as historical subjects, become knowledge producers” (9). According to Yow (2005), oral history testimony is also valuable because it provides the kind of information that makes other public documents understandable. Etter-Lewis (1991) writes that oral history “offers a unique and provocative means of gathering information central to understanding women’s lives and viewpoints.” It captures the complex identities of these women, characterized by the intersection of race, gender, and age with society at large—its culture and history (43). She concludes that, “scholarly studies by and about women often prove to be fruitless for women of color” (43). Scholars of color have made strides in recent years in publishing literature by and about women teachers of color (Walker, 2001; Foster, 1997), but very little research is currently available on one sub-group—Asian American women teachers.

Data

Participants and Setting

Because there are too few retired Japanese American teachers to make random sampling plausible (Merriam, 1998), I used a purposive sampling method to select the participants for this study. I was interested in the experiences of Japanese Americans in Washington state so I deliberately sought out teachers of Japanese descent who had spent most of their teaching years in this area and who had retired in the state. Although the interviews were predominantly conducted in the Seattle area, participants were recruited

from throughout the state. Professor Gehrke and I sought out teachers by newsletters, community nominations, and through the Japanese American teachers' network. Eleven teachers responded. Based on social categories assigned to them, such as race, gender, class, and age, I selected seven of the eleven volunteer teachers for this study. One teacher is much younger than others in this study and is still teaching, two others grew up in Hawai'i and did not share the same history as the teachers in this study, and one never taught in the Seattle area.

The first six oral history interviews with Japanese American teachers revealed patterns of similarity and difference in their access to employment in Seattle schools. This tended to vary according to the year they entered the teaching profession. I continued to seek more teachers of Japanese descent to interview, and Dr. Gehrke and I were able to conduct five more oral histories.⁴ Throughout these interviews and immediately following, I made notes to use as additional data. I also transcribed the tapes. The interviews provided fresh opportunities to capture the complexities of Japanese American teachers' perceptions and experiences in their involvement with the Seattle School District, especially those of teachers who began teaching before the civil rights movement of the 1960s. The data were analyzed and themes identified using "Atlas.ti," a computer program designed for qualitative data analysis.

Documents and Artifacts

Professional artifacts were collected to supplement interview data. These artifacts included lesson plans, photographs, awards, letters, and other personal materials related to their teaching careers. I also reviewed policy documents from the Seattle School District regarding the hiring and placement of teachers of color. The Revised Code of Washington and other legal documents helped me to understand the laws that pertained at the time to employment of teachers of color.

Findings

As an Asian American student who grew up in the United States, I have been told by white teachers that "Oriental" students are smart, though they tend to be quiet and docile in the classroom. This stereotype is also conveyed in typical Western images in the media of the "Oriental" woman, who is represented as subservient and passive. Although I knew that these stereotypes were distortions, I never once, in all my years at school, saw an image of a strong female Asian American. I am happy to say that this lack has been redressed as a result of my introduction to the eleven role models I met in the process of conducting the oral interviews. In the following section I offer a brief account, drawn from their words in the oral interviews, of some aspects of the lives of these pioneer women teachers that conveys their spirit and their commitment to education.

Becoming Teachers

Lily T is among the first group of Japanese American women teachers to be hired by the Seattle School District in 1951. When I

asked her about getting hired, she said, "I was lucky to get a job." In recalling her first year of teaching, she admits that she knew that students would be curious about her. "I'm sure their parents must have told them that the school was going to have a Japanese teacher... I explained to them that I was born in Seattle" (Lily T., interview, 2005).

The first lesson she taught on the first day of school was a short lesson on Japanese. "We're all going to have a real quick lesson in learning some Japanese words, going to learn how to count to 1-2-3-4-5 in Japanese. And it was easy, because those five numbers, it sounds so much like some English. Ichi is itchy. Nei was your "knee." Son was the sun. Chi was girl, she. And five was go". She concluded the lesson by saying, "So you see, it's not different. We're all the same" (Lily T., interview, 2005).

Lily T. felt that she was lucky to get her teaching job, but eighty-seven year old Claire Seguro, who was also hired in 1951, credits her principal with providing her with an opportunity to become a teacher. Claire recalls, "Son of an immigrant, he wasn't quiet about it. He was Italian with a very loud voice. And what he wanted, he went after it; and that is how he got those of us [teachers of color]" (Claire, interview, 2006). During the late 1940s, while Claire was completing her teacher education courses, many Japanese Americans were not able to pursue a teaching job because Japanese Americans could not be placed in schools to complete their student teaching assignments. A retired eighty-one year old Japanese American teacher, Bette, speaks of this barrier: "When you'd go to the counselors for advice to what area you should go into, when I mentioned teaching, they said—Well, you know, teaching, we cannot help you when you finish. So there's no point in your pursuing it." But Betty enjoyed working with children, and she continued to volunteer in her children's schools until 1965. In 1965, she was hired to be a part of the summer Head Start Program, and she became a full-time teacher in 1970. It took her longer to obtain a teaching certificate. "I had to take all the education classes because, you see, I graduated in 1948, and they said that anything over five years, you have to take over. I had to take everything that was required in the education department, and that was about fifty credits" (Bette, interview, 2005).

During the civil rights movement of the 1960s and the following years, teachers of Japanese descent had a different experience with school district hiring and placement practices. When Mako graduated in 1966, she found that "Education was a field that was open to Japanese Americans at that point." She continues, "I went to apply for a [teaching] job, and I was pretty sure I would get a job" (Mako, interview, 2005). Miyoko, who is eighty years old and started teaching in 1975, found that she had no difficulty in securing a teaching job. She was hired to teach English Language Learners (ELL) and Japanese language at a local high school with a diverse student population. "When I was hired in through the school district, we had to write a little essay and if we passed that, we were accepted into the program, that is, into the school district to teach" (Miyoko, interview, 2004). Although it was fairly easy for Miyoko to enter the teaching profession in the mid 1970s, Miyoko did not

consider teaching when she was younger. It was not until she was in her mid 40s that she returned to complete her college degree. That was when, in 1970, an advisor in the college of education suggested that she pursue a career in teaching.

Contributing to Education

After a full day of teaching, Claire often taught classes for the parents of her students. Because of her fluency in Japanese, she was asked by the district to teach citizenship class after school. She describes the class as “a night school kind of thing. The bad thing was there was not a real textbook” (Claire, interview, 2006). But Claire was able to make a useful professional connection with a teacher from California who helped to provide materials for the class. Claire felt that in establishing connections with her students’ parents, she was able to maintain a useful two-way communication. Claire’s ongoing communication with the parents of her students helped to improve student learning in the classroom.

Mako, a retired teacher, now directs a cultural diversity training program for teachers to better prepare them for our increasingly diverse student population. Her training provides professional development opportunities for teachers to participate in candid discussions about issues related to racial prejudice and consequences of stereotyping people. As a teacher during the civil rights movement, she created the multicultural curriculum for the district—the Rainbow ABC Program. She got involved in multicultural education early in her career. “After the first year of teaching, my principal asked me if I would like to work on this project that they were working on, trying to come up with some curriculum for making Seattle schools more multicultural...that was probably the first official way that I got involved with multicultural education” (Mako, interview, 2005). Mako’s Rainbow ABC Program has helped to address some of the social issues that affect students from diverse cultures, and it has helped to reduce stereotyping in district schools.

When I asked Claire about a significant historical event during her teaching years, she related the period of mandatory school integration in her district. “I think it’s a good thing that they were forced because there is never a good time to do something like—we’ve got to integrate these kids.” She recalls that the teachers of color in the district were a little more sensitive to those [students of color].” Claire also helped students in her high school to develop awareness of Japanese culture through arranging international visits. For three years, she took the school choir to Japan. Over two hundred students a year participated in this cultural exchange. “The kids who wanted to go to Japan would come over to [my school] because they knew we were talking about an exchange.” As a result of these trips, Claire comments that she established close relationships with her former students. After all these years, Claire still visits with them.

When asked to relate some of her experience as a teacher, Miyoko tells how she enhanced the school curriculum to meet the needs of all her students. “As I gained more experience, I found out what worked for me with my class and not necessarily, you know,

black-and-white as we were taught [in teacher education program].” Miyoko recalls how, on two separate occasions, she prevented students of Asian ancestry from committing suicide. Miyoko was able to reach out and connect with Asian American students with an understanding of their difficulties in the school, even with the ones who were labeled as “troublemakers” by other teachers. She comments on one particular student: “He picked up on it, that I cared. But if it were some other, you know, like the Caucasian or American culture, I wonder if that would have worked. They might have thought, you know, what’s with this teacher?” (Miyoko, interview, 2004).

Sharon, an eighty-one year old school librarian, contributed to her school by making up for a lack of multicultural books in her library. “There really weren’t any [books that would describe the Japanese American experience]. There was a book called *Tales a Chinese Grandmother Told Me*. But there weren’t any Korean tales. [I] would try to fill the empties.” She adds: “I also put out the Library News Weekly...and when I talk about supplementing for something like Black History Week, I would take posters of all the black leaders in the nation and then we would speak about each one. For example, one of them actually was the discoverer of blood plasma.” She also describes how important it is to provide role models for students: “to see one of their own achieve anything of this sort [is a valuable lesson]... we’d talk about world leaders that are black...we could make black history come alive and make them—try to motivate them to become like them” (Sharon, interview, 2005).

The oral history interviews provided wonderful opportunities for me to meet many Japanese American women teachers in Washington. Through their stories, I was able to learn more about who these pioneer teachers of Asian descent were, and how they became teachers. The intersectional framework that I used was helpful in exploring the multiple identities of these teachers and their professional lives as teacher leaders and multiculturalists. Their work has helped to give many students “an equal chance to experience educational success” (Banks, 2004, p.3). They employed and developed valuable teaching “techniques and methods that facilitate the academic achievement of students from diverse racial, ethnic, and social-class groups” (Banks, 2004, p.5). Their own backgrounds gave them an insight into the nature of different ethnic communities, and they showed affection for their residents because they grew up in similar communities (Banks, 2004, p. 767). They provided support and links between generations and through their personal and professional identities. This study is only a first step in beginning to recognize their contributions to education.

REFERENCES

- Alsop, J. (2006). *Teacher identity discourses: Negotiating personal and professional spaces*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Banks, J. A., & Banks, C. A. M. (2004). *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Casey, K. (1993). *I answer with my life: Life histories of women teachers working for social change*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Choy, C. (2003). *Empire of care: Nursing and migration in Filipino American history*. Durham: Duke University of Press.
- Collins, P. (1990). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. Boston: Unwin Hyman.
- Crawford, J. (2004). *Educating English learners: Language diversity in the classroom* (5th ed.). Los Angeles: Bilingual Educational Services, Inc.
- Crenshaw, K. (1996). The intersection of race and gender," In K. Crenshaw et al. (Eds). *Critical Race Theory*. New York: New Press.
- Dougherty, J. (2004). *More than one struggle: The evolution of Black school reform in Milwaukee*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Etter-Lewis, G. (1991). Standing up and speaking out: African American women's narrative legacy. *Discourse & Society*, 2, 4, 425–437.
- Foster, M. (1997). *Black teachers on teaching*. New York: The New Press.
- Gerke, N. & Kang, J. (2005, April). *Culture, crisis, and choice in the lives & work of Japanese American teachers of the 50s & 60s*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Hune, S. (2003). Introduction. In S. Hune & Nomura, G. M. (Eds.), *Asian/Pacific Islander American women: A historical anthology* (pp. 1–15). New York: New York Press.
- Johnson, S. (1990). *Teachers at work*. New York: Basic Books.
- Kim, N. (2000). The general survey course on Asian American women: Transformative education and Asian American feminist pedagogy. *Journal of Asian American Studies*, 3, 1, 37–65.
- Krane, J., Oxman-Martinez, J., & Ducey, K. (2001). Violence against women and ethnoracial minority women: examining assumptions about ethnicity and race. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 32 (3), 1–18.
- Lee, S. J. (1996). *Unraveling the "model minority" stereotype: Listening to Asian American youth*. New York: Teacher College Press.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Office of Superintendent and Instruction (2004). Retrieved on November 30, 2004, from <http://www.k12.wa.us/>
- San Miguel Jr., G. (2001). *Brown, not White: School integration and the Chicano movement in Houston*. Houston: Texas A&M University Press.
- Shimabukuro, R. (2001). *Born in Seattle: The campaign for Japanese American redress*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Taylor, Q. (1994). *The forging of a Black community: Seattle's central district from 1870 through the civil rights era*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- US Census Bureau. (2003). *Statistical abstract of the United States: 2003*. Washington D.C.: United States Department of Commerce.
- Walker, V. S. (2001). African American Teaching in the South: 1940–1960. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38, 4, 751–79
- Walker, V. S. (1996). *Their highest potential: An African American school community in the segregated south*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Yow, V. R. (2005). *Recording oral history: A guide for the humanities and social sciences*, 2nd Edition. Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press.

ENDNOTES

- ¹ I would like to thank Nathalie Gehrke for introducing me to the oral history methodology and for inviting me to collaborate on the oral history project. I also wish to thank Nancy Beadie, Gail Nomura, and Manka Varghese on their valuable comments on this study.
- ² Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) hired non-credentialed teacher candidates with a minimum of a bachelor's degree and provided them with 40 hours of intensive training before placing us in self-contained classrooms. We were given emergency credentials until we completed all state-required teacher education courses within five years. LAUSD discontinued emergency credentials in fall of 2003. I was hired in 1994 and received my teaching credential from LAUSD Intern Program in 1996.
- ³ Oral History Project by Dr. Nathalie Gehrke and Julie Kang helped to collect eleven oral histories of Japanese American retired women teachers in Washington.

Developing Curriculum Materials on East Asia for Secondary School Students

by Linda K. Menton

Introduction

The Curriculum Research & Development Group (CRDG) is a research unit of the College of Education at the University of Hawai'i. Part of our mission is to develop curriculum materials for students in grades K–12. We pilot-test our curriculum materials in our attached laboratory school, which has about four hundred students who are selected by lottery to create a student body that reflects the ethnic distribution of Hawai'i and includes a broad range of student academic achievement and family socio-economic levels.

The social studies section of CRDG has been developing curriculum materials on Asia since the early 1990s. As a result of our geographic position in the middle of the Pacific, and because we are the only state where the majority of its residents trace their ancestry to Asia rather than to Europe, we are well aware of Asia's role in the world as a partner, a competitor, and a market. We want our students, and by extension, students in public and private schools throughout the United States, to understand the history, cultures, and geography of Asia. Certainly it is in their best economic interests to do so. China, with its population of 1.3 billion people, 20 percent of the world's population, is rapidly becoming an economic powerhouse. Japan, which is America's most important security ally in Asia, has the third largest economy in the world after the United States and China. And South Korea, another American security ally, is estimated to have become the world's tenth largest economy in terms of gross domestic product (GDP) in 2004. Furthermore, the countries of East Asia, meaning China, Japan, and South Korea, are beginning to understand the value of regionalization for themselves and are working in partnership with each other to reach a common goal: promoting exports to American and European markets. The first East Asia Summit was held under the auspices of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) in 2005.

Teaching and Learning About Asia

There is general agreement in the United States, at least in theory, that students should learn about Asia. However, the actual state of teaching about Asia in American schools, according to a 2001 report by the Asia Society, is neither comprehensive nor systematic, with social studies teachers in one survey devoting less than 5 percent of class time to Asia-related content.¹

There are several interrelated reasons for this omission:

- 1) a perception among teachers that they are being asked to stuff more and more into an already overcrowded world history curriculum;
- 2) uncertainty in the American public school systems as to what secondary school students will be required to know

on still-pending standardized social studies tests under the No Child Left Behind legislation. While teachers are very sure that students will be tested on their knowledge of American history, it is not clear what other social studies content students will be tested on;

3) inadequate preparation to teach about Asia. Ninety-five percent of teachers surveyed in a 1999 study self-reported that they do not have adequate preparation to teach about Asia;²

4) lack of curriculum materials about Asia. World history textbooks, despite their compendious size, frequently give short shrift to Asia. Although Asian civilizations receive more coverage in such texts than they did in the past, many can still be justifiably labeled "Eurocentric" in content. Yet despite these deficiencies, teachers report that textbooks are still the most common resource that they use to teach about Asia.³ It is true that there is a myriad of curriculum packages about Asia available on the Web. However, the quality of these materials is uneven and teachers may not be qualified to evaluate them for historical accuracy.

The social studies section of CRDG has worked to address these curricular concerns by providing teachers and students with historically accurate and pedagogically sound instructional materials about Asia. We published a curriculum package entitled *China: Understanding Its Past*, which includes a student book, a teacher's manual, and a compact disc with Chinese music from different regions, genres, and time periods in 1998. We developed a similar curriculum package, *The Rise of Modern Japan*, in 2004.⁴

Modern East Asia

We originally planned to develop a set of four interrelated but stand-alone books on China, Japan, Southeast Asia, and the Pacific, as part of a project entitled Curriculum on Asian and Pacific History. All of these instructional materials were designed to be used as flexibly as possible: to supplement the truncated information in world history texts; to be used as a primary text in an area studies course; and to use in related student activities such as Model United Nations or World Quest. As a result of our work on the China and Japan books, we decided to follow up by developing a text on East Asia, rather than Southeast Asia. We knew that our China and Japan books did not address East Asia as a region, and we were also concerned about the omission of Korea in this context.

We surveyed the existing instructional materials on East Asia to decide whether such a project was feasible. Although we found a few books that focus on the countries of East Asia using a

traditional country-by-country approach, we were not able to find a single textbook for secondary students that focused on East Asia as a region or that used a thematic approach. We applied for and received a grant from the International Research & Studies Program, which is part of the United States Department of Education, to undertake this project.

This paper focuses on one aspect of that project: the process of developing the organizational framework for a thematically based text focused on China, including Hong Kong and Taiwan; Japan; and South and North Korea.

Organizational Structure: The Larger Context

We learned long ago at CRDG that no one person has all the skills needed to develop curriculum materials on Asia. Our initial efforts to recruit such a person resulted in applicants who were either academic area specialists, who had no idea how to develop instructional materials for high school students, or excellent secondary teachers who lacked the in-depth content knowledge required for such work. We solved this problem by pooling our strengths and skills and working in teams. Our teams include area specialists, usually advanced doctoral students, who have both history and language skills, and CRDG curriculum developers, who have the necessary pedagogical skills and secondary school teaching experience for such an undertaking. Such a team allows us to work together to develop historically accurate and pedagogically sound instructional materials.

The University of Hawai'i is home to three academic centers focused on East Asia: the Center for Chinese Studies, the Center for Japanese Studies, and the Center for Korean Studies. The university is also a National Resource Center for East Asia. As a result, we have access to an excellent library collection and to many academic East Asia specialists. These academics, as well as scholars from other institutions, serve as advisors and scholarly readers for the project. They read the manuscript in draft form, and we make revisions based on their feedback. We also base revisions on feedback from teachers and high school students who pilot-test the materials in our laboratory school.

The first step in developing instructional materials, regardless of their subject or format, is to develop a solid organizational framework. We knew we did not want our text on East Asia to focus on China, Japan, and Korea separately, with one-third of the book devoted to each country. We also knew we wanted to avoid the pitfalls of traditional world history texts that emphasize coverage rather than depth and focus exclusively on chronology rather than themes and trends.

However, once we actually began to develop such a thematic framework, we realized that it was much more difficult to do than we had anticipated. I think it is fair to say that creating an organizational structure for *Modern East Asia*, the working title for this text, has proved the most difficult of any of the books we have written so far.

We decided that the guiding question for this text would be, What does a tenth- or eleventh-grade student need to know about modern East Asia?

The question is deceptively simple, but it conceals deeper questions that include some contentious issues, such as

What should be included in a historical narrative?

What can be left out?

Who decides what is included and what is left out?

Who is “qualified” to write such a narrative? Who is not and why not?

Notably none of these questions is directed to the pedagogical or developmental needs of secondary students; rather they are political questions, in the broadest sense of that word. Nevertheless, these political questions are especially germane when it comes to writing history for pre-college students.

There was a firestorm of controversy in the United States when the national standards for history, particularly for American history for grades 5–12, were published in the early 1990s. The standards became the subject of rancorous congressional hearings that pitted various interest groups against each other. Conservatives complained that the standards emphasized the worst aspects of American history, such as slavery, promoted other cultures too much, highlighted women and minorities at the expense of traditional American heroes, and marginalized Western civilization. Lynne Cheney, the former chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities, described the standards as “grim and gloomy.” In the end, after the U.S. Senate voted 99 to 1 to reject the standards, a revised set of standards was published that did not include the historical examples that some found so objectionable in the original version.⁵

The American debate about history standards is a good indicator of how important national narratives are; how important they are perceived to be in creating a common national past and a common national identity; and how important they are in passing on the “truth” of a nation’s past, whatever that “truth” is considered to be, to the next generation.

These issues are not unique to the United States. Certainly we hear some of the same questions and concerns expressed in the on-going controversy about history textbooks in Japan, and the objections expressed about them by China and Korea. This longtime controversy speaks to the questions posed earlier regarding national narratives and their purpose, and who can write them and who cannot. Disagreements over textbooks, and over the way the past is portrayed in them, are often stand-ins for larger battles about past historical wrongs—especially the refusal to acknowledge them—and current political, economic, and territorial disputes.

Small wonder then that we, a team of American educators, “outsiders” as sociologists use the term, approached the task of developing a history text about East Asia with trepidation. How could we write a text that would be judged meritorious by historians, acceptable by the general public, and engaging to high school students?

Organizational Structure: The Reality

We decided that we wanted to develop a textbook about the same size as its predecessors on China and Japan, about 250 pages for the student book. We also decided that the entire instructional package would consist of a student book, a teacher’s manual, and a student activity book that would also be produced on a compact disc.

We wanted the student book to include timelines, maps, pronunciation guides, historical photos, primary documents, literary excerpts, poems and songs, charts and graphs, and many, many student activities. Fortunately, technology has made it possible to “save” some space in the student book by putting some of these items on the compact disc. It was tempting to use the disc as a default, and add many more things to it than would fit in the book. However, we endeavored to avoid the temptation, as we would simply end up with an over-long book on a disc.

Plan A

Our first efforts at imposing some structure on the history of modern East Asia was to decide what “modern” means. This is a very difficult concept for high school students, who tend to believe

that “modern” means today, right now, this very minute. It does not mean yesterday, it does not mean last year, and it certainly does not mean centuries ago. But historians see the concept much differently. We decided that since we could not write “everything” about China, Japan, and Korea, we would begin with a prologue that would *briefly* describe the last traditional dynasties of each country and then proceed with the first chapter circa 1860. So the first framework looked something like Plan A.

Plan B

Plan A, we soon learned, had the potential to turn into a thousand-page opus. So we decided instead to sketch out a thematic/chronological approach, which became Plan B. We had developed a thematically based text once before. This earlier text, entitled *A History of Hawai’i*, allowed teachers and students to study the political, economic, social, and land history of Hawai’i during a particular time span—the territorial years, for example. Alternatively, they could study one aspect of that history, such as political history, over a long time period.⁶ The schema for *A History of Hawai’i* is shown below.

Plan A

Prologue/Introduction (15 pages)	
	Qing China: 1644–1864* Tokugawa Japan: 1600–1868 Chosun Korea: 1392–1860
Chapter I (60 pages)	1860s to 1912
Chapter II (75 pages)	1912–1945
Chapter III (100 pages)	1945 to today
*The Qing dynasty ended in 1911, but 1864 was chosen to coincide with the defeat of the Taiping by Chinese government forces. Some historians date the beginnings of Chinese nationalism to 1850 and the beginning of the Taiping Rebellion.	

Schema for *A History of Hawai’i*

UNIT ONE Precontact to 1900	UNIT TWO 1900 to 1945	UNIT THREE 1945 to the Present
Chapter 1 Political	Chapter 5 Political	Chapter 9 Political
Chapter 2 Economic	Chapter 6 Economic	Chapter 10 Economic
Chapter 3 Social	Chapter 7 Social	Chapter 11 Social
Chapter 4 Land	Chapter 8 Land	Chapter 12 Land

Our first effort to construct a similar structure for Modern East Asia looked like this—

Plan B

Prologue	Chapter I	Chapter II	Chapter III
	1860s–1912	1912–1945	1945 to present
	Political	Political	Political
	Economic	Economic	Economic
	Social	Social	Social
	Foreign relations	Foreign relations	Foreign relations

It soon became apparent, however, that the histories of three very different nations could not be divided up this way. Forcing history into categories to make it “fit” destroyed the historical integrity of what we were trying to do. Nevertheless, the exercise made us more cognizant of the common threads we wanted to weave through the narrative. For example, we wanted to include the exchange of beliefs, such as Confucianism and Buddhism, and practices, such as the development of writing systems, that had taken place among these countries and cultures. It also forced us to differentiate among experiences, such as imperialism and colonialism, which were common to all three countries but were played out differently in each.

Plan C

We began to think that we might be reinventing the wheel. Maybe somebody else has done this already. So, we took a look at the national standards for world history to see if that organizational structure might work for us. After all, we had to be sure we were addressing the standards, and we could always adjust the time periods if we needed to. This resulted in Plan C, based on the national world history standards.

Plan C’s organizational structure obviously had problems. These included its omission of Korea, its dated “impact of the West” approach, and its failure to make any kind of regional con-

Plan C

The Emergence of the First Global Age, 1450–1770

Standard 5: Transformations in Asian Societies in the era of European Expansion

The student understands the transformations in India, China, and Japan in an era of expanding European commercial power.

Therefore, the student is able to:

1. Explain how the Manchus overthrew the Ming dynasty, established the multiethnic Qing, and doubled the size of the Chinese empire.
2. Evaluate China’s cultural and economic achievements during the reigns of the Kangxi and Qianlong emperors.
3. Assess the extent of European commercial penetration of China and the ability of the Chinese government to control trade.
4. Explain the character of centralized feudalism in Japan under the Tokugawa shogunate and the reasons for Japan’s political stability, economic growth and cultural dynamism.
5. Analyze Japan’s relations with Europeans between the 16th and 18th centuries and the consequences of its policy of limiting contact with foreigners.

Plan C**An Age of Revolutions, 1750–1914****Standard 3: The transformation of Eurasian societies in an era of global trade and rising European power, 1750–1870.**

Standard 3 D: The student understands how China’s Qing dynasty responded to economic and military crisis in the late 18th and 19th centuries.

Therefore, the student is able to:

1. Analyze the economic and social consequences of rapid population growth in China.
2. Analyze causes of governmental breakdown and social disintegration in China in the late 18th century.
3. Analyze why China resisted political contact with Europeans and how the opium trade contributed to European penetration of Chinese markets.
4. Analyze the causes and consequences of the Taiping Rebellion.
5. Explain the growth of the Chinese diaspora and assess the role of overseas Chinese in attempts to reform the Qing.
6. Analyze how Chinese began to reform in government after 1895 and why revolution broke out in 1911.

Standard 3 E The student understands how Japan was transformed from feudal to shogunate to modern nation state in the 19th century.

Therefore, the students is able to:

1. Analyze the internal and external causes of the Meiji Restoration.
2. Analyze the goals and policies of the Meiji state and their impact on Japan’s modernization.
3. Assess the impact of Western ideas and the roles of Confucianism and Shinto values on Japan during the Meiji period.
4. Explain the transformation of Japan from a hereditary social system to a middle class society.
5. Explain changes in Japan’s relations with China and the Western powers from the 1850s to the 1890s.
6. Analyze Japan’s rapid industrialization, technological advancement, and national integration in the late 19th and early 20th centuries.⁷

nections, with the possible exception of standard 3E/5, regarding changes in Japan’s relations with China from the 1850s to the 1890s. Furthermore, if we tried to include all the standards, we could easily end up with another thousand-page book. After all, the standards cited here end with 1914, which coincided with our planned prologue and chapter I dates. In any event, this content-based approach reassured us that we were on the right track—many of the people, themes, and events mentioned were consistent with our earlier selections.

Plan D

We were starting to get worried. Time was moving on. We had lots of ideas and lots of timelines, and lots of pieces of paper but we needed to start pilot-testing our materials with students. What would happen if we just started writing, without a plan or an outline, doing exactly what we tell students not do? We decided it was worth a try, and so we started writing what we called “units,” pieces of text that were not very well written, that did not flow very well or move smoothly from one paragraph to the next, but that forced us to go back to the question, What does a tenth or eleventh grade student need to know about modern East Asia?

When we exchanged our units of text, which focused only on the prologue and the first chapter, we began to discern a structure that we thought would work. Its organizing principle is chronological—

However, we began to see that this schema also raised new concerns and questions.

- 1) What had we missed?
- 2) How could we address one of the major criticisms about American textbooks about Asia—that they almost always focus on America’s war experiences there? We were adamant in wanting to avoid this pitfall and, at the same time, represent war as a significant force in these countries’ histories.
- 3) How could we explicitly identify the critical connecting points for students?

Regarding this last point, we realized that we could not expect high school students to synthesize complex historical material without guidance. Our solution was to include key questions throughout the text to help students make connections. We also

planned to include fill-in-the-blanks retrieval charts and have students use them to answer questions or complete an activity. For example: What ideology formed the basis for Chinese, Korean, and Japanese society and how was it reflected in the organization of the main social classes in China, Korea, and Japan? Or, China, Japan, and Korea all signed unequal treaties with foreign powers in the

mid-nineteenth century. How were these treaties and the impact they had on each country similar or different? Or, using this series of color-coded maps, describe the changes in government and the establishment of new nations that took place in East Asia between 1945 and 1950. Then describe the political status of each of those nations today.

Plan D

Prologue: Last Traditional Dynasties	China	Japan	Korea
Chapter I 1860s to 1912 Key concepts: Sino-centricism; cultural exchange; domestic turmoil/dynastic decline; foreign imperialism; response to imperialism; self-strengthening; modernization; nationalism Point of confluence:	Japan	China	Korea
Chapter II 1912–1945 Key Concepts: Colonialism; industrialization; nationalism; republicanisim; liberalism; parliamentary democracy; revolution; ultra nationalism; militarism; capitalism, Communism; fascism; world war. Point of confluence:	Japan	China	Korea
Chapter III 1945 to today Key Concepts Cold War; Communism; democratization; technology; post-industrialization; market economy; globalization and global economy; human rights; cultural identity and integrity Point of confluence:	Japan	China	Korea

Plan E

1945

China (PRC)	Japan	S. Korea (ROK)	N. Korea (DPRK)	Taiwan (ROC)	Hong Kong (SAU)	Convergence Activity
1. Civil War Communist Revolution (Korean)	2. Occupation (posters)	1. Korean War	1. Korean War	1. Flight to	Return to Britain	1. Map-post WWII 2. Korean War 3. Cold War
2. Mao/GLF	2. Economic Recovery a. Growth b. Gov./zaibatsu c. Korean War	2. Economic Development	Political Status	Economic change/ growth	Economic growth (con't.)	
3. Cultural Revolution 1966-1977		3. Democratizaon	Economic Collapse	Government Change: authoritarianism to "democracy" 1949–1479	Return to China 1997 +50	
4. Economic Reform			4. Isolationism		4. Economic Change 1. Japan 2. Korea 3. China From textiles to heavy industry (J/K), to technology transfer	Economic Change: Japan Korea China From textiles to heavy industry (J/K), to technology transfer. Labor costs.

Where We Are Now: Plan E

We have been working on a digital web-based resource entitled *Cross Currents*, for several years. It focuses on the post-war history of the United States and Japan and the “cross currents” or influences the two countries have had on each other. This project, which is aimed at students in the United States and Japan, is written (and audio-recorded) in both Japanese and English. The experience of writing for the Web, with the limitations of what can be read easily on a screen, and writing text that we knew would be translated into Japanese, forced us to simplify our writing style and focus on the essence of what we wanted students to know. We decided that the lessons we learned from developing *Cross Currents* might well apply to a book on modern East Asia. And so we developed Plan E.

Plan E

In this plan we decided to focus more explicitly on “recent” East Asian history, concentrating on the years from 1945 to the present. We made this decision, which meant postponing the development of the middle chapters, because of the tendency to focus too much on the past and not on the present, with “present” meaning post-World War II. Thus we developed Plan E with the intentions of going back and picking up the threads or themes we think are absolutely essential to understanding East Asia and ruthlessly leaving out what is not essential. We are aware that there will never be consensus among historians as to what is and is not “essential” in a specific historical narrative. However, we have found that working in reverse chronological order has made it easier for us to identify the key concepts or ideas that connect the past and the present, and to connect those ideas over chapters. For example, it is impossible for students to understand how world-shattering Mao’s command to “destroy the four olds” during the Cultural Revolution was for Chinese society and Chinese families without an understanding of traditional Confucianism.

In order to reduce the overwhelming amount of student text that Plan E would **inevitably** involve, we have decided to write brief content units on given topics such as the Asian Financial Crisis. A variety of hand-on activities could then be used to help students grasp and synthesize the content contained in Plan E.

Conclusion

Our efforts to design an organizational structure for this book have made us very aware of the value of three questions. The first is our own, the “what” or content question posed earlier, namely, “What does a tenth or eleventh grade student need to know about modern East Asia?” The second is a “why” question, that perennial student grievance posed as a query that is familiar to history teachers everywhere: “Why do I have to learn this stuff? And what does it have to do with me?” It is a valid question. And if we cannot answer

it, if we cannot help students see how the past is influencing the present, then, indeed, why do they have to learn this stuff? And what does it have to do with them? The third question is also our own: “How can we best help students and teachers understand how the past affects the present?” We are optimistic that this framework for a high school textbook focused on China, Hong Kong, and Taiwan; Japan; and South and North Korea is an initial step in helping teachers help their students understand how the past affects the present not only in East Asia but also in the larger context of human history.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author acknowledges the many team members who have worked on the Curriculum on Asian and Pacific History—Eileen H. Tamura, Noren W. Lush, Chance I. Gusukuma, Francis K. C. Tsui, Warren Cohen, and Lisa Ritts.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Asia in the Schools: Preparing Young Americans for Today’s Interconnected World.* (2001). New York: The Asia Society.
- Menton, L. K., & Tamura, E. H. (1989, rev. ed. 1999). *A History of Hawaii*. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i, Curriculum Research & Development Group.
- Menton, L. K., Lush, N. W., Tamura, E. H., & Gusukuma, C. (2003). *The Rise of Modern Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press & the Curriculum Research & Development Group.
- National Standards for History, Basic Edition.* (1996). Los Angeles: University of California, National Center for History in the Schools.
- National Standard for United States History, Exploring the American Experience, Grades 5–12.* (1994). Los Angeles: University of California, National Center for History in the Schools.
- National Standards for World History: Exploring Paths to the Present.* (1994). Los Angeles: University of California, National Center for History in the Schools.

ENDNOTES

- ¹ *Asia in the Schools*, 26.
- ² *Asia in the Schools*, 30.
- ³ *Asia in the Schools*, 30–31.
- ⁴ Tamura et al, *China Understanding Its Past*, and Menton et al. *The Rise of Modern Japan*.
- ⁵ *National Standards for United States History, Exploring the American Experiences, Grades 5–12*, 1994; *National Standards for History, Basic Edition*, 1996.
- ⁶ Linda K. Menton and Eileen H. Tamura. *A History of Hawai’i*, vii.
- ⁷ *National Standards for World History*, 196, 222, 224.

Language and Cultural Maintenance of Hawai'i-born Nisei

by Hiromi Yoshida

Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to consider how *Nisei*, the second generation of Japanese immigrants, in Hilo on the island of Hawai'i have maintained their Japanese cultural and linguistic skills. *Issei* refers to the first-generation Japanese Americans and *Nisei* to the second-generation. *Nikkei* refers generally to people of Japanese ancestry. A sub-group called *Kibei Nisei* includes people who were born on the US mainland or in Hawai'i and then went to Japan in their formative years. As a result, this latter group became more fluent in Japanese than in English, and they tend to speak Japanese better than other *Nisei*. This paper deals only with *Nisei* and not the *Kibei Nisei*.

At the beginning of my research, my interests were focused on the lives of Japanese immigrants in Japanese communities in Hilo. Although a large numbers of studies have been conducted on Japanese immigrants in Hawai'i, most of them focus on the island of Oahu. Surprisingly, few studies have so far been conducted with the Japanese immigrants on the island of Hawai'i. In addition, research studies have tended to focus on the *Nisei* soldiers during World War II or the lives of Japanese immigrants in plantation villages, and they have ignored the experience of Japanese immigrants' who lived in the towns. Needless to say, these significant issues are not only important academically but are of value in presenting a more complete picture of the Japanese-American experience in Hawai'i. I believe strongly that it is important to give a clear idea of the lives of Japanese immigrants in towns as well as their experiences during the war and in plantation villages.

Methodology and fieldwork

Between 2003 and 2005, I was able to visit Hilo five times to investigate the Japanese communities of *Shinmachi* and *Yashijimachou*.¹ Usually, I stayed there for two or three weeks at a time, except for the first visit when I stayed for only one week. Of course, these communities do not exist any more because of tsunamis in 1946 and in 1960. However, I was able to meet numerous *Nikkei* who are still living in Hilo. I was also able to join various parties and events and this allowed me to meet as many *Nikkei* as necessary for my study. Surprisingly, the younger generations, such as third and fourth generations of *Nikkei* have very little knowledge about these older communities of *Shinmachi* and *Yashijimachou*.

Fortunately, I was able to receive considerable support from Professor Honda of the University of Hawai'i. Professor Honda is president of the Hawai'i Japanese Center in Hilo and through his kind help, I was able to participate in some of the activities of

the Center. Finally, I met some *Nisei* who had lived in *Shinmachi* and *Yashijimachou*. I also had several opportunities to gather information by interviewing some *Nikkei* who possessed a lot of knowledge about these communities. These ten *Nisei* who were kind enough to share their life histories with me are the core informants of my research study. The results of this research were compiled for my master's thesis and include maps that represented what these Japanese communities looked like, and how Japanese immigrants lived there.

While conducting research, I kept wondering why these *Nisei* could still speak Japanese so fluently in spite of the limited use of Japanese that they seemed to make in their daily lives. These *Nikkei* had experienced many difficult circumstances, especially during the war period, when the use of Japanese had been banned. How had they retained their Japanese language abilities?

I hypothesized that there were some circumstances that allowed them to use their Japanese. However, I could not, at first, find any evidence that would explain how they had been able to keep their language and cultural knowledge alive. I needed, therefore, to look closely at individual life histories to find the reasons.

In this paper, I will first provide a history of these Japanese immigrant communities in Hilo. Next, I will describe my research findings. I will then offer an analysis and explanation using the "reward system" theory proposed by Joshua A. Fishman.² I will conclude with some comments on the *Nisei* use of Japanese and the special Japanese culture they uphold.

My research is based on interviews with *Nisei* whom I have met. I recognize that there are *Nisei* who do not want to speak Japanese nor participate in Japanese events and who are less familiar with their Japanese roots. Thus, I do not intend to generalize my findings to all *Nisei* in Hilo.

The Communities of Japanese immigrants in Hilo:

Yashijimachou and Shinmachi

Towards the end of the nineteenth century, Japanese people started to travel across the Pacific Ocean as immigrants. They set off for many destinations in North and South America. Many traveled to Hawai'i to find work in the plantations. The majority of these people were from the Hiroshima, Yamaguchi, and Okinawa prefectures.³ They left Japan to look for better lives—many of them hoping to save money by working hard. After arriving in Hawai'i, most of these immigrants started to work at the big sugar plantations. The contract period for the plantation was

normally three years. After their **contract had expired**, a few of these immigrants went back to Japan, but others remained at the plantation villages, while others chose to move to the mainland of the United States. **Some were able to find work outside of the plantations in such towns as Hilo.**⁴

Early immigrant groups in Hilo lived in the downtown area, where a number of other ethnic groups—Caucasian American, Chinese, and Portuguese were already established. By the beginning of twentieth century, the Japanese were the majority ethnic group in the coastal areas.⁵ Many of them lived inside or near downtown. As more and more Japanese kept moving into these areas, Japanese communities gradually took shape close to the downtown area. Japanese immigrants soon started **their own businesses. There were grocery stores, tofu shops, barbershops, restaurants, hotels, and theaters. Others worked as fishermen, carpenters, and stevedores.** Two major Japanese areas developed. The first was formed in the area of Waiākea, located in the southern part of Hilo. Although its official name was Waiākea Town, **Japanese people called it *Yashijimachou*, which means “the coconuts-island town” in Japanese.**⁶ The second area was formed between the downtown and the *Yashijimachou* area. This area was called *Shinmachi*, meaning “a new town.” **The name of *Shinmachi* was the official name. However, during World War II, these Japanese names, as well as many names for streets and parks, were required to be changed. But in spite of these official demands, *Shinmachi* somehow survived in use.**

World War II and Japanese Immigrants

The war was a particularly difficult experience for Japanese immigrants in Hilo. Fortunately, the majority of them were able to stay in their own homes and many of them continued their businesses **under the martial law that was declared at the outbreak of the war.** Thus, compared to many Japanese immigrants on the mainland who were almost all sent to concentration camps, the Japanese immigrants in Hilo lived under better circumstances. Of course, many of the stories I heard told of tragic situations. In one case, one of my informants **served as a member of the 100th Battalion and went to fight in Europe. In another case, the father of my informant was sent to a concentration camp on the US mainland. One informant lost her husband during the war.** Unfortunately, she could not prepare a proper funeral as there were no monks in Hilo, and it was strictly banned for more than ten Japanese to **gather together in one place.**

The Japanese in Hilo were also prohibited to speak Japanese in public, and Japanese schools were shut down. My informants remember how quiet it was inside the buses back then, as many Japanese immigrants were not able to speak English. They did, however, **speak Japanese at home.**

The Tsunamis of 1946 and 1960

On the first of April, 1946, April Fools Day, a major tsunami hit Hawai‘i. It devastated the coastal area of Hilo. It swept buildings, roads, and people away. Almost all of my informants suffered personally from this disaster.⁷ Some of them lost family

members. In Hilo alone, **ninety-six people were killed.**⁸ It was an unexpected and cruel occurrence for people who were finally getting their lives back together after the war. It was a hard struggle, but people found the strength to carry on and rebuild their old communities.

In 1960, as people were beginning to put the nightmare of 1946 behind them, another tsunami struck Hilo with a similar deadly force.⁹ It was because of this **second strike against Hilo** that legislation was enacted to create a green zone as a barrier against future tsunamis. The people who had lived there were required to relocate. *Yashijimachou* and *Shinmachi* were two of the areas hardest hit by the giant waves, and these devastated communities along the coast **have vanished, replaced by a golf course and a parking area.**

Introducing Two Nisei¹⁰

I would like to introduce two of the *Nisei* who were the subjects of my study. One grew up in *Shinmachi* and the other grew up in *Yashijimachou*. Both of them speak fluent Japanese.

My first informant was Mr. Yoshirou Inoue. He was born in 1918 and grew up in *Shinmachi*. Like many other Japanese immigrants to Hawai‘i, **his father came to the islands first, and then his mother came as a picture bride.** Both of them were from Fukuoka prefecture. **For this generation, finding a partner with the same religion was important. They first lived in a plantation village, but the family moved to *Shinmachi* later.** Mr. Inoue began his education in Japanese language at an early age. **After entering Waiākea Elementary School, he started to study Japanese at a Buddhist church.**

He joined the National Guards and then served in World War II as a member of the 100th Battalion. **He returned to Hilo after the war, and before the 1946 tsunami that devastated *Shinmachi*.** He survived, but other family members were not so fortunate. He lost his parents, one of his nephews, and a niece. **Nowadays he participates in the activities of Hawai‘i Japanese Center, and because of his fluency in Japanese and his very friendly, outgoing character, he contributes positively to the visitor experience and to the welcome that people from Japan enjoy when they visit the center.**

The other subject of my study is Ms. Kimiyo Higashi. She was born in 1923 in *Yashijimachou*. **Although her parents came to Hilo separately, they were both from Yamaguchi prefecture.** Her father was a carpenter. **Her mother had run a tofu shop first, then a general store in *Yashijimachou*.** She attended a Japanese language school in *Yashijimachou*, called *Yahijima Nippongo Gakkou*. She recalled many stories of *Yashijimachou* and was willing to share them with me.

At present, she works as a volunteer for the Hawai‘i Japanese Center answering telephone calls and helping visitors. **Because of her fluency in Japanese and vivid memories of early life in Hilo, she has been able to contribute a lot to the center and to its visitors.**

Findings and analysis

The findings of this study fall into four major categories: (1)

the age of subjects and the acquisition of the Japanese language, (2) the parents' role in promoting Japanese, (3) the position of Japanese language in society, and (4) personal contacts with Japanese language and the culture.

Acquiring Japanese. It is important to point out that my informants finished their Japanese language education when they were in their teens. That was before the war, and before the tsunamis destroyed their communities. Children form their language abilities at a very young age and because these *Nisei* speak English much better than Japanese, they consider that English is their first language. However, Nakajima (2000) defines "mother tongue" as "the first language they met"—so in one sense their mother tongue was Japanese.¹¹ Inevitably, English would become the dominant language later in their lives, but during their childhood, Japanese was the first language, the "mother tongue" of these *Nisei*. In the case of Ms. Higashi, who was born in 1923 in *Yashijimachou*, she had already mastered the foundations of Japanese language before the war started. The acquisition of Japanese language and culture inside these Japanese communities was completed before the people were banned from using Japanese during the war. This helps explain why these *Nisei* maintained their Japanese language and cultural skills.

The Role of Parents. *Nisei* were strongly encouraged to learn Japanese language and culture by their parents. Many studies on Japanese immigrants have pointed out that the creation of Japanese language schools was due to the eagerness of *Issei* to maintain their Japanese heritage.¹² It is said that *Nisei* used a varied mixture of English, Hawaiian, and Japanese with local dialects. For instance, "Papa, Hana hana. House, Oran" means "My father is at work, absent from home." "Papa" and "house" are English words. "Hana hana" means job in Hawaiian. "Oran" means absent in Japanese.¹³ *Issei* aspired to provide proper Japanese language and cultural education so that their children would grow up as competent Japanese speakers fully aware of their cultural heritage. Moreover, many of the Japanese immigrants were thinking of returning to Japan someday after they have saved enough money. Many *Nisei* complied with their parents' expectations.

Mr. Inoue, who was born in 1918 in *Shinmachi*, remembered that his mother encouraged him to take every opportunity to learn and use Japanese. He mentioned that though he himself was interested in learning Japanese, his mother's expectation was quite a strong motivation as well. In addition, when he was only five years old, his mother arranged private lessons in reading and writing Japanese. In Japan, children do not usually begin learning to read and write until they are six years old. Mr. Inoue's mother also found a part time job for her son so that he could use Japanese when he was a high school student. He had to keep a book in Japanese and communicate with customers in Japanese.

Japanese Language in the Community. Japanese language did not have a low social status in Hilo. An important reason for the survival of a language is that it possesses a certain amount of political, economic, and cultural power in the society.¹⁴ The Japanese accounted for sixty percent of the population of Hilo, so

Japanese language and culture enjoyed substantial support in the area. Thus for *Nisei* who grew up in *Yashijimachou* and *Shinmachi*, Japanese was the dominant language.

It should be noted in addition that Japanese immigrants' experiences in Hilo during the war were less harsh than those in other areas. Discrimination and prejudice were much less intense than in the mainland US and Japanese language and culture did not need to be disclaimed by the *Nisei*. For example, Mr. Inoue mentions that he was surprised to witness how African-Americans were segregated in public places when he was training on the mainland. He repeatedly told me that he was shocked to see it, as he had never experienced such discrimination in Hilo. He recalled that he used to have lunch together with his co-worker from Portugal. This atmosphere of ethnic toleration undoubtedly affected, in positive ways, Mr. Inoue's attitude towards the Japanese language and the culture.

Personal Contacts. Several of the people I spoke with, who speak fluently in Japanese, managed to stay in touch with Japanese language and culture. After the war, there was a decrease in the stream of people, products, and information from Japan to Hilo. However, some of these *Nisei* were able to visit Japan and invite their relatives or friends to visit Hawai'i. These events inspired the *Nisei* to use Japanese whenever the occasion permitted. For example, my informants were keen to speak with me in Japanese.

Reading and writing in Japanese was not so much a part of the daily lives of these *Nisei*, and so their literacy abilities have gradually declined. However, they are still able to enjoy watching TV dramas from Japan, listening to Japanese radio programs, and singing Japanese songs at Karaoke¹⁵. They consider these to be enjoyable activities that provide them with opportunities to keep their speaking and listening skills alive.

My informants often participate in activities arranged by the Hawai'i Japanese Center. Its theme is "preserving the past to build the future." The center has two main objectives: to gather and preserve historical materials for anyone who wants to know the history of Japanese immigrants and to organize events and activities for the *Nikkei* community. My informants report that they enjoy participating in singing Karaoke, dancing at festivals, welcoming guests from Japan, and explaining local history to them in Japanese. Thus the center performs an important role in the community in promoting Japanese culture and language.

On March 3, the Girl's Day Festival was celebrated at the campus of the University of Hawai'i.¹⁶ This event brought together not only *Nikkei* but other university students. They were able to enjoy participating in Japanese martial arts such as *Aikido* and traditions like *Sadou* (the tea ceremony), and *Shuuiji* (penmanship). On April 19, there was a showing of the movie *Aizen Katsura* (The Tree of Love). It is quite an old film, made in 1938, and based on a novel with the same title by Kawaguchi Matsuda. It is a love story involving a doctor from a rich family and a single mother. They struggle to overcome many difficulties to be together. I had never heard of it, but it is a great favorite of the *Nisei*. On Mother's day, the eleventh of May, they showed *Samurai Musashi*, a film

based on the life of the famed swordsman. On June 15, they had a Japanese buffet luncheon party. In July, they had a show with Japanese singers and dancers. And in August, they had a guest from Okinawa who demonstrated Okinawan dance and music and explained the history of these arts.

Later in the fall, the Center held a *Kamon* (family crest) workshop. Many *Nisei* have obtained their family crests from Japan. The *Kamon* show *Nikkei* their roots, if they have been maintained properly. I participated in this workshop with several *Nisei* and saw how excited they were to trace their roots. In October the Center held one its main events, a musical festival called Musical Nostalgia. Both professional and semi-professional singers and dancers entertained the audience of more than three hundred people. The variety and excellence of these events attracts a wide participation, including *Nisei* and non-Japanese people who live in Hilo.

The above stories suggest interesting patterns of linguistic and cultural survival along the lines posited by Joshua Fishman who identifies four rewards that contribute to language maintenance. There are social rewards such as enforcing and recognizing membership in the family, in the community, in society, and generally among people; fiscal rewards such as jobs, promotions, raises, and bonuses; political rewards such as elections, appointments, and public, acclaim; and, finally, religious rewards.¹⁷

When the *Nisei* were younger, a variety of social and fiscal rewards contributed to them learning Japanese. These results were clear from the individual life histories that my research disclosed. However, this did not explain why some *Nisei*, many who are now in their 80s, are still able to speak Japanese fluently. I suspect that one main reason they have maintained their Japanese is not due simply to the continuing influence of earlier social and fiscal rewards. It is more a result of personal interests and commitments kept alive by the survival of community values. The *Nisei* continue to enjoy old Japanese songs and films that enable them to stay in touch with Japanese language and culture. This personal factor would not have been as strong in their earlier years. But in surviving the difficult periods of the war and the tsunamis that devastated their communities, they have maintained and deepened their desire to keep their language and culture alive. It is an affirmation of personal value, sense of community, and commitment.

Thoughts on Japanese Language and the Culture of the *Nisei*

I have referred to *Nisei*'s fluency in speaking Japanese. This requires some further explanations. Their Japanese language is different from standard Japanese spoken in contemporary Japanese society. *Nisei* Japanese is based on Japanese influenced by Hiroshima and Yamaguchi dialects and mixed with vocabulary that derives from other languages such as English and Hawaiian. Their language often betrays older patterns of Japanese speech.

For instance, Mr. Inoue related a story to me from his childhood—a story about catching some small fish. His mother disliked cooking such small fish. So, he brought them to his friends' house.

Mr. Inoue: Washiga, yoo, Sakana demo chiisaino toru, yeah? Uchino house motteittara, mendokusai tte okorukara, ano house ittene. Ano obasanga, ryourishite, soide, tofuuya dakara, aburaga aru, yeah? Asukode, soijake, washi, natsuyasumi no tokide, uchinoieni ite tabetakoto nai.

It's interesting to reflect on the rich linguistic variety of this passage: *Yoo* is a local dialect word of western Japan that means "often". *Yeah* is the same as in English conversation. *House* is English. *Soide* means "and then" in Japanese. This is a local dialect word of western and southern Japan. *Sorede* is standard Japanese. *Asukode* means "there" in Japanese. This word is used mainly in western and southern Japan. *Asokode* is standard Japanese. *Soijake* means "because of that" in Hiroshima dialect, while *Soudakara* is used in standard Japanese. Similarly, *Jakee* or *Jakara* are employed quite often among *Nisei*, and are still in use in the dialect of Hiroshima and its surrounding areas.

With regard to Japanese culture and entertainment, the *Nisei* clearly favor pre-war times. They may enjoy TV programs and songs that are currently popular in Japan. However, these people have a special attachment to the past. Even though the *Nisei* have kept in touch with Japanese people and Japanese culture, the language and culture of the *Nisei* are quite distinctive. They have changed it to fit to the local life of Hilo, and it is this personal dimension that has become internalized, preserving a continuous tradition of language and practice.

Conclusion

The *Nisei* of Hilo have experienced some difficulties in maintaining their proficiency in Japanese language and culture. Nevertheless, four factors have contributed to linguistic and cultural maintenance. First, the *Nisei* acquired their language and the culture early and were able to develop it through various educational means—the school, the home, and the community. Secondly, *Issei* played a significant role in motivating *Nisei* to learn the Japanese language and culture. The high expectations that they had for their children and the strong support that they gave them were important factors. Thirdly, the prestige of Japanese language in the wider community was critical to keeping the tradition alive. And finally, even though their exposure to Japanese was and is limited, the Hawai'i Japanese Center has provided and continues to provide many opportunities to promote Japanese language so that people are able to remain acquainted with Japanese culture. *Nisei* do enjoy entertainments that allow them to use their Japanese. They like singing Karaoke in Japanese, watching Japanese films, and talking with guests from Japan. All of these activities allow the *Nisei* to keep in touch routinely with Japanese language and the culture. These internal and external influences have impacted the continuity of Japanese language and culture among the *Nisei* in Hilo. Furthermore, as the life histories of the *Nisei* make clear, there is a personal dimension to their attachment to the Japanese language and culture—one that contributes importantly to the survival of Japanese language and culture in Hawai'i.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Dudley, W. & Stone, S. (2000). *The Tsunami of 1946 and the Devastation of Hilo Town*. Virginia: The Donning Company.
- Dudley, W., & Lee, M. (1998). *TSUNAMI!*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Fishman, J. A. (1985). "The Rise and Fall of the Ethnic Revival: Perspectives on Language and Ethnicity." Berlin: Mouton.
- Hawai'i Nihonjin Rengou Kyokai. (1964). *Hawai'i Nihonjin Imin-shi* [A History of Japanese Immigrants in Hawai'i]. ed. Motohiro, T. Honolulu: United Japanese Society of Hawai'i.
- Nakajima, K. (2001). *Bairingarū Kyōiku No Houhou: 12saimadeni Oyato Kyōshūga Dekirukoto* [A way of Bilingual Education: What parents and teachers can do when their children become 12 years old]. Tokyo: Aruku.
- Nakamura, R. I. & Kobayashi, G.R. (1999). "The History of The Waiākea Pirates Athletic Club and The Yashijima Story (Waiākea Town). Waiākea Pirates Athletic Club.
- Wright, G. (1999). *Hilo from the Beginning: A History of Hawai'i Islands "Crescent City."* Hilo, HI: Basically Books.

ENDNOTES

- ¹ *Shinmachi* means "new town" and *Yashijimachou* means "coconut-island town" in Japanese.
- ² Fishman, *The Rise and Fall of the Ethnic Revival: Perspectives on Language and Ethnicity*, 369
- ³ Kyokai. *Hawaii Nihonjin Imin-shi*, 312–314
- ⁴ *Ibid.*, 317
- ⁵ Glen Wright, *Hilo from the Beginning : A History of Hawai'i Islands*, 33.
- ⁶ Nakamura & Kobayashi, *The History of The Waiākea Pirates Athletic Club and The Yashijima Story*, 19.
- ⁷ Editorial, *Hilo Tribune-Herald*, April 3, 1946; Editorial, *Hawaii Tribune-Herald*, April 1, 1979
- ⁸ Dudley & Stone, *The Tsunami of 1946 and the Devastation of Hilo Town*, 16.
- ⁹ Dudley & Lee, *TSUNAMI!* 130–176.
- ¹⁰ These are not the real names of the two subjects.
- ¹¹ Nakajima, *Bairingarū Kyōiku No Houhou*, 18–26.
- ¹² Tanimura, *Hawai'i Nihonjin Imin-shi*, 14.
- ¹³ *Ibid.*, 15.
- ¹⁴ Nakajima, 12.
- ¹⁵ A Japanese radio program from the Hawaii Japanese Center on KHBC (AM1060) called *Kangaesaserareta Mondai*.
- ¹⁶ "Keep in Touch"(January, 1, 2004) is a news later which is published by the Hawaii Japanese Center.
- ¹⁷ Fishman, 369.

The US Occupation and Japan's New Democracy

by *Ruriko Kumano*

Introduction

Education, in my view, is in part a process through which important national values are imparted from one generation to the next. I was raised in affluent postwar Japan, and schooled, like others of my generation, to despise the use of military force and every form of physical confrontation. The pacifist ideal of peace was taught as an overriding value. I was told that as long as Japan maintained its pacifism, the Japanese people would live in peace forever. My generation were raised without a clear sense of duty to defend our homeland—we did not identify such words as “patriotism,” “loyalty,” and “national defense” with positive values. Why? Postwar education in Japan, the product of the seven-year US occupation after WWII, emphasizes pacifism and democracy. I came to United States for my graduate studies in order to study how contemporary Japanese education has been shaped by the American occupation's educational reforms.

During the US Occupation of Japan (1945–1952), a victorious America attempted to reform Japanese education by replacing Japan's tradition system of values with one that promoted American democratic values. The United States had considered the source of Japan's militarism to lie in the selfless loyalty and love of country that many older Japanese had valued. They wanted to replace these older values with new ones that would ensure a more pacifist outlook. Thus, in the name of democratization and pacification, Japan lost some important aspects of its cultural heritage. But why did the United States want to eliminate these natural sentiments from the Japanese psyche? And what was the cost of these changes?

This paper focuses on the first four months of the Occupation when Japan's first postwar education minister, Maeda Tamon,¹ attempted to change education in the direction of a new democratic Japan. Maeda, Japan's preeminent liberal at the time, took the position of minister of education on August 18, 1945, before the Allied Occupation officially began. In his first two months, he quickly initiated a number of educational reforms without interference from American officials. He wanted these reforms not only to meet American expectations but also to preserve what he believed to be the unique aspect of Japanese culture—the emperor system. However, Maeda's understanding of the word “democracy” differed dramatically from what America wanted, and this difference incited the US to intervene with a different set of educational reforms. This paper examines Maeda's efforts, and the US reaction to them.

The Occupation

On July 26, 1945, the Allied powers, who were by this time absolutely certain of victory, issued the Potsdam Declaration which made the following demands on Imperial Japan: (1) punishment for “those who have deceived and misled the people of Japan into em-

barking on world conquest,” (2) complete dismantlement of Japan's war-making powers, and (3) establishment of “freedom of speech, of religion, and of thought, as well as respect for the fundamental human rights.”²

The Potsdam Declaration was unambiguous—the Allied powers urged the Japanese to surrender unconditionally now or face “utter destruction.”³ But because it failed to specify the fate of the emperor, the Japanese government feared that surrender might end the emperor's life. The Japanese government chose to respond with “*mokusatsu*”—a deliberately vague but fateful word that literally means “kill by silence”⁴—until the Allied powers guaranteed the emperor's safety.

Unfortunately, the Allied powers interpreted Japanese silence, with tragic consequences, as a rejection of the declaration. President Harry S. Truman issued an order to drop the first atomic bomb on Hiroshima on August 6, 1945; two hundred thousand died.⁵ On August 8, the Soviet Union, which had maintained a neutrality pact with Japan, saw a chance to expand its territorial possessions and declared war.⁶ Nearly one million Soviet troops crossed the Siberian border into Manchuria (Manchuko) and began massacring Japanese soldiers and civilians.⁷ On August 9, the United States dropped a second atomic bomb on Nagasaki, killing one hundred and twenty thousand.⁸ On August 15, 1945, the emperor's own voice, broadcast over the radio, urged his loyal subjects to surrender.

A vanquished Japan was to be occupied by the Allied powers “until the purposes set forth in the Potsdam Declaration [were] achieved.”⁹ President Truman designated US Army General Douglas MacArthur as the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers (SCAP).¹⁰ Thus, MacArthur was granted absolute power over Japan, though in effect he used the Japanese government to rule the nation.¹¹

Ostensibly, the Allied powers jointly occupied Japan, but it was the United States that in reality monopolized every sphere of influence. When Britain and the Soviet Union also insisted on participating in the Occupation, the United States grudgingly agreed to establish the Far Eastern Commission and the Allied Council for Japan. The Far Eastern Commission met regularly in Washington to guide MacArthur in matters of basic policy. The Allied Council for Japan—composed of representatives from the United States, the Soviet Union, China, and the British Commonwealth—also conferred regularly in Tokyo to supervise MacArthur.¹² However, the various members of this bickering multinational body could seldom agree, and they were, in any case, powerless to act without United States' approval.¹³

The United States wanted to make sure that Japan would never again threaten the national security of neighboring Asian countries and the interests of the United States. American officials believed that for Japan to become a peace-loving member of the world

community, it had to be transformed into a democratic country—a change that required not only dismantling Japan's prewar political system but also effecting a complete reorientation of the thinking and values of the Japanese people.

MacArthur and his staff in Tokyo (collectively called GHQ) understood the immensity of their task; after all, reforms would have lasting power only if Japanese citizens understood them, embraced them, and passed them on to the next generation. MacArthur believed he first had to destroy what lay at the foundation of Japan's nationalistic militarism: passionate patriotism based on the belief that the emperor was the divine father to the Japanese people. A new foundation—democracy—would be laid through educational reform.

Maeda Tamon Becomes Minister of Education

On August 15, 1945, Prime Minister Suzuki Kantaro announced that Japan had accepted the unconditional surrender under one condition: that the emperor continues to rule Japan.¹⁴ Accordingly, Education Minister Ota Kozo issued special instructions to prefectural governors and school principals stating that people should devote their hearts and souls to “guarding the fundamental character of the Japanese Empire” because only such an attitude would show fidelity to the emperor.¹⁵

Following Japan's surrender, the Japanese government attempted to maintain social cohesion by trying to preserve *kokutai* (national polity, i.e., the emperor system).¹⁶ Prince Higashikuni Naruhiko, the first postwar prime minister, formed a cabinet on August 17, 1945, and appointed Maeda Tamon to be the first postwar education minister.¹⁷

The Prime Minister Higashikuni announced that his cabinet's mission was three-fold: to maintain *kokutai*, to comply with the Potsdam Declaration, and to observe the Imperial Rescript on Surrender which Emperor Hirohito announced on the radio on August 15, 1945.¹⁸

... Let the entire nation continue as one family from generation to generation, ever firm in its faith of the imperishableness of its divine land, and mindful of its heavy burden of responsibilities, and the long road before it... foster nobility of spirit; and work with resolution so as ye may enhance the innate glory of the Imperial state and keep pace with the progress of the world.¹⁹

This rescript, unofficially the emperor's wish for his subjects, served as the fundamental policy for the postwar Japanese government. Education Minister Maeda applied the government policy to his educational policy and announced it at a press conference on August 18.

The foundation of Japanese education cannot exist without the 1890 Imperial Rescript on Education and the 1945 Imperial Rescript on Surrender. I would like to solve Japan's future educational problems by translating these imperial rescripts into concrete policies.²⁰

The 1890 Imperial Rescript on Education he referred to was the rescript in which the emperor set the purpose of education: to inculcate morality, the nucleus of which was loyalty and piety to the emperor and individual love and sacrifice to one's country.²¹ Maeda's policy was to continue this prewar educational purpose. While the Japanese government was determined to preserve the emperor system and its educational philosophy, MacArthur had a plan to eliminate both.

MacArthur's Plans for Spiritual Disarmament

While MacArthur was well informed about US policy,²² his decisions during the Occupation were largely based on his staff's advice. His most trusted advisor, Brigadier General Bonner F. Fellers, had been MacArthur's military secretary and the chief of the Psychological Warfare Branch since 1943.²³

Fellers' perceptions of Japanese personalities during the war formed Japan's postwar reform plan.²⁴ Less than one month before Japan's surrender, Feller's Psychological Warfare Branch published a report entitled “Youth: Pawn of the Militarists,” which explained that *Shinto*, Japan's indigenous religion, was the spiritual foundation for emperor worship. The report quoted Daniel C. Holtom, a prominent expert on Shinto.

Psychological disarmament of Japan will be confronted by the fact that in the schools and other agencies of official propaganda there exists a definite Shinto education inimical to the peace of the world.²⁵

Holtom emphasized the connection between Shinto and Japanese nationalism and interpreted the wartime rhetoric of Shinto as the engine of war—a view that was highly influential in the Occupation's response to Shinto.²⁶

At MacArthur's headquarters in the Philippines, Fellers submitted a memorandum, dated August 15, 1945, for establishing the Information Dissemination Section, which was to 1) encourage cooperation from the Japanese, 2) “assist in orderly transition from war to peace,” and 3) assist in removing the influence of militarism and “Japanese concepts which oppose democratic principles.”²⁷ Before leaving for Japan, MacArthur authorized the plan and appointed Feller the chief of the section.²⁸

On August 30, General MacArthur arrived on the Atsugi Airfield near Yokohama.²⁹ On September 2, 1945, the Japanese delegates signed the terms of the surrender on the USS battleship *Missouri*, which was stationed in Tokyo Bay.³⁰ MacArthur said that the Occupation was “the opportunity” for “a race, long stunted by ancient concepts of mythological teaching,” that needed to be uplifted by “practical demonstrations of Christian ideals.”³¹ MacArthur ruled Japan with evangelistic fervor.

Maeda Begins His Reforms

During the first few months of the Occupation, MacArthur let the Ministry of Education initiate reforms “unless and until this prove[s] to be ineffective or insincere.”³²

Maeda recalled:

For about a month following my appointment as Minister of Education, we were permitted a comparatively free hand, with a minimum of restraints being employed, due largely to the fact that the Occupation authorities themselves had at this time not yet completely established their own policy.³³

Soon after the Occupation began, Bonner Fellers requested a meeting with Maeda.³⁴ Maeda later wrote about the interview: He asked me where attention ought to be centered in the field of education. I replied that I wished to give most attention to establishing Civics education throughout the period of compulsory education and throughout the higher schools, and added that unfortunately there was in the Japanese language no word exactly suitable for translating “Civics.”³⁵

Fellers agreed with him and said, “Please proceed with it.”³⁶

On September 15, 1945, Maeda issued “The Educational Plan for Building the New Japan,” the first comprehensive policy on Japanese education; it reflected both the Japanese cabinet’s policy as well as his own ideas for postwar Japan.³⁷ The main policies were as follows:

1. The maintenance of the structure of the Imperial State
2. Compliance with the Imperial Rescript on Surrender
3. The promotion of scientific education
4. The creation of a peaceful state by eliminating all militaristic thoughts
5. The construction of a new ethical Japan through the cultivation of religious sensibilities
6. The improvement of culture through a comprehensive program of adult education.³⁸

Maeda did not forget to reemphasize the importance of preserving *kokutai*: “[E]fforts will be made for safeguarding and maintaining the structure of the Imperial State.”³⁹ Indeed earlier, on September 9, he had given a speech that was broadcast on the radio in which he said,

The real strength of Japan’s national polity was revealed at the end of the war: Once the emperor called for stopping the war, the Japanese followed the emperor’s order despite differences in opinions. Thus, the most important thing we have to keep in mind was to guard our *kokutai*.⁴⁰

In order to balance the old with the new, Maeda established as a top priority “the advancement of scientific education.”⁴¹ It was an obvious reaction to the American use of the atomic bombs, which had exposed the scientific gap between the two countries.⁴² Hiding the political reason for his preoccupation with science education,

Maeda urged that Japan “should root its foundation in an eternal search for truth, in purely scientific thoughts.”⁴³ He lamented that “recent moral decay (among the Japanese people) had to be remedied by our sincere obedience to the Rescript on Education.”

⁴⁴ After all, the document claimed that the harmonious relationship among the people and their loyalty to the emperor were the most important virtues for happiness and the prosperity of Japan.

Maeda as a “Liberal” Japanese

US State Department officials trusted Maeda as a “liberal” and expected him to carry out radical reforms in line with American objectives. Charles A. Beard, a prominent historian, wrote a letter on August 19, 1945, to President Truman’s White House secretary in which he mentioned his 1922 meeting with Maeda in Japan.⁴⁵ He praised Maeda as “a friend of the United States”⁴⁶ and suggested that the liaison officer between MacArthur’s staff and the Ministry of Education obtain information about Maeda’s character and history. The White House forwarded the letter to the State Department and the War Department.⁴⁷ It turned out that GHQ’s first chief educational officer, Harold Henderson, was already well acquainted with Maeda.⁴⁸ Prior to the war, until it started in 1941, Maeda was director of the Japan Institute and of the Japanese Cultural Library in New York,⁴⁹ where Henderson, a professor of Japanese at Columbia University, was a frequent visitor.⁵⁰ During the war, Henderson had been a specialist in propaganda leaflets and a member of Bonner Fellers’ leaflet executive committee in the Southwest Pacific campaigns. Fellers selected Henderson to be a member of the Information Dissemination Section and assigned him with the task of making contact with his prewar Japanese friends.⁵¹

Soon after Maeda’s educational policies were publicized on September 15, Henderson, now chief of GHQ’s Educational Section, informed Maeda that he, Henderson, would be a liaison between the Ministry of Education and GHQ.⁵² Referring to the newspaper accounts on Maeda’s policies, Henderson said that GHQ was satisfied with Maeda’s plan and encouraged him to continue his work in the same direction. Henderson also told Maeda that GHQ did not intend to issue directives pertaining to education but rather to handle everything by means of personal conferences between the two of them.⁵³

On September 22, 1945, the Information Dissemination Section was reorganized as the Civil Information and Education Section (CI & E).⁵⁴ Colonel (soon Brigadier General) Ken Dyke became the head of CI & E and put Henderson in charge of the Division of Education, Religion, and Monuments.⁵⁵ Dyke and Henderson preferred to work behind the scenes with Maeda, whom Henderson trusted to take the proper initiative as a Japanese liberal. Henderson told Maeda about what SCAP and the US government wanted to be done in the schools and asked him to make his own decisions.⁵⁶

Differences Emerge

On October 4, 1945, SCAP issued the Civil Liberties Directive and ordered the Japanese government to abrogate “restrictions

on freedom of thought, of religion, of assembly and of speech, including the unrestricted discussion of the Emperor, the Imperial Institution and the Imperial Japanese Government.”⁵⁷

MacArthur also ordered the Japanese government to release political prisoners, the majority of whom were hardcore socialists or communists, whom the Japanese government considered the destroyers of *kokutai*.⁵⁸ This directive shocked the Higashikuni cabinet. The next day, the Higashikuni cabinet resigned because it failed to comprehend the Allied demands.

It was urgent for the Japanese government to find leading figures “who could work in harmony with” SCAP and who would be able to fathom SCAP’s expectations.⁵⁹ The incumbent Japanese leaders proposed to MacArthur that Shidehara Kijuro, a 73-year-old former foreign minister (1929–31) known to be a pacifist,⁶⁰ become the next prime minister. MacArthur approved the recommendation that Shidehara form a cabinet in which Maeda would remain as the education minister because Maeda was considered “a political liberal.”⁶¹ The new cabinet declared that “democratic politics” be established.⁶² This was the Japanese government’s first use of the term “democracy.” Shidehara stated that Japanese politics had respected the people’s will, as evidenced in the first provision of the Charter Oath of 1868, which the Emperor Meiji had declared as the basic policy of the newly established nation:⁶³ “Deliberative assemblies shall be widely established and all matters decided by public discussion.”⁶⁴ Shidehara added that “based on this spirit of the Charter Oath, the Japanese government aimed to establish democratic politics by respecting people’s basic rights and recovering completely freedom of speech, assembly, and association.”⁶⁵

Maeda also started to use the word “democracy,” by which he meant that

“sovereignty resides in His Majesty. We, subjects, have been allowed to participate in the governing of the Empire.... This is a special nature of the Japanese-style democracy.”⁶⁶ In Maeda’s “Japanese-style democracy,” loyalty and patriotism were still encouraged.

We must respect our indigenous values: loyalty and patriotism. These values will be truly fulfilled with the development and perfection of democracy, which is based on respect for individuality. It seems loyalty, patriotism, and democracy are incompatible, but they are actually ostensibly supportive of each other. Democratic education has to be based on Japanese indigenous culture.⁶⁷

Maeda’s idea of democracy was a desperate attempt to hold on to the imperial rule while complying with the Allied demand for popular sovereignty and power.

One week after the issue of the Civil Liberty Directive, MacArthur demanded specific reforms from the Shidehara cabinet in a “Statement to the Japanese Government Concerning Required Reforms,” in which MacArthur aimed at education:

The opening of the schools to more liberal education—that the people may shape their future progress from factual

knowledge and benefit from an understanding of a system under which government becomes the servant rather than the master of the people.⁶⁸

MacArthur’s demand indicated that Maeda’s “Japanese-style democracy,” in which the emperor was the ruler, was far from the American-style democracy of popular sovereignty.

US Evaluation of Maeda’s Reforms

The Research and Analysis (R & A) Branch of the State Department scrutinized Maeda’s reforms in a report dated October 5, 1945. Maeda’s reforms had three areas of focus: “preservation of the national polity, expansion of scientific education, and elimination of military training and wartime doctrines.”⁶⁹ Although appealing words such as “science,” “non-military,” and “peace” were integral to Maeda’s reform policy, R & A dismissed Maeda’s gesture as being “only the use of other expressions to describe the same situation.”⁷⁰ If Maeda truly intended to change education, why had he not yet come up with a proposal to “revise the courses in Japanese ethics and history” by eliminating doctrines that had been “the backbone of nationalist education”?⁷¹ R & A concluded that Japanese policymakers would continue to perpetuate “the philosophy of militant nationalism”⁷² to the detriment of American policy and feared that such a conservative view would be a formidable obstacle to freedom of education as well as to the elimination of the “religio-nationalist interpretation of Japanese mythology and the glorification of militarism” from educational curricula. It recommended the use of “external pressures” or the “force of combined student-faculty demands.” Otherwise, it foresaw no real change.⁷³

Direct Action from the GHQ

Henderson visited Maeda once again in mid-October and told him that “The other day... we agreed to let everything connected with education be carried out by conferences between us, but Washington now says that such a casual arrangement will never do.”⁷⁴ With apologies, Henderson handed him an outline of the directive of October 22, 1945,⁷⁵ which ordered not only that educational content, personnel, and facilities be critically examined in accordance with the Occupation’s specified policies but also that the Ministry of Education submit reports “describing in detail all action taken to comply with the provisions” of the directive.⁷⁶ A week later, SCAP issued the October 30, 1945, directive, which established the procedures for purging undesirable teachers.⁷⁷

The United States Launches the Spiritual Disarmament of the Japanese

On December 15, 1945, MacArthur prohibited the dissemination of Shinto doctrines and other religions in all educational institutions supported by public funds.⁷⁸ He also banned “*Kokutai no Hongi*” (The Cardinal Principles of Kokutai), published by the Ministry of Education in 1937, which defined the principles of national polity. The Ministry of Education complied with the Shinto directives, with one exception; the prohibition on shrine worship did not explicitly include the Imperial Palace, so pupils and teachers

continued to line up and bow deeply in the palace's direction.⁷⁹ This deliberate flouting of SCAP's directives only increased the severity of American reforms.

On December 31, 1945, SCAP issued the fourth directive, which prohibited *shushin* (teaching morals), Japanese history, and geography in school until SCAP granted resumption.⁸⁰ The last blow came when Emperor Hirohito denied his divinity in his New Year's Day address.

The ties between us and our people...do not depend upon mere legends and myths. They are not predicated on the false conception that the Emperor is divine... Love of the family and love of the country are especially strong in this country. With more of this devotion should we now work towards love of mankind⁸¹

MacArthur, relieved to see Japan's "pagan" belief system rectified, commented that the emperor's statement pleased him because the emperor undertook "a leading part in the democratization of his people. He squarely takes his stand for the future along liberal lines."⁸²

It was actually Maeda who wrote the emperor's statement.⁸³ On December 23, 1945, Prime Minister Shidehara told Maeda that an influential American urged him to have the emperor issue a statement disavowing the emperor's divinity.⁸⁴ Shidehara asked Maeda to prepare the emperor's address.⁸⁵ Concurring with the idea, Maeda said to Shidehara that after the surrender, people were lethargic and did not know what they should do, so it would be good for the emperor to sweep away the mysterious clouds about him and declare that he was with the people.⁸⁶ Maeda had expressed his opinion on this issue during a Diet session at the beginning of December 1945 when one diet member asked Education Minister Maeda whether or not the emperor was *kami* ("god"), Maeda answered:

There is a difference between "kami" in Japanese and "god" in English. I think that Japanese "kami" is not equivalent to the Christian concept of "God" as the Almighty and the Creator. Although Japanese "kami" includes divinity, its emphasis is more on having the highest position. If you ask me whether the emperor is "god" in the Western sense, the emperor is not. But if "kami" is strictly interpreted in Japanese concept from ancient time, the emperor is a "kami."⁸⁷

On January 4, 1946, Maeda reassured the prefectural governors and the heads of all schools that the Emperor's "human declaration" did not change the relationship between the emperor and his subjects.

The unique relationship between the Sovereign and his subjects in our country does not consist in imaginary myths and legends...we may realize the close relationship between the Sovereign and his subjects; that is, the Sovereign and his subjects belong to one family. I am deeply impressed by the magnanimity of His Majesty's will and our desire to serve

him devotedly cannot but be augmented ever more.⁸⁸

That same day, SCAP ordered the Japanese government to dissolve "militaristic and ultra-nationalistic organizations" and to remove all elements undesirable for the growth of democracy from government and other public offices.⁸⁹ This directive hit the Shidehara cabinet hard since some cabinet members, including Maeda, came under the categories mentioned in the directive.⁹⁰ When he was governor of Niigata prefecture during the war, Maeda held the post of branch chief of the Imperial Rule Assistance Association, which in the directive was categorized as "militaristic nationalism and aggressive influential terroristic or secret patriotic society."⁹¹ Although some US officials in the State Department were reluctant to purge him, Maeda had to go.⁹² Given Maeda's consistent adherence to the status quo, he was not popular among the Occupation authorities. For example, Elliott R. Thorpe, the former chief of counter-intelligence for MacArthur, stated, "We made the mistake of initially using a reactionary named Maeda as education minister."⁹³ Maeda formally resigned from the cabinet on January 13, 1946, and was forbidden to hold a public office for five years.⁹⁴

Conclusion

During the first few months of the Occupation, SCAP carefully watched the Japanese government-initiated reforms while preparing to implement its own policies. Maeda was a touchstone for SCAP to see what a "liberal" Japanese would do. Ultimately, Maeda's addresses and reforms revealed that his concept of democracy was far from that of the United States. What Maeda wished to keep—the emperor system and people's loyalty to the emperor—was what the United States wanted to remove. Concluding that the Japanese government did not understand democracy and that the Japanese could not change from within, SCAP issued directives that destroyed everything Maeda so ardently wanted to keep intact.

REFERENCES

- Dower, J. W. (1999). *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the Wake of World War II*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.
- Duus, P. (1998). *Modern Japan*, 2nd ed. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Hardacre, H. (1989). *Shinto and the State, 1868–1988*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Japan. Ministry of Education, Science and Culture, ed. (1980). *Japan's Modern Education System: A History of the First Hundred Years*. Tokyo: Printing Bureau, Ministry of Finance.
- Kamiya, M. (1980). "Mombusho nikki [Education Ministry diary]." In *Henreki* [Journey]. Tokyo: Misuzu Shobo.
- Kobayashi, T. (1976). *Society, Schools, and Progress in Japan*. Oxford: Pergamon Press Ltd.
- Kurosawa, H. (1982). *Sengo kyoiku no genryu o motomete: Maeda Tamon no kyoiku rinen* [Searching for the origin of education in postwar Japan: Maeda Tamon's educational philosophy]. Tokyo: Naigai Shuppan.
- Maeda, T. (1956). "Beard hakase o shinobu [Reminiscence on Dr. Beard]." *Amerika Kenkyu* 3, no. 12, pp. 3–9.

- Maeda, T. (1956). "The Direction of Postwar Education in Japan." *Japan Quarterly* 3, no. 4, pp. 414–425.
- Maeda, T. (1963). *Maeda Tamon: sono bun, sono hito* [Maeda Tamon: his writing and personality]. Tokyo: Kanko Sewanin Daihyo Horikiri Zenjiro.
- Maeda, T. (1947). *Sanso seishi* [Maeda Tamon's reminiscence]. Tokyo: Hata Shoten.
- Mayo, M. J. (1981). "Psychological Disarmament: American Wartime Planning for the Education and Re-Education of Defeated Japan, 1943–1945." In *The Occupation of Japan: Educational and Social Reform*, the Proceedings of a Symposium held on 16–18 October 1980, edited by Thomas W. Burkman, 21–127. Norfolk, VA: MacArthur Memorial.
- Mikiso, H. (1986). *Modern Japan: A Historical Survey*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Nishi, T. (1982). *Unconditional Democracy: Education and Politics in Occupied Japan, 1945–1952*. Stanford: Hoover Institution Press.
- Oinas-Kukkonen, H. (2003). *Tolerance, Suspicion, and Hostility: Changing US Attitudes toward the Japanese Communist Movement, 1944–1947*. Westpoint, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Orr, M. T. (1954). "Education Reform Policy in Occupied Japan." Ph.D. diss., University of North Carolina.
- Sengo Nihon Kyoiku Shiryo Shusei, ed. (1982). *Sengo Nihon Kyoiku Shiryo Shusei* [Completion of sources of postwar Japanese education]. Vol. 1. Tokyo: Sanichi Shobo.
- Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers (SCAP). Civil Information and Education. Education Section. (1948). *Education in the New Japan*. 2 vols. Tokyo.
- Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers (SCAP). Government Section. (1949). *Political Reorientation of Japan, September 1945 to September 1948*. 2 vols. Washington DC: United States Government Printing Office.
- Suzuki, E. (1970). *Kyoiku Gyosei* [Educational administration]. Tokyo: Tokyo Daigaku Shuppankai.
- Takemae, E. (2002). *Inside GHQ: The Allied Occupation of Japan and Its Legacy*. Translated by Robert Ricketts and Sebastian Swann. New York: Continuum.
- Thorpe, E. R. (1969). *East Wind, Rain: The Intimate Account of an Intelligence Officer in the Pacific 1939–49*. Boston: Gambit incorporated.
- Tsunoda, R., de Bary, W. T. and Keene, D. eds. (1958). *Sources of Japanese Tradition*. Vol. 2. New York: Columbia University Press.
- United States. Department of States. (1979). *O.S.S./State Department Intelligence and Research Reports, Part II Postwar Japan, Korea, and Southeast Asia*. Washington, DC: A Microfilm Project of University Publications of America, Inc.
- Woodard, W. P. (1972). *The Allied Occupation of Japan 1945–1952 and Japanese Religions*. Leiden, Netherlands: E.J. Brill.
- United States. Army Forces. Pacific, Psychological Warfare Branch, OMS, GHQ. *PWB: Basic Military Plan for Psychological Warfare in the Southwest Pacific Area*. 1945. Pacific Rare Folio, Hamilton Library, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.

NEWSPAPERS

Asahi Shimbun (Tokyo)

Nippon Times (Tokyo)

United States. Army Forces. Pacific, Psychological Warfare Branch, OMS, GHQ. *PWB: Basic Military Plan for Psychological Warfare in the Southwest Pacific Area*. 1945. Pacific Rare Folio, Hamilton Library, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.

ENDNOTES

- ¹ Throughout the paper, I have followed the Japanese convention in which the family name precedes the given name (thus, for example, Maeda's full name is Maeda Tamon). This rule is reversed in identifying the authors of publications: I followed the Western order for authors of all publications both in English and Japanese.
- ² For a full text, see SCAP, Government Section, *Political Reorientation of Japan*, 2: 413.
- ³ SCAP, Government Section, *Political Reorientation of Japan*, 2: 413.
- ⁴ Peter Duus, *Modern Japan*, 2nd ed., 245.
- ⁵ Toshio Nishi, *Unconditional Democracy: Education and Politics in Occupied Japan 1945–1952*, 1.
- ⁶ Nishi, *Unconditional Democracy*, 30; Mikiso Hane, *Modern Japan: A Historical Survey*, 325.
- ⁷ Duus, *Modern Japan*, 247.
- ⁸ Nishi, *Unconditional Democracy*, 1.
- ⁹ James F. Byrnes, Secretary of State to Max Grassli, Charge d' Affaires ad interim of Switzerland, "Reply by Secretary of State to Japanese Qualified Acceptance" August 11, 1945 in *Political Reorientation of Japan*, 2: 415.
- ¹⁰ James F. Byrnes, Secretary of State to Max Grassli, Charge d' Affaires ad interim of Switzerland, "Secretary of State Byrnes' Reply of August 14, 1945" in *Political Reorientation of Japan*, 2: 418; Nishi, *Unconditional Democracy*, 32.
- ¹¹ "Authority of General MacArthur as Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers" in *Political Reorientation of Japan*, 2: 427.
- ¹² "Agreement of Foreign Ministers at Moscow on Establishing Far Eastern Commission and Allied Council for Japan," December 27, 1945, in *Political Reorientation of Japan*, 2: 421; Orr, "Education Reform Policy in Occupied Japan," 67.
- ¹³ Orr, "Education Reform Policy in Occupied Japan," 70; Brigadier General Courtney Whitney, "Forward: The Philosophy of the Occupation" in *Political Reorientation of Japan*, 1: xix–xx.
- ¹⁴ Nishi, *Unconditional Democracy*, 147.

SPECIAL COLLECTIONS

Bonner F. Fellers Papers, Hoover Institution Archives.

Joseph C. Trainor Papers, Hoover Institution Archives.

- ¹⁵“Instructions Are Issued By Education Ministry,” *Nippon Times*, August 18, 1945; Nishi, *Unconditional Democracy*, 147; Department of State, Research and Analysis Branch, “Japanese Postwar Education Policies,” October 5, 1945, p.1, File 097.3 Z1092. No. 3266 in *O.S.S./State Department Intelligence and Research Reports, Part II Postwar Japan, Korea, and Southeast Asia*.
- ¹⁶Prime Minister Higashikuni’s press interview in *Asahi Shimbun*, August 30, 1945; Nishi, *Unconditional Democracy*, 146.
- ¹⁷“Mr. Maeda Tamon, as Education Minister,” *Asahi Shimbun*, August 19, 1945.
- ¹⁸Prime Minister Higashikuni’s press interview in *Asahi Shimbun*, August 30, 1945.
- ¹⁹“Imperial Rescript,” quoted in “His Majesty Issues Rescript to Restore Peace,” *Nippon Times*, August 15, 1945, p.1.
- ²⁰*Asahi Shimbun*, August 19, 1945, quoted in Eiichi Suzuki, *Kyoiku gyosei*, 160. (My translation).
- ²¹Kobayashi, *Society, Schools, and Progress in Japan*, 54.
- ²²Marlene J. Mayo, “Psychological Disarmament: American War-time Planning for the Education and Re-Education of Defeated Japan, 1943–1945.” 66–67.
- ²³For objectives and actual activities of the Psychological Warfare Branch, see Bonner F. Fellers, “Forward” to United States, Army Forces, Pacific, Psychological Warfare Branch, OMS, GHQ, PWB: *Basic Military Plan for Psychological Warfare in the Southwest Pacific Area* (1945), Pacific Rare Folio, Hamilton Library, University of Hawaii at Manoa.
- ²⁴John W. Dower, *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the Wake of World War II*, 280.
- ²⁵Daniel C. Holtom, “Shinto in the Postwar World” in *Far Eastern Survey*, American Council, Institute of Pacific Relations, Vol. WIV, No.3, February 14, 1945, quoted in Collation Section, Psychological Warfare Branch, OMS, GHQ, AFPAC, *Inside Japan*, “2. Youth: Pawn of the Militarists” Special Report No.5, July 23, 1945, p.14; box 13, Bonner Fellers Papers, Hoover Institution Archives.
- ²⁶See Helen Hardacre, *Shinto and the State, 1868–1988*, 134–135; Mark Taylor Orr, chief of the Education Division of CI & E, cited Holtom’s analysis on Shinto and its direct connection with State and education in Mark Taylor Orr, “Education Reform Policy in Occupied Japan,” 3–4.
- ²⁷Bonner F. Fellers, “Dissemination of Information in Japan” August 15, 1945; box 13, Bonner Fellers papers, Hoover Institution Archives.
- ²⁸Mayo, “Psychological Disarmament,” 83; “Re-education of Japan Said Long-Term Project,” *Nippon Times*, September 28, 1945.
- ²⁹*Nippon Times*, August 29, 1945; Orr, “Education Reform Policy in Occupied Japan,” 76.
- ³⁰“Instrument of Surrender” in *Political Reorientation of Japan*, 2: 419.
- ³¹Douglas MacArthur, “Second Anniversary of Surrender,” September 2, 1947 in *Political Reorientation of Japan*, 2: 775.
- ³²Arundel Del Re and M. A. Piacentini to SCAP, GHQ, CI&E, “Preliminary Report on Measures Pertaining to the Cultural Re-education of Japan” October 3, 1945, p.1; box 20, Joseph C. Trainor papers, Hoover Institution Archives. A CI & E report stated that “directives are used only when it is judged that Japanese efforts are out of line with or controvert general Occupational policies” in SCAP, CI & E, Education Division, *Education in the New Japan*, 1:136.
- ³³Maeda, “The Direction of Postwar Education in Japan,” *Japan Quarterly* 3, no.4 (1956): 415.
- ³⁴Maeda, “The Direction of Postwar Education in Japan,” 417.
- ³⁵Maeda, “The Direction of Postwar Education in Japan,” 417.
- ³⁶Tamon Maeda “Seiji to minshushugi [Politics and democracy]” in *Maeda Tamon sono bun sono hito*, 100–101.
- ³⁷Japan, Ministry of Education, Science and Culture, ed., *Japan’s Modern Educational System: A History of the First Hundred Years*, 226.
- ³⁸“Big Education Reforms Are Decided by Ministry,” *Nippon Times*, September 16, 1945; Orr, “Education Reform Policy in Occupied Japan,” 199.
- ³⁹“Big Education Reforms Are Decided by Ministry,” *Nippon Times*, September 16, 1945; *Japan’s Modern Educational System*, 226.
- ⁴⁰*Asahi Shimbun*, September 10, 1945; *Maeda Tamon sono bun sono hito*, pp.67–74. (My translation).
- ⁴¹Research and Analysis Branch, “Japanese Postwar Education Policies,” October 5, 1945, pp.1–2, File 097.3 Z1092. No. 3266; *Asahi Shimbun*, September 5, 1945; Nishi, *Unconditional Democracy*, 161.
- ⁴²Nishi, *Unconditional Democracy*, 161.
- ⁴³Tamon Maeda, “*Seinen gakuto ni tsugu* [Message for the youth],” in *Maeda Tamon sono bun sono hito*, 73, quoted in Nishi, *Unconditional Democracy*, 162.
- ⁴⁴Nishi, *Unconditional Democracy*, 148; Suzuki, *Kyoiku gyosei*, 160–161.
- ⁴⁵Maeda reminisced on his acquaintance with Dr. Beard in Maeda Tamon, “Beard hakase o shinobu” [Reminiscence on Dr. Beard], *Amerika Kenkyu* 3, no. 12 (1950): 4.
- ⁴⁶Mayo, “Psychological Disarmament,” 116, notes 79 (Mayo quoted Beard’s letter that Maeda “had been converted to Christianity by a Quaker missionary in Japan and was active in Christian work” (p.116). However, I have not encountered any documents that substantiate the fact that Maeda converted to Christianity.)
- ⁴⁷Mayo, “Psychological Disarmament,” 116, note 79.
- ⁴⁸Mayo, “Psychological Disarmament,” 116, note 79; Tamon Maeda, *Sanso seishi*, 216; Maeda, “The Direction of Postwar Education in Japan,” *Japan Quarterly* 3, no. 4 (1956): 415.
- ⁴⁹Toshio Nishi, *Unconditional Democracy*, 147; Research and Analysis Branch, “Analysis of the Shidehara Cabinet,” p. 5.
- ⁵⁰Maeda Tamon, *Sanso seishi*, 216; Mayo, “Psychological Disarmament,” 84.

- ⁵¹ Mayo, "Psychological Disarmament," 84.
- ⁵² Maeda, *Sanso seishi*, 216; Maeda, "The Direction of Postwar Education in Japan," *Japan Quarterly* 3, no.4 (1956), 415; Mieko Kamiya, "Mombusho diary," in *Henreki*, 213.
- ⁵³ Maeda, "The Direction of Postwar Education in Japan," 415.
- ⁵⁴ Orr, "Education Reform Policy in Occupied Japan," 82; Mayo, "Psychological Disarmament," 84–85.
- ⁵⁵ Mayo, "Psychological Disarmament," 85.
- ⁵⁶ Mayo, "Psychological Disarmament," 91.
- ⁵⁷ *Political Reorientation of Japan*, 2: 463–465.
- ⁵⁸ Henry Oinas–Kukkonen, *Tolerance, Suspicion, and Hostility*, 16.
- ⁵⁹ Research and Analysis Branch, "Analysis of Shidehara Cabinet," October 12, 1945, p.1, File 097.3 A1092. No. 3274 in *O.S.S./State Department Intelligence and Research Reports, Part II Postwar Japan, Korea, and Southeast Asia*.
- ⁶⁰ Research and Analysis Branch, "Analysis of Shidehara Cabinet," October 12, 1945, p.1; "Baron Shidehara Gets Imperial Command To Organize Cabinet," *Nippon Times*, October 7, 1945.
- ⁶¹ Research and Analysis Branch, "Analysis of Shidehara Cabinet," October 12, 1945, p.5.
- ⁶² "Prime Minister Shidehara declared his administrative policies," *Asahi Shimbun*, October 10, 1945.
- ⁶³ "Prime Minister Shidehara declared his administrative policies," *Asahi Shimbun*, October 10, 1945.
- ⁶⁴ "The Charter Oath," in Ryusaku Tsunoda, Wm. Theodore de Bary, and Donald Keene, eds., *Source of Japanese Tradition*, vol. 2, 137.
- ⁶⁵ "Prime Minister Shidehara declared his administrative policies," *Asahi Shimbun*, October 10, 1945. (My translation).
- ⁶⁶ Maeda's speech on October 15, in *Sengo nihon kyoiku shiryo shu-sei vol.1, Haisen to kyoiku no minshuka* (Tokyo: Sanichi shobo, 1982), 123. (My translation).
- ⁶⁷ Tamon Maeda, *Sanso seishi*, 40. (My translation).
- ⁶⁸ SCAP, "Statement to the Japanese Government Concerning Required Reforms," October 11, 1945 in *Political Reorientation of Japan*, 2: 741.
- ⁶⁹ United States, Department of States, Interim Research and Intelligence, Research and Analysis Branch, "Japanese Post-War Education Policies," October 5, 1945, p.1, File 097.3 Z1092 No. 3266 in *O.S.S./State Department Intelligence and Research Reports, Part II Postwar Japan, Korea, and Southeast Asia*.
- ⁷⁰ "Japanese Post–War Education Policies," p. 3.
- ⁷¹ "Japanese Post–War Education in Japan," p. 3.
- ⁷² "Japanese Post–War Education in Japan," p. 3.
- ⁷³ "Japanese Post–War Education in Japan," pp. 3–4.
- ⁷⁴ Maeda, "The Direction of Postwar Education in Japan," 415.
- ⁷⁵ Maeda, "The Direction of Postwar Education in Japan," 415.
- ⁷⁶ "Memorandum for Imperial Japanese Government, Subj.: Administration of the Educational System of Japan" October 22, 1945, in SCAP, CI & E, Education Division, *Education in the New Japan*, 2: 28.
- ⁷⁷ SCAP, CI & E, Education Division, *Education in the New Japan*, 2: 29–30; *Japan's Modern Educational System*, 229.
- ⁷⁸ SCAP Directive, "Abolition of Governmental Sponsorship, Support, Perpetuation, Control, and Dissemination of State Shinto (*Kokka Shinto, Jinja Shinto*)" in *Political Reorientation of Japan*, 2: 467.
- ⁷⁹ Nishi, *Unconditional Democracy*, 171.
- ⁸⁰ *Japan's Modern Educational System*, 229–230; *Education in the New Japan*, 2: 36–39
- ⁸¹ "Imperial Rescript," of January 1st 1946, *Nippon Times*, January 1, 1946; "Emperor's Imperial Rescript Denying His Divinity," January 1, 1946, in SCAP, Government Section, *Political Reorientation of Japan*, 2: 470.
- ⁸² "General MacArthur's Comment on Imperial Rescript of January 1, 1946," in SCAP, Government Section, *Political Reorientation of Japan*, 2: 471.
- ⁸³ The principle source here is Tamon Maeda "Ningen sengen no uchi soto"[Inside and Outside the Human declaration] in *Maeda Tamon sono bun so no hito*, 75–87.
- ⁸⁴ Mr. R.H. Blyth, a professor at the Gakushuin (the Peers School) and a tutor of the crown Prince, acted as informal liaison between the Imperial Household and CI & E, GHQ. See Woodard, *The Allied Occupation of Japan 1945–1952*, 259, 317–319; Eiji Takemae, *Inside GHQ: The Allied Occupation of Japan and its Legacy*, 237.
- ⁸⁵ Maeda, *Maeda Tamon sono bun sono hito*, 76.
- ⁸⁶ Maeda, *Maeda Tamon sono bun sono hito*, 77.
- ⁸⁷ Maeda, *Maeda Tamon sono bun sono hito*, 82.
- ⁸⁸ *Education in the New Japan*, 2: 157–158.
- ⁸⁹ "SCAP Orders Removal, Exclusion From Public Offices of Those War Responsible," *Nippon Times*, January 5, 1946, p.1.
- ⁹⁰ "Shidehara Lineup is Badly Shaken By SCAP's Orders," *Nippon Times*, January 6, 1946, p.1.
- ⁹¹ "SCAP Orders Removal, Exclusion From Public Offices of Those War Responsible," *Nippon Times*, January 5, 1946, p.1.
- ⁹² Mayo stated that Gordon T. Bowles, the author of the US educational reform plan, had "confidence in Maeda's essential liberalism and was critical of the later decision to purge him" in Mayo, *Psychological Disarmament*, 116.
- ⁹³ Elliott R. Thorpe, *East Wind, Rain: The Intimate Account of an Intelligence Officer in the Pacific 1939–49*, 194.
- ⁹⁴ Mieko Kamiya to Hidefumi Kurosawa, September 15, 1974, a letter in Hidefumi Kurosawa, *Sengo kyoiku no genryu o motomete*, 228.

Metaphor and Metonymy in English Language Program Curriculum Discourse in Hawai‘i: Towards an Ecological Approach

by Brian Rugen, and Neil Johnson

Introduction

“At first, some, some of students said Hawai‘i is not good in order to learn language. English language, I mean second language, because, because, they say some student is from Hawai‘i, and Hawaiian people cannot speak standard language, standard English. So if we have a conversation in English, I mean, listen to English, it’s different from mainland.”

This quote was taken from an interview with a Japanese woman studying at a private English language school in Hawai‘i as she answered a question about language policies at her school. Her comments triggered questions regarding educational and language policies pointing to particular worldviews. Our purpose in this paper is to explore the representational practices found in online curriculum policy discourse from three private English language programs in Hawai‘i. These representational practices, by highlighting particular ideologies and hiding others, attempt to position students “so that they are prepared for uncritical admission into sociocultural conditions discursively constructed well in advance of that admission” (Corson, 1995, p. 301). Furthermore, we hope to elaborate on a model of critical policymaking in order to raise awareness of the language in policy discourse. “When meaning is produced through language unreflectively to the extent that it gets sedimented into common-sense knowledge—which we call ideology—it tends to masquerade as ‘fixed truths’ or ‘existing facts’ about the social world, as if such facts were immune to particular relations of power or material interests” (Giroux & McLaren, 1992, p. 13).

In the case of Hawai‘i, ever since first Western contact, language and education policies “have as their common thread a hegemonic process initiated, instituted, and perpetuated by an English-speaking Caucasian establishment through which political and social power could be acquired and maintained” (Kawamoto, 1993, p. 204). This can be seen in such practices as the banning of Hawaiian in 1896 in schools when English became the official language of instruction, and, in the 1920s, the educational segregation of students based on English proficiency (Huebner, 1985; Kawamoto, 1993).

As a result of increasing linguistic diversity, and in order to address oppressive language policies, scholars have looked to school language policies as “an integral and necessary part of the administration and the curriculum practice of schools” (Corson, 1999, p. 1). A school language policy, or LPAC (Language Policies Across the Curriculum), is a policy document that addresses a school’s language needs and aims. The policy should target areas within

a particular school’s management, organization, pedagogy, and curriculum where specific language needs might exist. May (1997) defines a school language policy as, “an action statement outlining the solutions necessary for addressing the diverse language needs of a school” (p. 229).

School language policies may be traced back to Britain and the Language Across the Curriculum (LAC) movement of the late 1960s and early 1970s. A 1966 document entitled “Towards a Language Policy Across the Curriculum,” prepared by the members of the London Association for the Teaching of English, provided the theoretical underpinnings for the concept (Barnes et al., 1990). The LAC movement drew heavily on the work of contemporary curriculum theorists as well as work on language and learning from Lev Vygotsky and Jerome Bruner.

Several texts emerged in the 1970s and 80s advocating in favor of school language policies. At the secondary school level (Marland, 1977; Knott, 1985) and the elementary school level (Maybin, 1985), these texts outlined the major tenets from the original document and how best to implement them at the individual school level. As a result, “In the United States, strong arguments were advanced for the idea that the school, rather than wider system entities like boards and ministries, is the key site for educational action and policymaking” (Corson, 1999, p. 2).

Corson (1990, 1995, 1999) provides one of the most comprehensive treatments of both theory and practice of school language policies. He also develops previous work on LAC by extending the original focus on first language concerns to include second language concerns and social justice issues. This is an important extension of the use of LACs and one that is crucial to our belief that (ESL) English language programs should consider drafting formal school language policies.

Corson explains that a specific language policy should address language issues under three broad headings: organization and management of the school, teacher approaches to language use, and the curriculum. Considering social justice issues in addressing these broad areas, he proposes a model of critical policymaking—a model with “a logical process of discovery and reform that also has emancipatory implications...” (Corson, 1999, p. 60). Corson’s model of critical policymaking draws heavily on the work of Bhaskar’s (1997) critical realist concept of discovery and Habermas’ (1990) discourse ethic. These theoretical concepts highlight the importance of consulting relevant actors in the policymaking process. Habermas, in particular, wants to “lessen the discursive randomness that typifies the management styles of organizations. In its place, he wants to instill a discourse arrangement for resolving conflicts of interpretation

as they develop, using a situation in which asymmetrical relations of power do not prevail or even operate” (Corson, 1995, p.136).

A critical policymaking model should “consult directly with sectional groups and respond as best it can to their concerns, while balancing them against other interests” (Corson, 1999, p. 64). However, he warns against simply using a survey, vote, or referendum to inform policy decisions as majority vote may be used in justifying something unjust. Furthermore, Corson (1999) notes, “referenda usually ignore the impact of structural factors that oppress sectional groups, because the majority do not understand or feel the impact of those structural factors on their own lives” (ibid, p. 64).

Concerned, too, with social justice issues and the implicit structural factors that oppress, we believe that what is missing in Corson’s critical policymaking model is a critical awareness of the *language* of such policies. We aim to extend this critical model, then, by initiating a discussion of how policy discourse points to particular ideologies in the discourses woven around English language teaching (ELT). Despite the efforts of policy models to combat explicit hegemonic practices, we feel such models need to consider the *implicit* ways in which policy and discourse highlight certain worldviews. The moment in which discourse moves from ideological struggle to common sense is when explicit ideology becomes implicit. Fairclough (2001) explains that, “a dominant discourse is subject to a process of naturalization, in which it appears to lose its connection with particular ideologies and interests and become the common-sense practice of the institution. Thus when ideology becomes common sense, it apparently ceases to be ideology; this is itself an ideological effect, for ideology is truly effective only when it is disguised” (p. 89).

In order to extend Corson’s model, we find it useful to supplement critical approaches with linguistic analysis. In discussing new approaches to educational policy analysis, Heck (2004) points out that “Despite the usefulness of critical theory in identifying oppressive social arrangements, there is some debate over the extent to which it actually entails advocacy and change—that is, a commitment to challenging existing relationships and using research to reach a certain end” (p. 165). He recommends focusing on smaller scale studies of the policy process—one such method being “the deconstruction of the language and intent of existing policies” (p. 167). We hope an analysis of this kind might lead us to a better understanding of the beliefs expressed in the quote at the beginning of this article from the Japanese student of English. As Alford (2005) notes: “Values presented in policy documents are mediated by words and are therefore, by necessity, distilled or coalesced representations of much more complex positions and assumptions and value systems” (p. 2).

Conceptual Metaphor And Metonymy

Metaphor

An important distinction in metaphor studies made by Lakoff and Turner is that “metaphor resides in thought, not just in words” (1989, p. 2). Metaphor has traditionally been seen as a figurative

device used by writers to create a sense of the literary within their work. Original, striking metaphors are one of the marks of great literature, however the everyday uses of metaphor that become part of our very means of conceptualizing events and experiences are also of much interest to linguists. The importance of metaphor to human thought has been established primarily by work done by Lakoff and Johnson (1980) and Lakoff (1987). In *Metaphors We Live By*, the authors demonstrate that metaphor is not simply an interesting part of speech, but actually reflects and shapes how we see the very world in which we live—“our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature” (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980, p. 3). This is a key concept because it tells us that metaphor is not neutral, it actively shapes how we perceive that which is around us. We think in metaphoric ways by structuring our thought, and conceptualizing one object or perception in terms of another. This idea has been developed in subsequent work by Lakoff (1987), in which this central suggestion about the way in which we shape our experience through metaphor, metonymy and “imaginative categories” is described further and applied to various domains of language use. Indeed, the growing body of research that applies metaphor theory to discourse analysis (e.g. Charteris-Black, 2006), and language pedagogy (e.g. Boers, 2000; 2003) for example, illustrates clearly that, “far from being merely a matter of words, metaphor is a matter of thought – all kinds of thought: thought about emotion, about society, about human character, about language, and about the nature of life and death. It is indispensable not only to our imagination but also to our reason (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980, p. xi). Without metaphor it would indeed be impossible for us to make sense of the world around us.

Furthermore, their claim is that not only do we see the world a certain way because of metaphor, but as the title of the book suggests, we also live our lives as if these categories were true. The example cited by Lakoff and Johnson (1980) to illustrate this point is with the metaphor ARGUMENT IS WAR. In this example, the concrete concept of “war” is mapped onto the abstract idea of argument—this conceptual framework allows us to understand what argument is about and, more than that, influences how we actually approach and “do” an argument. So that the surface idioms and idiomatic phrases that this metaphor produces in English such as “she held her position” are only surface manifestations of a cognitive way of seeing the world. Lakoff and Johnson make the point that if we conceptualize argument as a dance between two partners (and there is no reason why a culture couldn’t see it this way), then not only would our language be different, but also that our values about argument and our behavior in arguing would be different. The fact that these metaphors now seem such a routine part of our daily lives is what gives them their power to shape our thoughts.

Interest in the power of metaphor to shape conceptual understanding and consequent action in the world has sparked the wide interest of discourse analysts. Lakoff (1992) examined metaphor in the news in framing the discourse of “the enemy” and

in offering a rationale for the invasion of Iraq during the Gulf Wars. He suggested that such discourse played an important part in the acceptance of these conflicts by the U.S. population in general. Santa Ana (1999) examined the use of metaphor in news media discourse in describing Mexican immigrants and found that the overriding metaphors were pejorative. This was linked to actual political changes in how Mexicans were dealt with by the legal system. Such critical approaches are also being undertaken in fields such as environmental policy analysis. Sharp and Richardson (2001), using a Foucauldian discourse analytic approach, note that “policy discourse can be understood as the bundle of exchanges that give shape through metaphors and practices to a particular policy-making process or debate” (p. 195).

Turner (1993) highlights the importance of metaphor to academic discourse and suggests that it is crucial that ESL students master the conventions of the target discourse community. He recommends explicit instruction. Barletta et al. (2006) examined the uses of metaphor and metonymy in the discourse of teaching materials. They found that they were important in establishing expectations and policies for individual teachers as well as for the department in question. In fact, throughout history, metaphors of education have reflected wider societal tendencies. For example, Charlton (1984) describes the metaphorical discourse of sixteenth century education: “In a society that was still predominately rural, it is not surprising that what, all-embracingly, might be called horticultural metaphors abound” (p. 58). Historically speaking, metaphors “partly constitute what it is possible to say about education at a particular historical moment and therefore what education can be. In fact, conventional metaphors have a more important part to play here than original metaphors, precisely because they have become accepted as normal ways of talking about and conceptualizing education” (Goatly, 2002, p. 265).

Metonymy

If metaphor allows us to use meanings implicit in one area of thought and map them onto another area, then metonymy reveals how we manipulate and organize large and complex categories. Whereas metaphor is based on relations of similarity between elements based on notions of comparison, metonymy is based on contiguity or nearness. Ungerer and Schmidt (1996) point to the key difference between these two features in how they structure abstract categories, noting that “while metaphor involves a mapping across different cognitive models, metonymy is a mapping within the same model” (p. 128). Indeed, metonymy, as the expression of part of a category to represent a whole, is used to highlight features of that category to which it belongs. For example, in the conventionalized metonymy examples cited by Ungerer and Schmidt, *We need a couple of strong bodies for our team* and *We need some new faces around here*, a relevant aspect of a human being is highlighted so that the model PHYSICAL STRENGTH is related to the category BODY in the first example, and the model INTELLIGENCE is related to the category of HEAD in the second (1996, p.129). As Johnson and Lakoff (1980) make clear, “...metonymies that are

grounded in our physical experience provide an essential means of comprehending religious and cultural concepts” (40).

In a study conducted in Japan, Matsuda (2002) found that for many Japanese students, “the terms foreign countries and abroad were synonymous with ‘the West’—specifically, North America and Western Europe” (p. 436). In addition, Kubota (2002) identifies how metonymy, such as the term “English” standing for “foreign language” in the broader educational discourse, is perhaps partly responsible for less than 1 percent enrollment in languages other than English in high school language classes (p. 19). This finding was replicated by Barletta et al (2006), who found that metonymic expressions were a very important aspect of the ideology of instruction and composition that were ultimately created by teaching philosophies and syllabi. For example, they describe the regular use of the metonym “this essay will” in which the *essay* comes to stand for the entire experience of the students writing in the course, and ultimately shapes a particular view of what academic writing is. Ducar (2006) revealed how the metonymic representation of Heritage Language Learners in Heritage Spanish Language textbooks may contribute to a negative subject position for the very learners for whom the texts were intended.

English Language Program Discourse In Hawai‘i

The analysis offered below must be seen as an introductory one. As Pennycook (2001) makes clear, without any evidence of the effect of discourse on the people coming into contact with that discourse, we are left with “a particular reading of a particular text” (p. 93). Further research, such as ethnographic investigation of resistance to subject positions (i.e. Canagarajah, 2004), is needed to see how these discourses are maintained, consumed, challenged, and resisted within the institutions themselves. This should take place both at the institutional level and at the more personal level of the classroom where interpersonal discourse takes place. Nevertheless we feel it is important and valuable to take the first step in highlighting some of the ways in which the discourse of English language operates, notably in the medium of the Internet.

The Web Sites of three prominent language institutions operating in Hawai‘i were selected randomly from a web search in May of 2006. Metaphorical and metonymical expressions from each school were grouped together according to the cognitive structural mappings they represent. Examining other available sites reveals that the sites selected for analysis are in many ways typical in offering a variety of information, in text and graphic modality, regarding the programs offered and their own particular setting.

In this sense, the school websites offer a new and hybrid form of discourse. They simultaneously display both policy and advertising designed to attract students to their programs. This hybridity is further evidenced by the multimodal nature of these texts, incorporating a mixture of linear and non-linear texts and visual images. Hull and Nelson (2005) argue that the new multimodal texts that are becoming part of our everyday way of communicating are quantitatively different, and that “multimodality

can afford, not just a new way to make meaning, but a different kind of meaning” (p. 225). In the same way that the printing press fundamentally changed the nature of social transmission and interaction with knowledge and information, it is argued that the computer is doing the same. It is important to note then, that these discourses on language policy are no longer confined to the institutions that create them, but can be seen as part of an evolving online discourse on what it means to study and speak the English language—simultaneously constituting and being constituted by prevailing attitudes towards the language and what it means to be a student and citizen in the age of globalization.

Upon examining in greater detail the textual elements of the online discourse of these institutions, one is immediately struck by the overwhelming use of metaphor and metonymy to describe and outline educational policy. These features of language are so commonplace, and such a part of how we use language, that they can become very difficult to separate out and codify for what they are—they truly have become invisible to us. And therein lies their power. Once separated out of the discourse and analyzed however, a clear picture of the kinds of ideology operating in Hawai'i emerges. It is important to note that language use is a matter of linguistic choice so that what may seem natural and “just the way we say that” is always capable of being expressed in an alternative form.

Specifically, the multimodality of these texts includes photographs, links, and text. The photographs on the program websites, it should be noted, may carry more than one meaning. The privileging of one *particular* meaning, then, relies on certain representational practices. For example, as Hall (1997) explains: “The ‘meaning’ of the photograph...does not lie exclusively in the image, but in the conjunction of image *and* text” (p. 326). On one school’s website, a picture of two attractive white females in bikinis jumping in the air is positioned over the caption: “Hurray! Transform your life at ICC!” On another school’s website, several small pictures show smiling students engaged in extracurricular activities such as bike riding or visiting an aquarium. Pegrum (2004) notes that although the “spirited, slightly hedonistic edge” to many of these photographs will attract many, the possibility of alienation exists as well, particularly in markets in East Asia, “which consist of students and their parents who see English...as a serious matter” (p. 6).

Contradicting such “hedonistic” visual images, text positioned immediately to the left of the photograph of the white females in bikinis emphasizes the “strict” policies of English-only which they “enforce” as a way for students to “improve their language.” These words evoke a semantic frame of social order, as Oxford et al. (1998) explain in their analysis on metaphors for classroom teachers. This social order frame includes metaphors that point to “strict control of students” and various “techniques of domination” (p. 24).

One prominent feature of all three programs is the way in which the discourses blend the pragmatic giving of information for educational purposes with the more business-oriented discourses of persuasion and sales. This finding reflects the finding of Fairclough (1995) in his analysis of a British university brochure. In our examples, this is achieved partly with the juxtaposing of different

forms of expression, or kinds of text, with attractive pictures of students looking happy and engaged in interesting activities. Metaphoric expression plays a part too. For example, the phrase “each member of the faculty is highly trained”, exemplifies the conceptual metaphor that UP (HIGH) IS GOOD and DOWN IS BAD. This is a small part of the way in which the owners of the school are able to persuade potential students, or customers, that this is the right program for them.

Another important feature of this discourse is the multiple examples of the “technologisation of discourse”, which Fairclough (1996) describes as the ways in which language becomes an economic commodity in discourse itself. Consider the following examples:

- ♦ The courses within the program concentrate on reading and writing [metonymy of courses standing for teachers, students and activities]
- ♦ Learn to construct and organize writing
- ♦ Demonstrate pronunciation skills
- ♦ Expand active vocabulary
- ♦ Build and refine skills
- ♦ Develop the critical thinking skills necessary for college
- ♦ Apply the skills you have
- ♦ Demonstrate an understanding; demonstrate a familiarity [metaphor of skills as trophies or objects to be created and displayed]

These technologies can then be bought and sold as any other commodity for sale on the educational market. Fairclough gives one pertinent example in how discourse has been managed to create changes in the way people interact and operate. He describes the way in which the discourses of business and advertising have been appropriated by education policy discourse, and he locates this change within an ongoing shift in educational priorities: “the competence and skills based approach harmonizes with the technologisation of discourse in a number of ways: it focuses on training in context-free techniques (skills), it is a pressure for standardization of practices, it fits with autonomous notions of self...” (p. 82). Cameron (2002) suggests ways in which the discourse of English language education has become commodified and homogenized in a way that promotes a single and accepted way forward for global communication. In this way, the discourse of English learning has come to resemble the discourse of self-improvement, itself a powerful ideological component of Western individualism. English then becomes synonymous with success and development and the de facto language of the global community.

The related discourse of sales and advertising is also prominent on the examined language school Web pages and is emphasized by the overwhelming focus upon English as a set of skills designed for individual development and progress. While this may seem commonplace and ideologically free, it must be understood in terms

of the wider discourse on globalization and the particular *ways of being in the world* that are being represented and promoted here. Consider these examples:

- ♦ *by helping them acquire skills* [course-for-process metonymy; language as a set of skills to be acquired]
- ♦ *the goal of instruction is to prepare the student to enter intermediate courses* [learning as goal driven enterprise which allow students to “enter” (access) further education/ courses]
- ♦ *give our students the best opportunity to improve their language*
- ♦ *students will learn to employ a process approach to writing and will progress from developing paragraphs* [learning English as progress and development]
- ♦ *formulating topic sentences worthy of further exploration/ sticking to the topic without getting sidetracked* [“good” English as worthy and valuable; learning as voyage metaphor; writing as a journey metaphor—a good journey goes straight and is direct]

The emphasis on each individual working on particular “skills” to make “progress” and “enter” into the realm of achievement, presents a very specific view of education and each person’s relationship to it. These pages offer very culturally and historically specific presentations of highly motivated individuals operating in the global, information-based economy of the twenty-first century. They are representations of the Western capitalist world. English is a skill and a tool for development and access to this world, and the norms of interaction within it are powerfully evoked by the repetition of phrases such as *course objectives* and *students will*. Phrases that emphasize the idea of achievement in certain clearly defined skills as the measure of educational success. For Pennycook (2001) these are part of a market driven culture that present “an economic view of the world that suggests a rational model of capital accumulation” (p. 126).

Further examples of this self-improvement discourse reflect a self-deficiency legacy described in Jenkins (2003). Several examples from the web pages of schools we analyzed highlight this:

- ♦ *give our students the best opportunity to improve their language*
- ♦ *life changing experience*
- ♦ *transform your life*
- ♦ *a stepping stone to promotion*

Jenkins (2003) identifies two previous periods of widespread diffusion of English. The first occurred in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as English was transported to the “new world.” The second occurred at various points in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries during the colonization of Asia and Africa. The legacy of these two periods is threefold: the endangering of many indigenous languages, the sense of linguistic inferiority assumed by the colonized, and the loss of ethnic identity. These examples parallel

Jenkins’ linguistic analysis and research in the literature, which demonstrates an ethos of the “disparagement of the non-Anglo ‘other’” (p. 51). She offers the following summary:

It is not surprising that, after centuries in which non-Anglo languages and cultures and local L2 varieties of English have been undermined in this way, a lack of confidence pervades many L2 speakers’ attitudes towards their use of English (p. 52).

The presentation of language as self-improvement and a set of skills not only provides us with a particular ideological view of the world but also a view of the nature of language itself. Such skills, it suggests, can be acquired, demonstrated, and then sold on the global job market. This is essentially a reductive view of language and language learning in which language is divorced from the context of its use, divided up into segments, and transmitted in manageable chunks to the learner. Van Lier (2004) contrasts this approach with an ecological approach to language that views language as fully situated within a cultural context, and learning language as a process characterized by increasing participation in cultural practices. In Hawai‘i, English is often presented as a homogenized artifact free from local concerns of the people of the state.

The opening quote in the introduction to this paper is interesting in this light. From the perspective of the market version, “standard English” may make sense to international students who are attracted to the idea of learning the “standard” form after exposure to the marketing machine that has promoted English as a global language. The perpetuation of standard English as the prestigious version of English, and the priority it gives in education to the “native speaker” takes a cyclical and mutually reinforcing form. Pennycook (2001) usefully describes this as, “the effects of the embodied linguistic/cultural capital of the native speaker, the power of the linguistic/cultural capital of the TOEFL and the draw of English because of the social and economic capital it promises” (p. 125). In this view, local versions become irrelevant (and even problematic); and in Hawai‘i this is a particularly notable deficit, given the history of the islands, especially with regard to the language of the Hawaiian people but also in reference to languages of other groups of immigrants who have contributed to the distinctive forms of English spoken here.

Reviewing these web pages again, the analysis of metonymy in particular reveals the way in which learning and language are conceptualized in this discourse. Several expressions and phrases are repeated throughout the texts, which share a metonymic conceptual framework. It is by means of metonymy that “institution” and “course” come to represent the entire academic and even life experience of the students who enter the program. The following textual examples illustrate this: *The courses within the program concentrate on reading and writing* and *The intensive ESL program allows students to study English*. What is happening in these examples is that the agency of teaching and learning are removed from the process. The concepts of course and program become

reified and divorced from the actual processes of teaching, studying, and learning. They suggest that learning English is simply a matter of taking the course or being admitted to the program. The word “allow,” for example, specifically carries a certain force in implying permission—in the sense of being permitted to join an exclusive club. Metonymy and metaphor are part of the narrative of persuasion presented by the texts—education, it is suggested, is a smooth transition from point A to point B. Point B represents progress, skills, and access to the new post-Fordist economy (see Gee, 2000 for discussion) that depends upon an increasingly network-based model, requiring workforce mobility and access to information. This point is underlined by the repeated heading that announces what students *will* be able to *do* by the end of each course—not what each student will have to learn, but what they will be able to do.

This use of language connects with the central metaphor running through these texts—that of writing or learning as building.

- ♦ *using facts to support opinions* [again, writing as construction requiring “support”]
- ♦ *construct and organize an outline* [writing as building metaphor]
- ♦ *ESL Reading/Writing is a course that builds and refines skills* [composition as building metaphor]

Again this may seem innocuous enough but the conceptual underpinning is revealing. The idea of WRITING AS BUILDING resonates in important ways with those of development and achievement found elsewhere in the text. Together they form a particular view of what it means to study English and enter such a program. By implication, the image of building suggests that those who are admitted will be part of a larger program that is in the process of construction, of being built, participation in which, it is suggested, will lead naturally on to the creation of positive futures. It also suggests that exclusion from progress and the global economy awaits those who are not admitted to the program. Other ways of being, and other, perhaps less utilitarian, educational motives and goals are excluded.

The notion of learner subjectivity and the influence this can have on a language learner has recently gained prominence, following Norton (1995). In Norton’s study, she followed a group of immigrant women in English-speaking Canada and tried to understand the reasons for the difficulties that these students were encountering. Norton describes in detail how the identity of a participant named Martina as mother and caregiver within her family “structured her relationship to both the public and private world and had a marked impact upon the ways she created opportunities to practice English” (p. 100).

Two other important studies reveal the potential importance that the construction of a subjective, and therefore limited, role in discourse can have for language learners. Siegal’s (1996) study of a western woman studying Japanese in Japan offers an interesting contrast and point of comparison with Norton’s work. The subjec-

tive role of a western female in Japan is such that the woman in this study was not expected to be able to speak appropriate Japanese, as the Japanese language demands a high level of pragmatic awareness in executing even the most basic of interactions. The study showed that because of this belief prevalent among her interlocutors, her Japanese proficiency suffered, and she received very little in the way of feedback or interactional scaffolding. As a western woman in Japan, she entered an ongoing discourse about the position of “the other” in relation to Japanese culture. These assumptions shaped the kinds of cooperative language activity that she engaged in. Her position was compounded by the fact that as a female she was also expected to speak in a very polite and what seemed, at least to her western sensibilities, in an overly humble and demure way. The subject of the study recognized this but chose to ignore it—opting for a more neutral yet ultimately less appropriate mode of discourse. Again this had implications for the kinds of interaction she could work with while in this culture. This study underlines the socially constructed nature of subjective states of mind that may operate subtly upon learners according to the discourses that they enter.

Ibrahim (1999) also makes a useful contribution to the identity and language learning question. He describes, using a critical ethnographic approach, how non-English speaking African immigrants to Canada “become black” as they enter the racial discourses of North America, a space where they are “already imagined, constructed and thus treated as blacks” (p. 349). Ibrahim makes the point that prior to immigration when they lived in their own communities back home, their racial identity was not an issue and the students constructed themselves according to local social markers. He notes, “In becoming Black the African youths were interpellated by Black popular culture forms, rap and hip-hop as sites of identification” (p. 365). This ‘becoming’ is then manifested in the investment the students make in their own language learning which becomes part of their identity. The students learn Black stylized English as they access the cultural world around them suggesting that “one invests where one sees oneself mirrored” (p. 365), or as Ibrahim himself concludes, “Identity, as re- and preconfigured here, governs what ESL learners acquire and how they acquire it” (p. 366). Engagement with language, discourse, and cultures can be an important aspect of the process of identity re-formation that is an important aspect of living in a foreign land and learning a foreign language.

These significant studies relate to the data in these language school texts in important ways. A particular subjectivity, or identity, is being implicitly created and offered to students who enter these schools. It remains to be seen what effect this may have on potential and actual students and what form, if any, resistance may take to the worldview and subject positions being shaped.

Conclusion

Looking back once more to the quote in the introduction from the English language learner from Japan, it is evident much work remains in challenging such myths as that of the native-speaker as

language owner. Jenkins (2006) expresses the view that “belief in native speaker ownership persists among both native and nonnative speakers—teachers, teacher educators, and linguists alike, although it is often expressed with more subtlety than it was in the past” (p. 171). We hope that by describing the use of metaphor and metonymy in English language program policy, we have added a new dimension to a critical policymaking model—a dimension that takes a first step in illuminating such myths and other, possibly hegemonic, ideological positions. In Hawai‘i, where language policies have traditionally been oppressive, it is important to uncover these subtle and implicit ways in which policies highlight certain worldviews and to recognize that “metaphor with political connotations can evoke and justify a power hierarchy in the person who used it and in the groups that respond to it” (Edelman, 1984, p. 45). Furthermore, just as Corson extended the school language policy to include second language issues, we have extended the model to private English language programs, addressing a sector of education and ELT that is often ignored in educational policy studies. In Hawai‘i, this sector represents a large part of the English language teaching business. In so doing, we need to acknowledge the tension between critical positions such as the native speaker myth with its “dubious and colonially-derived notions that English is best taught monolingually and by native speakers” (Pegrum, 2004, p. 4) and practical positions emphasizing adult students’ needs for acquiring the skills to enter university or publish in a journal. As Bizzell (1987) puts it, “our dilemma is that we want to empower students to succeed in the dominant culture so that they can transform it from within; but we fear that if they do succeed, their thinking will be changed in such a way that they will no longer want to transform it”.

Without critical approaches to these issues, ideologies might present incomplete pictures of the English language that leads to “confusion or resistance when students are confronted with different types of English users or uses” (Matsuda, 2002, p. 438). In calling for a more “organic approach” to language and language policy, we find Corson’s (1999) suggestion in keeping with recent developments in language education that call for a more “ecological” approach (Kramsch, 2002; Van Lier, 2004). The essential point of such an approach is that language should be seen as fully situated in particular social contexts, with particular histories and ethnographies of communication. Our suggestion is that documents such as those analyzed in this paper should, wherever possible, reflect local realities and offer multiple and various possibilities for student engagement with the wider social world. We hope that the analysis offered here may provide a small first step in raising language awareness and engaging educators and policy makers with the possibilities offered by such an approach.

REFERENCES

- Alford, J. (2005). Discursive patterns in ESL policy: Competing discourses in the new ‘Education Queensland’ ESL policy and guidelines document. In S. May, M. Franken, & R. Barnard
- (Eds.), *LED 2003: Refereed conference proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Language, Education, and Diversity*. Hamilton: Wilf Malcolm Institute of Educational Research, University of Waikato.
- Barletta, N., Cortez, N., & Medzerian, S. (2006). Metaphors and Metonymies: Reproduction and Resistance from Official Educational Policy to Language Classroom Practice. Bag Lunch talk. SLAT Program. University of Arizona.
- Barnes, D., Britton, J., & Torbe, M. (1990). *Language, the learner and the school*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
- Bhaskar, R. A. (1997). *A realist theory of science*. London: Verso.
- Bizzell, P. (1987). Context, convention and canon: Some uses of the concept of ‘discourse community.’ Penn State Conference on Rhetoric and Composition. State College, July 1987.
- Boers, F. (2000). Metaphor awareness and vocabulary retention. *Applied Linguistics*, 21, 553–571.
- Boers, F. (2003). Applied linguistics perspectives on cross-cultural variation in conceptual metaphor. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 18, (pp. 231–238).
- Canagarajah, S. (2004). Subversive identities, pedagogical safe houses, and critical learning. In Norton, B. & Toohey, K. (Eds.), *Critical pedagogies and language learning* (pp. 116–137). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Charlton, K. (1984). The paradox of metaphor: A sixteenth-century case study. In W. Taylor (Ed.), *Metaphors of education* (pp. 54–67). London: Heinemann
- Charteris-Black, J. (2006) Britain as a container: immigration metaphors in the 2005 election campaign. *Discourse & Society*, 17(5), 563–581.
- Corson, D. (1990). *Language policy across the curriculum*. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.
- Corson, D. (Ed). (1995). *Discourse and power in educational organizations*. Cresskill, N.J.: Hampton.
- Corson, D. (1999). *Language policy in schools: A resource for teachers and administrators*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ducar, C. (2006). The metaphoric and metonymic othering of U.S. Latino populations in Spanish heritage language textbooks: A critical discourse analysis perspective. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. The University of Arizona.
- Edelman, M. (1984). The political language of the helping professions. In Shapiro, M. (Ed.), *Language and politics* 32–48. New York: New York University Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. London: Pearson.
- Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and power*. Harlow, England: Pearson.
- Fairclough, N. (1996). Technologicalisation of Discourse. In Caldas-

- Coulthard, C. R., & Coulthard, M. (Eds.) *Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis*. (pp. 71–94) New York: Routledge.
- Gee, J. P. (2000). New people in new worlds: Networks, the new capitalism and schools. In Cope, B and Kalantziz, M. (Eds.), *Multiliteracies: Literacy learning and the design of social futures* (pp. 43–68). New York: Routledge.
- Giroux, H. A., & McLaren, P. (1992). Writing from the margins: Geographies of identity, pedagogy, and power. *Journal of Education*, 174(1), 7–30.
- Goatly, (2002). Conflicting metaphors in the Hong Kong special administrative region educational reform proposals. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 17(4), 263–294.
- Habermas, J. (1990). *Moral consciousness and communicative action*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Hall, S. (Ed.). (1997). *Representation: cultural representations and signifying practices*. London: Sage.
- Heck, R. (2004). *Studying educational and social policy: Theoretical concepts and research methods*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Huebner, (1985). Language education policy in Hawaii: Two case studies and some current issues. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 56, 29–49.
- Hull, G. A., & Nelson, M. (2005). Locating the semiotic power of multimodality. *Written Communication*, 22(2), 224–261
- Ibrahim, A. (1999). Becoming Black: Rap and hip-hop, race, gender, identity and politics of ESL learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33, 349–70.
- Jenkins, J. (2006). Current perspectives on teaching World Englishes and English as a Lingua Franca. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1), 157–181.
- Jenkins, J. (2003). *World Englishes: A resource book for students*. London: Routledge.
- Kaplan, R. B. & Baldauf Jr., R. B. (2003). *Language and Language-in-Education Planning in the Pacific Basin*. London: Kluwer Academic
- Kawamoto, (1993). Hegemony and language politics in Hawaii. *World Englishes*, 12(2), 193–207.
- Knott, R. (1985). *The English department in a changing world*. Milton, Keynes: Open University Press.
- Kubota, (2002). The impact of globalization on language teaching in Japan. In D. Block & D. Cameron (Eds.), *Globalization and language teaching* (pp. 13–28). London: Routledge.
- Kramsch, C. (Ed.) (2002). *Language Acquisition and Language Socialization*. New York: Continuum Press.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G. (1992). Metaphor and war: The metaphor system used to justify war in the gulf. In M. Putz (Ed.), *Thirty Years of Linguistic Evolution*. (pp. 463–481); Philadelphia/Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Lakoff, G. & Turner, M. (1989). *More than cool reason: A field guide to poetic metaphor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Marland, M. (1977). *Language across the curriculum*. London: Heinemann.
- Matsuda, (2002). 'International understanding' through teaching World Englishes. *World Englishes*, 21(3), 436–440.
- May, S. (1997). School Language Policies. In R. Wodak & D. Corson (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education, Volume 1: Language policy and political issues in education* (pp. 229–240). Netherlands: Kluwer.
- Maybin, J. (1985). Working towards a school language policy. In *Every child's language: An in-service pack for primary teachers* (pp. 95–108). Clevedon: The Open University & Multilingual Matters.
- Norton Peirce, B. (1995). Social Identity, investment and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29 (1), 9–31.
- Oxford, R.L., Tomlinson, S., Barcelos, A., Harrington, C., Lavine, R.Z., Saleh, A., & Longhini, A. (1998). Clashing metaphors about classroom teachers: Toward a systematic typology for the language teaching field. *System*, 26, 3–50.
- Pegrum, M. (2004). Selling English: Advertising and the discourses of ELT. *English Today*, 20, 3–10.
- Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics: A critical introduction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Santa Ana, O. (1999). Like an animal I was treated: Anti-immigrant metaphor in US public discourse. *Discourse & Society* Vol. 10, No. 2, 191–224.
- Sharp, L., & Richardson, T. (2001). Reflections on Foucauldian discourse analysis in planning and environmental policy research. *Journal of Environmental Policy and Planning*, 3, 193–209.
- Siegal, A. (1996). The role of learner subjectivity in second language sociolinguistic competency: Western women learning Japanese. *Applied Linguistics*, 17(3) 356–382.
- Turner, J. (1993). Falling into Place: Conceptual Metaphor and Western Academic Culture. *Intercultural Communication Studies* III: 1, 49–62
- Ungerer, F., & Schmidt, H. J. (1996). *An Introduction to Cognitive Linguistics*. London. Longman Press.
- Van Lier, L. (2004). *The Ecology and Semiotics of Language Learning: A Sociocultural Perspective*. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

The Impact of Life Stages on Parent-child Relationships: A Comparative Look at Japanese & American University Students

Yoshimitsu Takei, Tokio Honda, and Sheau-Hue Shieh

Introduction

Adolescence is often considered a period in a person's life when important physiological and emotional changes occur (Erikson, 1963; Friedenberg, 1962; Hamburg, 1974). When discussing adolescence, however, it should not be forgotten that it is just another stage in one's life span between birth and death. By adopting a life-span perspective, researchers are more likely to consider contextual factors which affect adolescents and less likely to ignore the possibility of the individual going through many changes in his or her life span (Lerner, 1987). This paper uses data obtained from undergraduate university students in the United States and Japan to address questions related to adolescence.

We explore the extent to which relationships between adolescents and parents reveal cross-cultural similarities or differences. We also explore how changes in child-parent relationships, and the reasons which purportedly account for those changes, reveal cross-cultural similarities or differences.

While many would assume that major differences in family relationships naturally exist between two societies that are as culturally different as the United States and Japan, there is a theoretical reason to anticipate the opposite. Goode (1970) proposed that families in industrialized societies show structural and normative changes which tend to converge. If this is true, then patterns of parent-child relationships in the two societies should reveal considerable similarities.

We provide a brief overview of this topic and then present an analysis of data collected from a sample of Japanese and American undergraduates. We identify similarities and differences in the parent-child relationships, as well as the changes that occurred over time. Our analysis offers some grounds for suggesting that industrialization, as Goode argues, could create similar patterns of change in relationships within the family in culturally dissimilar societies.

The Invention of Adolescence

The concepts of childhood and adolescence did not exist in Europe during the Middle Ages. Philippe Aries (1962) tells us that medieval children were not treated much differently from adults once they no longer needed to wear swaddling clothes. Age-grading was not practiced and young children often worked, or even married, during what are today considered elementary school years.

This situation changed largely as a result of Catholic Church leaders adopting the belief that while children were born innocent, they were corrupted by the sinful ways of the adults. Clerics began to preach that it was a parental duty to keep children as innocent as

possible. The gradual dissemination of this view among the middle-class contributed to the gradual decline of apprenticeship and the rise of schools as we know them today. Newer schools ultimately assigned pupils to age-graded classes starting at around age six, a practice which gradually eliminated the earlier pattern of classes that included a wide range of ages of pupils.

The construction of childhood as a separate stage in a person's life began during the fifteenth century in Europe and spread slowly throughout the continent. Adolescence was invented several hundred years later. Gillis (1981) documents the social conditions that created adolescence in England during the period from 1870 to 1900. According to Bakan (1976) adolescence came into existence in the United States in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

The development of adolescence as a stage separate from childhood and before adulthood required legitimizing a non-adult status for those who formerly were considered old enough to work. The passage of child-labor laws, which restricted employment of children younger than sixteen years old and the establishment of a separate judicial system to treat minors promoted the belief that teenagers were not quite adults. This, in turn, made mandatory school attendance until age sixteen the norm throughout most of the nation (Bakan, 1976).

The crystallization of adolescence as a separate stage in a person's life also had a noteworthy effect on the life trajectories of the American population by creating a period wherein many young people are in a state of psychosocial limbo; they are no longer children, but not yet legally adults. This contradiction probably accounts for some of the behavioral patterns that we associate with adolescents in this country. The behavioral manifestations of this psychosocial separation is represented by age-graded cliques as well as interest in engaging in activities such as sexual contacts, driving a car, and drinking, which are supposed to be reserved for those deemed to be legally "adult."

Adolescence in Japan seems to have become fairly similar to adolescence in the United States. Those under twenty cannot vote and those under eighteen are not tried as adults for minor crimes. Like their American counterparts, there are Japanese youths who conduct car and motorcycle races on city streets, but the majority of Japanese adolescents, especially males, view formal education and career preparation as their primary tasks.

It seems reasonable to suggest, however, that leaving high school and either taking a full-time job or enrolling in a university represent visible turning points in the lives of both American and Japanese adolescents. In both societies, full-time employment is likely to change the status of the adolescent with the family since

both parents and children view this as a significant step toward adulthood.

Similarly, becoming a university student is probably viewed in both societies as important preparation for adulthood. Although it does prolong the financially dependent status of the adolescent, most students in the United States see “growing up” as one of the main purposes of being a university student (Becker, et al., 1968). This is an important change in perspective from that which characterized their years as a high school pupil. Japanese university students, on the other hand, supposedly enjoy their university years as a “honeymoon” between the secondary school rigors of preparing for university entrance examinations and the anticipated demands of work after graduation. It is likely, however, that having done well on the entrance examination and being accepted by a university provides them the status of a future white-collar worker and that may be psychosocially quite meaningful as a turning point in their lives.

The Problem

American adolescents seem to present more problems of control to their parents than adolescents in other societies (Kandel and Lesser, 1972). Japanese adolescents are depicted in the American scholarly writings as extremely docile in comparison to American adolescents. Given the rather brief overview presented above, what reasonable questions can be asked about the relationship between adolescents and their parents in the United States and Japan? A logical hypothesis is that there will be a higher incidence of tension and conflict between parents and adolescent children in the United States than in Japan. Whether this popular belief is supported empirically constitutes our major line of inquiry.

The Sample

This questionnaire was originally constructed by one of the co-authors of this paper to study the effects of families on the attitudes of Japanese university students. Parts of this questionnaire were translated from Japanese to English and some of the items were deliberately left open-ended in order to obtain as much information as possible. The questionnaire was administered to 330 American undergraduates late in 1989. The Japanese version was administered to 349 undergraduates in May 1990.

The American sample includes only the White respondents and is more heavily female than the Japanese sample (75 percent versus 61 percent). The American undergraduates' ages ranged from nineteen to thirty-nine years (with twenty as the mode), while the Japanese sample is much more homogeneous, with ages ranging from twenty to twenty-five years (with twenty-one as the mode). Eighty-six percent of the American and 98 percent of the Japanese students lived with their fathers most of their lives. Ninety-nine percent of the Americans and 98 percent of the Japanese students grew up with their biological mothers. Both samples comprise large numbers of education majors and most students had fairly

similar socio-economic backgrounds as indicated by their fathers' educational attainment.

Variables

We used nationality and gender as the independent variables in this paper. Since we viewed this as an exploratory study, we were primarily interested in discovering the cross-national similarities and differences between our two samples and did not collect much demographic information from our respondents.

As dependent variables, we used the student responses from a few items which were intended to assess perceived relationships with parents over their relatively short life span. The first item asked, “Have your opinions about your father changed since you were a child?” The students were asked to check “No,” “Yes, once,” or “Yes, more than once.” If they answered “Yes,” they were then asked to respond to several open-ended items which were to indicate when, why, and how their opinions changed.

While the open-ended items provided a wealth of information, they did pose some difficulties in coding. We used more than eighty categories each to code the “Why?” and “How?” responses. A few responses included fairly unique experiences such as a parent's death, a student's treatment for emotional problems, a student “learned how babies were made,” etc. Responses were coded into conceptually coherent categories in order to enable a comparison by nationality and gender.

We first categorized the responses to the “How?” question in terms of whether the response indicated an emotionally positive, neutral, or negative change. Recorded responses were categorized as “became better,” “neither,” or “became worse.” We also recoded the responses to the “Why?” question in terms of the attributed source of the change. We selected all responses which attributed a change in attitude to the student and labeled those as “change in self” responses. Typical responses placed in this category were statements such as “I grew up and developed a better understanding,” and “I matured and saw things differently.” When the source of the change was attributed to events such as “mother took a job” or “father had an affair,” we categorized such statements as “other change.”

Results

The first important finding is that a majority of both Japanese and American university students experienced changes in their attitudes towards their parents. Those most likely to report changes in attitudes toward their fathers were the American females. Table 1.1 shows that 70 percent claimed that their attitudes toward their fathers had changed at least once by the time they were surveyed. The group that reported the fewest attitudinal changes towards their fathers was the Japanese female students; 52 percent of them claimed that their attitudes towards their fathers had not changed at all.

In contrast, both American and Japanese students were less likely to report changed opinions towards their mothers. The Japanese male undergraduates showed the highest percentage (77 percent) of those who reported “no change” in the way they viewed

Table 1.1
 Frequency of Changes in Opinion of American & Japanese
 University Students toward Fathers

Percentage of:	American Males	American Females	Japanese Males	Japanese Females
No change	36	30	42	52
Yes, once	18	21	31	25
Yes, more than once	46	49	27	22
N	76	231	134	206

Table 1.2
 Frequency of Changes in Opinion of American & Japanese
 University Students toward Mothers

Percentage of:	American Males	American Females	Japanese Males	Japanese Females
No change	63	46	77	62
Yes, once	18	24	12	28
Yes, more than once	19	30	11	10
N	79	245	132	210

Table 2.1
 American & Japanese Students' Perceptions of How Their Opinions
 Toward Their Fathers Have Changed

Percentage of:	American Males	American Females	Japanese Males	Japanese Females
No change	77	62	58	55
Yes, once	16	26	26	32
Yes, more than once	7	12	17	14
N	44	159	66	88

Table 2.2
 American & Japanese Students' Perceptions of How Their Opinions
 Toward Their Mothers Have Changed

Percentage of:	American Males	American Females	Japanese Males	Japanese Females
No change	43	69	33	59
Yes, once	52	19	57	31
Yes, more than once	4	12	10	9
N	23	126	21	64

Table 3.1
Reasons Given by American & Japanese Students
For changes in Opinion toward Fathers

Percentage of:	American Males	American Females	Japanese Males	Japanese Females
Change in self	78	66	64	77
Other reasons	22	34	36	23
N	45	158	67	88

Table 3.2
American & Japanese Students' Perceptions of How Their Opinions
Toward Their Mothers Have Changed

Percentage of:	American Males	American Females	Japanese Males	Japanese Females
Change in self	48	67	73	65
Other reasons	52	33	27	35
N	25	126	22	66

their mothers (Table 1.2). This finding is consistent with the depictions of many Japanese mothers devoting themselves to their sons' academic credentials and future careers.

The American females were the most likely to report changed opinions towards their mothers. Journalistic accounts of adolescent females in the United States suggest that they often have stormy relationships with their parents over "control issues," such as appropriate attire and dating issues. It is reasonable to suspect that this is due to parents supervising their daughters' behavior more closely than their sons' behavior. When we asked students to indicate the ages when their opinions changed towards their fathers and mothers, the mode was eighteen years old for American and Japanese students (both male and female) vis-à-vis their fathers. The common turning point in the relationship seems to be enrollment in a university.

In reference to a change in attitude toward their mothers, however, the mode was sixteen years old for American males, eighteen years old for American females, fifteen years old for Japanese males, and eighteen years old for Japanese females. The variation by gender vis-à-vis mothers has not received much attention by those who study families, although this study indicated that boys seem to undergo a change in their relationship with their mother a little earlier than girls

Our data suggests that Japanese university students are a little more likely than American students to report stable relationships with their parents. On the other hand, there also are interesting differences by gender within each society. If we attempt to ascertain

the direction of the changes, it is clear that most of the students perceive their relationship with their fathers to have improved. This is especially true for the American students, as shown in Table 2.1. More than 75 percent of the American males and 62 percent of the American females reported that their opinions of their fathers had improved by the time of this survey.

This pattern suggests that many students had some feelings of antagonism towards their fathers, which we suspect began sometime during their earlier adolescent years and is the most likely explanation for them to report that their opinions towards their fathers had "become better."

When describing how their opinions towards their mother changed, both American and Japanese females were more likely than the males to report a change for the better. Tables 1.2 and 2.2 suggest that females in both societies are more likely than males to have difficulties in their relationships with their mothers while in secondary school.

An analysis of the data to see why opinions toward their parents changed indicates that students most often attributed the change to themselves. Most of the students said that their opinions changed because they had changed, matured, or gained a better understanding of their father or mother (Table 3.1 and 3.2).

Conclusion

Several interesting patterns in American and Japanese parent-child relationships were revealed in this preliminary study. Our sample indicates that American females are the most likely

group to have problematical relationships with either or both of their parents. Japanese females' relationships with their fathers seem most likely to remain stable. Japanese males seem to be particularly close to their mothers. Students are much more likely to say that their opinions of their parents improved rather than worsened.

We can conclude that our data support the view that there are cultural differences between American university students and Japanese university students in their relationships with their parents. We can also say that the similarities in these patterns by gender and the changes in relationships reported by the students seem to suggest some degree of cultural convergence between the two countries. In both countries, becoming a university student seems to result in an improvement of the parent-child relationship.

In industrialized societies, most children do not automatically inherit their parents' occupation and have to compete with others to obtain a desirable status in life. This places parents and their children in a contradictory relationship. Many parents want to control their children's lives to promote achievement and to minimize behaviors that most adults define as self-destructive. Many children, on the other hand, desire more autonomy than what their parents are willing to allow. This potentially conflictual relationship is especially acute during adolescence and the data from Japanese and American undergraduates support this interpretation of family relationships in industrialized societies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aries, P. (1962). *Centuries of Childhood: A Social History of Family Life*. New York: Random House.
- Bakan, D. (1976). Adolescence in America: From Idea to Social Fact. In A. Skolnick (Ed.), *Rethinking Childhood Perspectives on Development and Society*. Boston: Little, Brown: 235–248.
- Becker, H. S., Geer, B., & Hughes, E. C. (1968). *Making the Grade*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Erickson, E. H. (1963) *Childhood and Society* (Second Edition). New York: W.W. Norton and Co.
- Friedenberg, E. Z. (1962). *The Vanishing Adolescent*. New York: Dell Publishing Co.
- Gillis, J. R. (1981). *Youth and History: Tradition and Change in European Age Relations 1770–Present*. New York: Academic Press.
- Goode, W. J. (1970) *World Revolution and Family Patterns*. New York: Free Press.
- Hamburg, R. (1974). "Early Adolescence: A Specific and Stressful Stage in the Life Cycle." In G. Coelho, D. A. Hamburg, & J. E. Adams (Eds.), *Coping and Adaptation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Kandel, D. B. & Lesser, G. S. (1972). *Youth In Two Worlds*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lerner, R. M. (1987). "A Life-Span Perspective for Early Adolescence." In *Biological-psychosocial Interactions in Early Adolescence*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum: 9–34.
-

University of Hawai'i at Mānoa
College of Education
Educational Perspectives
1776 University Avenue
Wist Hall, Room 113
Honolulu, HI 96822

NONPROFIT
ORGANIZATION
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
HONOLULU, HI
PERMIT NO. 278

Website: www.hawaii.edu/edper

