# Critical Psychology in Japan: Voices for change

**Yasuhiro Igarashi**
*Yamano College of Aesthetics*

**Atsuko Aono**
*Fukuyama University*

**Tin Tin Htun**
*Temple University, Japan Campus*

**Satoshi Suzuki**
*Tokyo University of Agriculture*

**Hajime Tanabe**
*Shizuoka University*

## Abstract

Up to recently Japanese psychologists have scarcely known about critical psychology in the English-speaking world or about the psychology of liberation in Latin America; although a few have recognized the importance of Klaus Holzkamp's work and have read it since 1970s. However, some have been engaged in critical psychological research and practice in relation to problems to be tackled in their local contexts. In this paper, critical research and practice by Japanese psychologists in feminist psychology, psychology of ethnic minorities, clinical psychology, discourse analysis, and theoretical psychology are discussed.

*Keywords:* feminist psychology, ethnic minority, discourse analysis, Certified Clinical Psychologist, theoretical psychology

## Introduction (*Yasuhiro Igarashi*)

The critical psychology movement that had developed across the world since the 1990s, which had been started by psychologists in English-speaking countries and given an edge by psychologists in Latin America, South-Africa, and in other parts of the globe, has not grabbed the attentions of Japanese psychologists until quite recently (Igarashi, 2011). Of course, Japanese psychology has many problems that require critical scrutiny. The psychology that was introduced into Japan as carrier of "new knowledge" from advanced Western countries in late 19th century, when the country started to modernize its society following the models of Western powers, has had serious problems since its inception (Igarashi, 2006).

Japanese psychologists had adopted a wide range of methodologies and frameworks to do their work by the end of the WWII. Neo-Behaviorism attracted only minor attention compared to Gestalt psychology and other methodologies and perspectives. But as a result of the post-war occupation and indirect rule of the Allied Forces, primarily the U.S. military that defeated the government of the Empire of Japan in 1945, American culture and learning hit many sectors of the country like a deluge. Psychologists, likewise, started eagerly absorbing North-American psychology soon after WWII. Neo-Behaviorism became the mainstream in

Japanese psychology in due course, and academic psychologists came to believe that the schools of psychology had been unified by the S-O-R psychology and longstanding controversies and confusion concerning the legitimate methodology of psychology had come to an end (Suenaga, 1971). Cognitive-Behaviorism, developed from Neo-behaviorism in the era of "Cognitive Revolution" (Baar, 1986), had predominated in academic psychology in Japan since the late 1970s.

So in a sense, it is normal and natural for Japanese psychologists who trained in the postwar years to believe that psychology is a science of mental process and behavior and that its legitimate research method is laboratory experimentation and other quantitative methods, not qualitative research methods such as interviews and discourse analysis. The myths of objectivity and neutrality of scientific psychology (Gergen, 1991) forge psychologist's belief that objective observation is pivotal for doing research and that psychologists should keep their distance from any social issues to be authentic. This notion has shaped not only how they act as psychologists, but as citizens also. Psychologists, who engage in political activities and speak for those who cannot speak for themselves, attract suspicious attention from their colleagues and face a threat to their authenticity. As for research methodology, qualitative research approaches has been able to find a small space for itself as non-political research methods that supplement quantitative methods such as large-scale questionnaires.

Each of contributors to this paper have been struggling where they work under the hegemony of scientific, or rather, scientistic psychology. Atuko Aono tells her story of being a feminist psychologist in a psychological world and society where male domination is much more deep-rooted than in Western countries. Tin Tin Htun, a Burmese who lives in Tokyo, did research on ethnic minority issues in Japan and brought about hard-to-find findings on the experiences of ethnic discrimination in this homogeneous society. Satoshi Suzuki found that discourse analysis could make invaluable contributions to understanding his clients as a school counsellor and started to introduce it into Japan, where positivism and quantification dominate psychology. Hajime Tanabe has trained certified clinical psychologists for a long time and starting pondering the characteristics of clinical psychology and the requirements for working as a good clinician in Japan. Yasuhiro Igarashi found theoretical psychology, a meta-discipline of psychology (Stam, 2000; Slife, 2000), when he was looking for "another psychology" besides the mainstream in the 1990s, and has been trying to introduce changes into Japanese psychology by introducing its perspectives since then. All the contributors to this paper are critical psychologists in its broadest sense, namely psychologists who have identified problems to be tackled in existing psychology which hamper our understanding of the person, and who work so that people who deserve much more respects to be paid to them may receive this.

### My research and practice as a feminist psychologist (*Atsuko Aono*)

My generation experienced the second wave of feminism during our college days in early 1970s. We passed around the translation of Friedan's *The feminine mystique*. In fact, I was more stimulated by the women's liberation movement than by my psychology lectures. I began a feminist library with my friends in late 1970s and it was here that we were first introduced to various events or news regarding women's liberation. I belonged to the association of graduate women students where they worked together towards improving their status both in academic and social systems.

As for my specialty, I was trained in the field of experimental social psychology, and I started out specialising in the study of personal space. At the same time, I encountered some feminist psychologist research, for example, Broverman et al.'s (1972) work on double standards in gender roles; Bem's (1974) study into psychological androgyny; and Frieze and Ramsey's (1976) investigation into the nonverbal characteristics of women. It's notable that a Japanese psychologist, Kashiwagi, wrote an article on gender roles earlier than these writers in 1967. I was so impressed with Frieze and Ramsey's article that I came to be more interested in the gender differences of personal space. Interestingly, when I met her about thirty years later, Frieze had a new theme in her work of dating violence. (She emphasised that young women were as violent as men.)

I dropped out of my doctoral course because I wanted to be economically independent early on (or perhaps I gave in because of my male peers). I worked as a part-time instructor for a few years and got my first full-time job at a women's junior college in 1984. Because of inadequate research conditions without rooms for experiments, I was forced to change the research methods I used. Also, I had to teach all sorts of psychology including general psychology, developmental psychology, and clinical psychology. In retrospect, these experiences broadened my interests and improved my methodological knowledge outside of traditional experimental social psychology.

When teaching psychology, I was often suspicious of the contents of textbooks; especially the descriptions on development seemed to reproduce traditional gender roles by emphasizing the importance of the mother-child relationship. To obtain more information, I analysed a lot of textbooks and looked at how they cited research which dealt with mother-child relationships. Harlow's studies on the motive for soft clothing or warm things were frequently cited as an evidence of human babies' attachment to their mothers, exaggerating his affirmations (Aono, 1990). In addition, Bowlby's (1988) attachment theory was undisputed in psychology textbooks at the time, even though there were different tendencies across the ages (Aono, 1993).

Once I finally decided to make a career in the academic world, I embarked again upon a PhD as a mature student whilst continuing with my work. I started studying personal space again, but this time I tried to examine Henley's (1977) oppression hypothesis which claims that gender differences in personal space could be explained by the difference of social status. While this old fashioned hypothesis has been referred to often by feminist psychologists, some meta-analyses indicated small effect sizes in personal space. When I was going to start my experiment dealing with the status variable, I found it very difficult to find women with a high status in Japanese companies. My simulated experiment showed that other people's gender or status is more important than the participant's. Japanese female workers would like to put their male bosses furthest. I completed my doctorate eventually in 2003. Since then, I have expanded the hypothesis into other areas, such as expression, posture, gesture. Lately, I had a new co-researcher from the UK who is interested in both nonverbal communication and gender.

If I look to the field of psychology in Japan, the way academic societies operate hugely affect our research and practice. As Japanese feminist psychologists may belong to any of over forty specialised psychological societies which are competing with each other, they seldom collaborate and the fruits of their research are not coherently organised as Japanese feminist psychology. So I called for the members of the Japanese Psychological Association (JPA) to set up the Collegium on Gender Studies in 2002 (Aono, 2006). At first, we took part in the

JPA board meeting to propose the creation of a new presentational section, *Women, Gender, and Feminism*. The following year, the *Gender and Feminism* section was set up as the JPA's 19th presentational section. However, we had to make a strong argument to prevent the board from erasing the word "feminism" because there had been a small number of entries to this section.

One of our activities is planning symposiums and workshops at the JPA annual meeting. The titles of past meetings are as follows: *Towards feminist psychology* (2002); *Issues of feminist psychology: Facing social pathology and family pathology* (2003); *Women's position in Japanese psychology: As objects or agents* (2004); *The significance and problem of research on gender differences: Aren't gender differences worth exploring?* (2005); *What are the aims of feminist psychology?: Searching directions in the future* (2006); *Backlash and psychological research: Does psychology contribute to gender equality?* (2007); *Reading psychological theories from the viewpoint of gender: What and how is the problem?* (2008); *Men as a problem of gender* (2009); *Men as researchers of gender* (2010). We have questioned what, how, and why we should study.

As a collaborative work, I jointly edited a translation of Unger's *Handbook of the psychology of women and gender* in 2004. We needed a handbook like this to better understand the interrelation of findings across various specialised fields. Whilst translating the book's first chapter, I learnt that feminist psychologists, though mainly western, struggled against the main stream of psychology and organised themselves to women's divisions. I met Unger in 2004 at a seminar hosted by Ochanomizu University's Institute for Gender Studies. She gave a lecture with the title *The social construction of gender: The empirical studies from the viewpoint of feminism*. I was very struck by her passion and persistence in using an empirical approach during her research life as a feminist social psychologist.

Although Unger's handbook was very valuable for Japanese scholars, I have cherished the idea of editing our own psychology of women and gender in Japan handbook to collaborate, learn from each other and share our findings. Our handbook consists of five parts: 'development', 'social roles and social systems', 'health matters', 'institutions and power', and 'theory and methodology', and in these sections we have particularly focused on reviewing the research of Japanese feminists. For my own part, I briefly reviewed the history of Japanese gender psychology, illustrating five eras: the time of importation from western countries (1970s), embryo (1980s), growth (1990s), and maturation (2000s). Although the field of gender studies has been gradually growing in popularity in Japan, feminist studies are still in a minority.

The Basic Law for a Gender-equal Society was not enacted until 1999 in Japan, much later than other industrial societies. Gender equality in labour and other social areas has not been accomplished yet. Furthermore, a backlash against feminism has occurred over the last decade with some citizen groups requiring public organisations to remove books on "gender" from their libraries, and also with the Cabinet Office directing local governments to self-censor and not use the word "gender free". These are examples of "gender-bashing" in Japan. Our Collegium issued a protest statement in keeping with other associations in 2005. It seems that the word "feminism" does not have currency with the public and that Japanese scholars, even feminists, hesitate to use the word "feminism" in their work.

Japanese gender psychologists lean to empirical research and quantitative methods in general. Although gender is seen as one of the important variables, its relationship with other social

variables has yet to be examined in Japan. Even if they were concerned with them, they are limited to the variables as family and couple. Furthermore, studies checking and criticising the theories and psychologies which the research is based on are quite a few. In 2008, I experienced a momentous encounter with Erica Burman, the British feminist and critical psychologist and well-known in Japan as the author of *Deconstructing developmental psychology*, and who was looking to establish communication with Japanese feminists. Since then, we have collaborated with one another to translate her book, plan a symposium at the Japanese Society for Developmental Psychology, and joint edit the special feature *Feminism and Psychology*.

It's important for us to continue and broaden the communication with other feminists around the world. This will help us to learn more feminist psychologies, to identify our own feminist psychology, and convey our message to the world. At the same time, it is meaningful that we feminist psychologists interact with critical psychologists in Japan. In this way, each point of view will join together and new research horizons will open.

### Unexplored territories: Minority issues[1] in Japan *(Tin Tin Htun)*

I first became aware of the existence of minorities after eight years in Japan. At that time I was helping with a research project, and although this particular project did not explicitly focus on minorities in Japan, it did deal with identifying low- and high-status groups in Japanese society. A few respondents (around 10%) identified Buraku[2] as a low-status group, but I noticed that the research team were unexpectedly nervous about mentioning Buraku in the writing of the paper. In the end the team decided to drop Buraku completely from the discussion of results. This intrigued me. Although I had done my graduate studies in Japan, none of the courses that I had taken in psychology mentioned Buraku. I had also never heard my colleagues or friends talk about Buraku. I couldn't understand why Buraku was a taboo discussion topic in research or even in conversation. Later, when I started teaching a course on gender issues in Japan, I also started to realize that research on women from minority groups is almost non-existent within Japanese academia. In my teaching, I started to cover prejudice and discrimination against Ainu, Buraku, and Zainichi Koreans[3] in a class on "Prejudice and Discrimination in Japan" at Temple University Japan Campus and Chuo University. These classroom experiences helped me begin to see that it is not uncommon for university students to know hardly anything about minority groups in Japan. Even though some students are aware of the existence of minority groups, parents, teachers, and other authorities do not usually encourage them to openly debate, ask questions about, or discuss the situation of minority groups in Japanese society. That's probably one important reason why issues of minority discrimination have become an unquestioned taboo, especially for the Buraku group (e.g., Ishikida, 2005), for the majority in Japan.

The same kind of taboo exists in psychological research, too. As someone who has been doing research and teaching social psychology in Japan, I am struck by the indisputable fact that mainstream Japanese psychology, particularly mainstream social psychology, fails to cover prejudice and discrimination against minorities in Japan. Not one paper related to Japanese ethnic minorities such as Ainu, Buraku, and Zainichi Koreans[4] has been published in the main academic forum for social psychology in Japan, *The Journal of Japanese Social Psychology*. Apart from a number of studies that have compared Japanese with other nationalities, especially Americans, and other studies that focus on intercultural issues and intergroup relationships between Japanese and foreigners in Japan, the research on intergroup relationships between Japanese and long-standing minority groups in Japan (i.e., Ainu,

Buraku, Zainichi, Okinawan) is virtually non-existent in Japanese social psychology. Given that intergroup relations, prejudice and discrimination have always been central issues in social psychology, this is an astonishing research gap. Why does Japanese social psychology fail to cover minority issues in Japan? According to Igarashi (2006), part of the answer is that Japanese psychologists are so strongly affected by a belief in the neutrality of science that talking about social and political issues has become a taboo for them. Yet, as Prilleltensky (1989) pointed out, the assumption of neutrality itself prevents psychologists from examining dominant ideologies influencing social order and social forces. Uncritical acceptance of prevailing ideology results in the maintenance and endorsement of the status quo. In the case of Japan, the prevailing ideology[5] of Japan as a mono-ethnic and homogenous country effectively stops Japanese psychologists from examining "race", "ethnicity", and "racism" in Japan, especially the experiences, positions, and status of minority groups in Japan. There is a strong need for critical psychology in Japan as a meta-discipline that not only questions the impact of prevailing ideology on the "value-neutral" and "objective" positions that psychologists take and maintain the status-quo by, but also promotes social justice and social change.

From a critical psychology perspective, it is important to understand the impact of mono-ethnic ideology on socio-political and institutional orders in Japan as well as on mainstream social psychology's frame of understanding. Race in Japan is not part of official discourse of the state. None of the fundamental laws of modern Japan focuses on race or ethnicity. The 1889 Meiji Constitution defined 'subjects' but did not mention race, whereas the 1947 Showa Constitution states that all "nationals" are equal under the law regardless of race, creed, sex, social status or family origin (Wetherall, 2007). The race or ethnicity of an individual is not usually required information in documents or official descriptions; rather people in Japan are principally registered based on their domicile. In theory, Japanese nationality is a legal status and free of race or ethnicity (Wetherall, 2008). Although Japan does not officially racialize Japanese nationality, the term 'Japanese' is associated with physical appearance, language, and other traits in everyday experience (Wetherall, 2008). Racialist terms such as *haafu* (half) for biracial children with one Japanese parent and one non-Japanese parent (usually Caucasian, not Asian) are commonly used in everyday discourse. Korean residents who take Japanese nationality still experience racialization and racism from their Japanese peers in different social contexts (see Lim, 2009), and there are numerous accounts of discrimination against Ainu, Buraku, and other ethnic groups in Japan (e.g., Diene, 2006). Admittedly, racism and racialization occur in Japan as in any other society, but social psychological research on these issues is highly limited.

Even if Japanese nationality is determined by law, racial homogeneity is an essential part of the popular and political discourse on national identity (Burgess, 2010) and the state's position towards minority groups (Wetherall, 2008). Japan has been criticized time and time again for its reluctant and minimal acknowledgement of the existence and the rights of minority groups (e.g., CERD, 2001; Diene, 2006; Human Rights Committee, 2008). In the third Japanese Government Periodic Report on the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) in 1991, Japan for the first time acknowledged 'Ainu people as minorities' (Takano, 1993: 3-4; Teshima, 1993: 29-30). Until then the Japanese government had resolutely denied the existence of minorities, but, in the same report, Korean residents (Zainichi Koreans) who have now been living in Japan for four generations were categorized as foreigners. Another minority group, the Buraku, were effectively de-historicised when the Law on Special Measures for Dowa Projects was enacted in 1969 to improve their living conditions (Takano, 1993: 3; Tomonaga, 1993: 7). The law categorized Buraku people as

residents of particular '*dowa*' districts rather than as a minority that has suffered discrimination by descent and residence over several centuries.

The Japanese government's reluctance to acknowledge the existence of minority groups in Japan is further reflected in other public and institutional discourses. Coverage of minority issues in the media (Burgess, 2008) and educational curriculum is minimal. The invisibility and unheard voices of minority groups in public spaces within direct proximity of the majority, together with the perceived taboo of discussing minority issues, offer a partial explanation of why there is such a dearth of research on minority issues in Japanese social psychology.

The lack of research on minorities, specifically research that attempts to understand the position of minorities from the perspective of minorities themselves, is connected to the dominant homogenous ideology and the maintenance of a particular racial and ethnic status quo within the broader Japanese social context for an academic discipline like social psychology. Japanese social psychologists' unwillingness to take up minority research and lack of interest in minority issues points to their complicity in reinforcing the ideology of homogeneity. The lack of research on minorities in Japan highlights the need for mainstream Japanese social psychology to critically re-examine the influence of social, cultural, political, and historical factors on psychological research and the establishment of knowledge, particularly in terms of the consequences of social psychology's contribution to society and groups that are marginalized in Japanese society. The striking absence of research on minority groups in Japan from a social psychological perspective has had a marked impact on social psychology's contribution in understanding intergroup relationships between Japanese and minority groups, as well as on how minority individuals respond to their own social and structural categorization in discriminated groups in Japanese society. Without researching the existing relationships between minority groups and the majority Japanese, neither intergroup relations research nor research on prejudice and discrimination can arrive at a fuller and deeper understanding of the nature of the specific group relationships that lead to prejudice and discrimination against minorities within the context of Japan. Equally, intergroup relationship research will fail to provide a comprehensive picture if it overlooks the perspectives of minorities regarding their own minority status. Although current minority research *in general* has provided structural, political, cultural and historical explanations about the exclusion of minority groups in Japan, it lacks a *specific* social psychological focus on how minority individuals perceive their positions in Japanese society. Such a perspective is needed because it can help us build our understanding of how individuals from marginalized groups respond to the structural ordering that is imposed on them. In short, this kind of bottom-up critical psychological approach can help us recognize and listen to the voices of minority others in Japan and therefore better understand the impact of social order and ideology on marginalized groups.

My own qualitative research (Tin Tin Htun, in press) on the social identities of long-established minority groups – Ainu, Buraku, and Korean residents – led to a diverse, complex and evolving picture in which minority individuals, as members of (devalued) minority groups in Japan, try to determine at a *personal* level the significance of the *group* identity ascribed to them. Examining minority identity at an individual level highlights the fact that identities and their meanings are fluid and evolving, depending on the positions and interpretations of the individual in a particular context. Individuals, it emerges, possess active agency and self-determination in resisting or accepting particular minority identities, just as social contexts play an important role in helping them deal with (devalued) minority identity.

The articulations of identity by the Ainu, Buraku, and *Zainichi* Korean participants in this research are embedded within particular socio-historical contexts; thus, individuals' own sense of social identity intersects with other discourses around their respective minority group as a collective. The Ainu participants emphasized learning about Ainu culture, history, and language as necessary acts in becoming "authentic" Ainu, whereas the Buraku explained their identity with prominent reference to human rights, discrimination, and the leading role of the Buraku Liberation League. On the other hand, *Zainichi* Korean participants centered their accounts on the reasons for their existence in Japan: older *Zainichi* participants saw their existence as a historical legacy of colonialism, whereas younger *Zainichi* (third or fourth generation) focused more on what being *Zainichi* means in Japan at present. All these different discourses reflect the socio-historical conditions of each minority's group relationship to the majority Japanese. Thus, the socio-historical background of each minority group not only provides a context where minority individuals can locate themselves to articulate their minority identity, but also reveals major impacts of mono-ethnic ideology on the social identity of minorities.

This kind of research touches upon the complex nature of in-group and out-group relationships in Japan through the subjective representations of social reality[6] of minority individuals. On a broader front, exploring the diverse and complex nature of the subjective representations of disadvantaged minority groups challenges the homogeneity and implicit notions of race and ethnicity that mainstream social psychology in Japan mirrors. More importantly, researching the social reality of minority individuals breaks the silence of mainstream social psychology research and questions the societal status quo of majority Japanese and minority groups. Above all the research indicates the imminent need for a critical psychology that can evaluate and reshape mainstream (social) psychology meta-theory and practices. Mainstream Japanese social psychology cannot afford to go on without connecting to societal needs, particularly in a period when Japanese society has been encountering diverse social, economic, and political issues such as the rights of ethnic and sexual minorities, migrant labour, the working poor, single mothers, child abuse, domestic violence, the low birth rate, a rapidly aging population, prolonged economic recession, nuclear and natural disasters. In a time such as the present, previously accepted and unquestioned social and political systems need to be rigorously examined for the future well-being of Japanese society. Psychology as a discipline has so much to contribute if it can incorporate critical psychology as a meta-discipline for effecting change in the lives of people (Austin & Prilleltensky, 2001) as well as change in the direction and orientation of psychology itself in Japan.

**Introduction of discourse analysis into Japanese psychology** (*Satoshi Suzuki*)

In Japan, discourse analysis has been one of the linguistic methods and known as a methodology of Foucaudian philosophy. Conversation analysis was introduced with ethnomethodology into sociology in late 1980s and 1990s, and sociologists who introduced conversation analysis and ethnomethodology had a critical orientation that towards analysing social problems such as discrimination (e.g., Yamada & Yoshii, 1991).

Discourse analysis was welcomed as a new approach to social psychology in the late 1980s in Europe (Wooffitt, 2005) and later it has established itself as one of qualitative researches in psychology (see Camic, Rhodes & Yardly, 2003). In Japanese psychology, interest in qualitative research increased in the 1990s. Grounded theory, narrative analysis, interviews, etc., have been used very often in qualitative research until recently, but discourse analysis

had not been attended to. Only a few textbooks on methodologies of psychology in Japan mention conversation analysis.

When I became discontented with psychological approaches to textual data and sought alternative approaches to it, I read a book on social constructionism (Burr, 1995) and found that discourse analysis was a very attractive approach. I attempted to analyse interview data on mental illness spoken by college students and textual data on school non-attendance written by secondary students. Later I wrote a book on discourse analysis (Suzuki, 2007). Today it is still the introductory book on discourse analysis in psychology written in Japanese, although there are some translated books on qualitative research in psychology which deal with it in one or two chapters (e.g., Willig, 2001; Banister et al., 1994).

A feature of the book is that it not only introduces studies done in Europe and USA but also includes unique ones conducted by Japanese psychologists who do not identify their studies as discourse analysis.

First is Hamada's deposition analysis. In Japanese judicial system, a suspect is interrogated in a locked room for many days. Consequently false accusations can occur easily. Hamada was concerned with about twenty cases and has requested comments on confession and witness deposition. He read huge reports on deposition and developed deposition analysis. Reports on a case are arranged in sequence and changes of their contents are investigated. Deposition analysis also assumes reports as results of interaction between interrogators and suspects. Based on his own analysis, he asserted innocence in many cases (e.g., Hamada, 1986; 1988).

Second is Nakajima's criticism of counselling (Nakajima, 1989; 1991). When he was a high school teacher he counselled a student. After leaving the school the student said to him: 'I felt dodged in counselling'. He took the remark seriously and began to criticize Rogerian counselling. He analysed textbooks on counselling and argued that techniques for acceptance results in ignorance of issues brought by the client and therefore to attention being given only to motives and feelings. He said that although a client might talk freely s/he could be controlled by his/her own words and that s/he might therefore be led to take on another issue. In this way, Nakajima argued a relation between techniques of counselling and construction of subjectivity.

Over the years there had been many Japanese psychologists who had criticized cognitivist and mechanistic tendencies in psychology and emphasized the social and cultural aspects of the human mind. Recently the discursive turn has influenced psychologists in this way; the two examples mentioned above are typical. Regrettably, many of them have (and had) almost no connection with foreign academic trends. Establishing connections between them is what is needed.

### History, current status and future prospects of the training and license system for Certified Clinical Psychologists in Japan: A discussion from a critical psychology point of view (*Hajime Tanabe*)

I have been engaged in psychological research and education at graduate schools and in practice as a psychologist and psychiatric social worker. In this decade, I have been involved in the establishment of the Master's Program in Clinical Human Sciences that aims to train helping professionals, who will be disciplined to be able to deliberate on their own practices from scientific, philosophical, ethical, legal and sociological points of view; and engaged in

training psychologists. One of the themes of the educational activities is cultivating an attitude of scientific, philosophical, socio-cultural and political reflection. I will summarize the history and current status of training and qualification systems for Certified Clinical Psychologists and point out some issues for discussion with critical psychology from the standpoint described above.

*Clinical psychology is not a part of scientific psychology*

There was a clinical psychology boom among students and in the book publication industry before the establishment of a qualification system for Certified Clinical Psychologists in Japan. However, as training courses having been set up in universities one after another since the system's establishment, the boom has been taking on a more substantial character. While the rapidly declining birth rate in Japan presents many universities with difficulties in obtaining students, psychology courses are having a rush of students. Students have come to think of being a psychologist as their job, career and profession, not as merely an academic interest. Students have an idealized expectation for "psychology" as an art of solving suffering and problems (that they themselves hold in many cases) and are not so "properly disciplined" in the epistemic framework of psychology as an empirical science as before.

Although there is a vague but eager expectation for psychologists to provide solutions for social issues on mental health, the "outcomes", following the prevalence of the professional groups certified by the current qualification system, is not "evident." The extent of their social contribution is rather obscure. Likely reflecting the "reality," the employment of psychologists has always been precarious and their income level low. The boom, nonetheless sustained for such a long period, would have to be analyzed as a kind of social phenomena. It seems that incorporeal dynamics of concerns move the society.

In Japanese clinical psychology, psychodynamic (around 50%) and humanistic (around 20%) approaches are the dominant theoretical orientations, with Jungians in particular a major vantage point. They have an epistemic framework rather opposite to the behavioural objectivism, averaged universalism, and logical positivism of "mainstream" psychology, and regard their academic area as a unique discipline rather than an application of basic psychology.

As a result, dominant discourses in Japanese clinical psychology still tend to depend on justifications by the authority of mentorship, "Holy Scriptures," or charismas (e.g., "our Master says" or "Freud said"). Of course, those who blindly follow authority without verifying their own practical experience would be a minority. However, the majority would not be aware that their verification processes involve epistemic problems such as selection biases and theoretical loads. In this situation, it is critical for sound development of the clinical practices to have a circuit of mutual verification by the scientific account, as well as to have a circuit of avoiding the one-sidedness of cognition built in the clinical culture such as mutual supervision.

However, the cooperation between psychology as an empirical science and clinical psychology has been weak. There were many symposia and workshops held during the annual meeting of the Japanese Psychological Association in 2010 discussing the cooperation and collaboration between "basic" psychology and clinical psychology. The issue has been explored and discussed as an important matter of concern in recent years.

As the reality, we have to admit that there is a gap rather than continuity between the knowledge, techniques and attitudes to be learned in the "main-stream" psychology and those to be learned by clinical psychologists. For the clinical-technique-oriented students getting the disciplinary training of the "main-stream" psychology in the undergraduate courses, what "psychology" should be might not be this kind but conceived as "arcana" beyond it, which can be permitted inheriting only by ones who become graduate students in the training course for clinical psychologists. Their motivation for learning scientific literacy is low in general. Therefore, before we try to relativize their "scientism" psychological epistemic framework from critical point of view, often we find out that their scientific epistemic framework itself has scarcely been formed. Calling their attention to mystified understanding of unconsciousness, excessive devotion to subjectivity, and lack of basic scientific attitudes such as pursuit of grounds, logicality, critical thinking, often shared by clinical-technique-oriented students, is what "mainstream" psychology is striving for. It is thus difficult to restrain the motivation to support the effort.

### History and politics of the qualification system

Activities for establishing a qualification system for psychologists in Japan dates back to the 1960's. The qualification authorization was first prepared in 1969 for the Japanese Association of Clinical Psychology, which was founded in the mid 1960's. Nevertheless, the authorization was not put in place. The criticism against its establishment in the University Dispute also targeted various qualification systems; the clinical internship system in medicine, for example, was forced to make major modifications in 1968. Under such a social climate, the objection to the qualification was adopted at the Association meeting. The proposed qualification had elements restricting professional freedom of their practices, suppression of diversity, and institutionalization of power structure. At the time any conventional authority was subject to criticism, and it was no surprise that the institutionalization of a new authority failed.

The members who supported the qualification for psychologists left the association, where leftist critical discourses had been dominant, and continued their activities. They organized the second association for clinical psychology, the Association of Japanese Clinical Psychology, at the beginning of the 1980's, when the clinical psychology boom gradually gained momentum. This is the association of (or concerned with) psychology with the largest number of members in Japan today. The fact that it has more members than the Japanese Psychological Association seems to suggest its relation to "mainstream" psychology mentioned above. In Japan, where clinical psychology is experiencing a boom, "mainstream" psychology is clearly not the majority.

At the end of the 1980's, the Japanese Certification Board for Clinical Psychologist started authorizing qualification, with the second association playing a central role, and two years later, in 1990, it became a legally incorporated foundation supervised by the Ministry of Education.

Though it does not seem to be fair, this qualification is hardly considered in applications for medical insurance up to this day, for the reason of not being a national qualification. Therefore psychologists working in health and medical institutions (30 to 40% of psychologists in Japan), who are threatened by potential discontinuation of employment, desire the establishment of a national qualification system. The Ministry of Health and Welfare have been examining a national qualification framework for psychologists in the

medical domain since the 1990's.

The Japanese Association of Clinical Psychology, who once criticized a qualification system as a power structure, has supported national qualification for psychologists in the medical domain since 1991. After that, members who opposed a qualification system resigned from the Association and established another society focusing on more social issues in 1993. They issued a remark criticizing the qualification system as the institutionalization of control over professionals and the life of people.

Certified Clinical Psychologists, on the other hand, despite the initial reputation of a "mere private qualification", has been developing the status of an "official qualification" as its influence expanded, and now it is commonly required for the employment of psychologists in the field of medicine as well as education. In particular, its presence appealed to the public with the project concerning the deployment of school counsellors by the Ministry of Education started in 1995. The clinical psychology boom entered a stage of Certified Clinical Psychologist boom.

In 1996 a system was introduced that offers examinations leading to eligibility for students who have finished a designated master's program. This system does not require undergraduate education specialized in psychology. One can enter the designated graduate school simply by passing the entrance examination without getting so called "disciplinary" training, including "basic" psychological research methods. Also, the system, as a matter of course, relates to the issue of personnel affairs and budgetary distribution. With the pressure on the profit performance of universities caused by the neo-liberal market fundamentalist political situation in Japan, many universities reorganized themselves to have designated training schools, and department constitution and personnel affairs are largely affected. This also caused the political tension between "mainstream" and clinical psychology.

Today, there are 160 designated schools producing more than 20,000 qualified persons in Japan. With the expansion of Certified Clinical Psychologists settled, the improvement of quality is now the issue. In Japan, many training courses for professionals are having troubles with quality as a side effect of mass production.

Lobbying for the national qualification for psychologists in the medical domain was enlivened between 2002 and 2005 by a new party. They demanded the qualification be "properly" fit to the power structure with medical doctors on the top: that psychologists are trained in undergraduate courses or vocational colleges (14 to 16 years of education in total), work under the control of medical doctors, just like other paramedics, and that qualification be limited to the medical domain or the "monarchy of medical doctors".

The concern with the length of education is related to the motivation for the improvement of psychologists' socio-economic status. The necessity for improving quality may be relevant here. Professional organisations act for the stability of their standing and improvement of their socio-economic status, as well as for the improvement of their quality and mutual education. It does not only secure their employment but also amplifies their voice in society and governmental administration, although it will be linked to the expansion of the power structure, also called the "psy-complex," affecting service beneficiaries and citizens in general on another front.

However, in reality, many psychologists are part-time workers or contracted workers not

covered by labour laws (about half of them are not fulltime; and it should be said that 75% of psychologists are women) and their salary level in the health and medical domain stays on a lower level equal to or less than that of other co-medical staff with 15 years of education. Many of them cannot maintain living independently. In addition to the recent economic slowdown, in this couple of years, seeing psychiatric social workers and nurses prepare training systems of psychological tests and cognitive-behavioural therapy for medical insurance application, the menace to their employment continuation has been increasing in urgency.

Following this situation, in 2008 a kind of compromise was accomplished, namely that the qualification would require undergraduate education specialized in psychology, including research methods; that it would assume master level of educational requirements as a general rule; and that psychologists will work under control of medical doctors in medical settings. The bill is under preparation to be presented, but the outcome, given the unstable political situation in Japan, in unpredictable.

In these years, it seems that the acute clinical psychology boom has finally cooled down and is moving to a next stage. Although there have been changes in Japanese pop culture, upholding the inner world in terms of discourses of a "real self" and personal "healing", the outcome of the deployment of school counsellors and the healthcare insurance system mentioned above may also have had a certain influence on that.

*Further issues in training psychologists in Japan: Engaging critical psychology*

Pursuit of substantial outcome chiefly in preventive activities: There are many urgent issues in Japanese society that demands improvement by "experts of mind", such as support for child-rearing, prevention of maltreatment, intimate partner violence, depression and suicide especially among workers. While for a 50 minutes session psychologists make an all-out effort for one "client", thousands of new sufferers appear – is it, then, the right choice to continue to pour your professional endeavours into fighting a fire? It is perhaps necessary to allocate limited resources more wisely and prioritize issues in training professionals, or there might be an argument for a community psychology point of view. The current situation has a strong tendency to turn out experts who see themselves as explorers of the "inside" – the unconscious or personal experience. One should live up to the "real" life expectations of the people as much as the urgent needs of their "inside" reality.

Of course, one could criticize medico-economical rationalism. The diffusion of the idea of prevention may end up seeing "potential" needs only through the logic of the capital, thus exploiting the "mental health" discourse for other, profitable ends. What critical discourse would be effective so that necessary resources are indeed provided for people in need? I expect well-balanced arguments from critical psychology.

Consideration to power structures:  The second issue is the attitude of interacting with people as human being, which may also relate to principles of community psychology: the "citizenship" that one practices as a member of a community living together and the "democracy" that one practices in trying to remove power gaps and barriers as far as possible and to form consensus through negotiation under the guaranty of sufficient scrutiny of information and free expression of opinions. This, however, would meet with a good deal of resistance in Japanese clinical psychology where professional practices are often based on medical models or personal growth models. Moreover, the psycho-dynamics of applicants,

which may underlie the clinical psychology boom, might let them ignore the orientation toward equal relationships. The unconscious motivation for compensating their woundedness and inferiority by being saviours of inferiors may have more than a limited impact.

Supervised practice as professional field training: Clinical internship system for doctor qualification in Japan has abolished and "newly qualified doctor in training" system without strict obligation has established in 1968 following protestation with force by the University Dispute against harsh working and training condition, though the harsh condition continued. Anyway they consistently have field training systems, and in 2004 new "newly qualified doctor in training" system with obligation has started. As the current psychologist training system in Japan lacks in it, the institutionalization of intensive supervised professional field training is expected.

Promoting a balanced scientific attitude: Psychologists trained in the U.K. and the U.S. seem to presuppose the cultivation of positivist "mainstream" psychology, where the development of claims based on rational accounts and evidence is an important framework in dialogues. As the result, the cognitive-behavioural approach, amenable to this epistemological framework, has extended its influence. Often people say Japan is following the U.S. 25 years late. The prosperity of the cognitive behaviour approach in Japan may yet occur in the future. However, the present conditions in Japanese clinical psychology are quite different, including the inferiority of the scientism that was mentioned above.

It is often pointed out that there were medico-economical pressures behind the scene. Simplified and excessive evidence-based claims are as irrational and dangerous as anti-scientism. In so far as practices are carried out as one of a diversity of socio-economic activities, it is unavoidable that accountability is required in the improvement of the social status of professionals. For their practices and systems to be developed soundly, promoting proper scientific literacy acknowledging its limits is important, which may enable proper communication with scientific psychologists, and understanding that it is fundamentally different from degenerating into scientism.

The reflection on a dynamic politico-economic processes and hidden socio-cultural structures should play a role in appropriately guiding practical activities for people. The author hopes that critical psychology can offer discourses that contribute to their sound development. To that end, the strategic approach of thoroughly considering the individual situation of each area and time may be required.

#### Japanese psychology as a theoretical psychologist views it *(Yasuhiro Igarashi)*

Just as the other contributors described above their experiences in a context where positivistic psychology, which demands us to be scientists and be detached from any social issues, dominates the discipline, I started major psychology as an undergraduate student in a university in Tokyo where mainstream scientific (or rather scientistic) psychology took over its department of psychology in late 1980's. Psychology has been indoctrinated to learners as "a science of mental process and behaviour" in introductory classes and textbooks. Psychotherapies and psychoanalysis were treated as some unrighteous versions of psychology. Those who had popular interests in psychological tests to understand both themselves and others, and wanted to know about diseases of the mind, were deemed as naive and shady. Experimental psychology, exemplified by cognitive psychology as its legitimate model, dominated academic psychology in Japan at that time.

I myself believed that what was called the science of the mind would bring me universal truth on the mind, just as physics and physiology do in each of their fields. I chose learned helplessness as my graduation thesis, which was a hot topic in the psychology of leaning, to bring about new ways to understand human depression by developing an animal model. I continued to do research in that field doing animal experiments in graduate school. But I started to feel that something intrinsic to the positivistic psychology had been hindering our understanding of the mind because of its emphasis on objectivism and persistence to quantitative research methods. And I could not overlook the fact that unreasonable behaviour by so-called scientific psychologists, who were motivated by their vanity, academic cliques and other extra-scientific personal interests, interfered with research activities, especially when younger generations of psychologists tried to introduce new approaches and to change the existing framework of the discipline. Some of the academic psychologists around me were not attractive as role models of being a researcher and a lecturer.

I felt something was seriously wrong with psychology, but I could not understand clearly what they were before I encountered theoretical psychology in the mid 1990's. I understand theoretical psychology as a meta-discipline of psychology. It means meta-study of psychology, that is, history of psychology, philosophy of psychology, sociology of psychology, and other researches that takes psychology and psychologist as its objects of research and investigation of new way of "doing psychology and being psychologists". Encounters with researchers at conferences held by the International Society for Theoretical Psychology brought me stimulation and new perspectives with which to reconsider psychology and psychologists.

I started to present on theoretical psychology at psychology conferences in Japan. I thought it is crucially important to come together with psychologists who have interests in meta-disciplinary issues of psychology and to show what theoretical psychology may teach us. So I translated into Japanese with my colleagues *Methods of Theoretical Psychology* (Kukla, 2001) in 2005; *Naming the mind: How psychology found its language* (Danziger, 1997) in 2005; *Qualitative Methods in Psychology: A research guide* (Banister et al., 1994) in 2008; and *Deconstructing developmental psychology* (Burman, 2008) in 2012, to stimulate the re-examination of the discipline from critical perspectives. We edited a special issue on critical psychology *Japanese Journal of Psychological Science* (Igarashi, 2011) which aimed to introduce this perspective to the Japanese reader. The second special issue on critical psychology will be published in the same journal in 2014. I will continue to work on the meta-discipline of psychology and to think on what psychology can bring about.

### Discussion: Reflexivity and psychologisation *(Yasuhiro Igarashi)*

Feminist psychology, the psychology of ethnic minorities, discourse analysis, meta-critical investigations of the training system of Certified Clinical Psychologists, and theoretical psychology; these developments, discussed above, are all in a small minority in Japanese psychology. Japanese academic psychology, which has been developing under the strong influence of North American psychology in the post-war period, defines itself as a scientific discipline and has no regard for extra-disciplinary factors that affect what psychologists do in research activities, in clinical settings, in lecture rooms and in other settings where they work. Thus, contributors to this paper have been working in an unfriendly, sometimes hostile atmosphere with the conviction that their practices as a researcher, a clinician, a lecturer, and a citizen can make changes in psychology in the country. I hope contributors to this paper the

small number of other psychologists who work in areas such as peace psychology and LGBT psychology, and who do research following the work of Klaus Holzkamp (1927-1995), the founder of German Critical Psychology, will continue to pursue their goals without being daunted by the difficulties under the hegemony of the mainstream scientist psychology.

I think there are two key words that are important for Japanese critical psychologists to make changes in the discipline and in the society. They are reflexivity and psychologisation.

Reflexivity is important for us to do psychology critically (Parker, 2005). To understand and to theorize how we affect research processes and other processes in which we work as psychologists, and how psychological products like personality theories, psychological tests and psychotherapies, among others, are related to the social world and the real lives of people, are crucial for criticizing psychology's status quo. But we don't have enough reflexivity, to my thought. Even self-acknowledged feminist psychologists in Japan dare not to remark on issues concerning social inequality. For example, the feminisation of poverty and child poverty has become one of the most serious problems in the society in the last decade. Surely, facing up to the reality of widening economic and social disparities that make women's and other disadvantaged people's lives hell in our living communities, is an important task of psychologists who engage in feminist practice. To point to inequality between genders in the psychological world and to claim equal rights for female psychologists is important, but it is not enough. Still today, Japanese feminist psychologists tend not to accept qualitative methods as legitimate research methods. It seems to me that to listen to what people in hardship say and to advocate for them, is an efficient way to work as a feminist psychologist, and it is relatively easy to do. However, most Japanese feminist psychologists or gender psychologists still prefer doing research with large-scale questionnaires and sometime marginalise those who use ethnography and other qualitative method. I think it is because they were trained and socialized in the culture of positivistic psychology as the mainstream psychologists exemplify it. We need more reflexivity.

One of the reasons I stress the significance of psychologization is that our lives and our society have been under the process of massive psychologization since the 1990's. As Tanabe wrote above, the presence of Certified Clinical Psychologists in schools and in clinics has become common in our daily life. Psychological products such as discourses concerning self-actualization, stress theories and questionnaires have been created against the backdrop of the need in certain social sectors to know and to control the conduct and the inner properties of people. What we do as psychologists tends to be predetermined more or less by such extra-disciplinary factors and have an effect on people in extra-disciplinary sectors, whether we wish or not. So to understand the process of psychologization and the significance of reflexivity are closely interrelated.

Today, more and more people want some psychological knowledge to know themselves and their significant others in this already psychologized society. Discourses on mental health and on personality will become much more popular in our private as well as social lives. Critical psychology has a lot of work to do. What critical psychologists around the world have achieved by tackling the problems they have faced in their own local contexts, will offer us invaluable lessons in Japan. We need to learn from their experiences.

**Notes** (to the section Unexplored territories: Minority issues[1] in Japan, by Tin Tin Htun)

1. Minorities in this paper mean subordinate segments of Japanese societies, especially in

    terms of ethnicity and descent.

2. People who are living in Buraku (hamlets) are stigmatized as the descendants of former outcasts. However, not all the people living in present-day Buraku communities have such descent.

3. The Ainu are the indigenous people of Northern Japan. Japanese territorial expansion resulted in the loss of Ainu's land (Hokkaido) and the total subjugation of the Ainu in 1789. Zainichi Koreans are Korean residents in Japan whose presence can be traced to Japan's colonization of Korea and the consequences of World War II.

4. Research on racism and discrimination against Zainichi Koreans and prejudice against sexual minorities in Japan was presented at the 51st Annual Meeting of the Japanese Society of Social Psychology in 2010. Apart from these two studies, I haven't been able to identify other psychological research that focuses on Ainu or Buraku.

5. Here ideology is defined as the worldview and social beliefs of a community, developed to justify and promote their economic and sociopolitical interest (Prilleltensky, 1989).

6. The term 'subjective representations of social reality' is borrowed from Tajfel (2010).

## References

Aono, A. (1990). Harlow's studies in psychology textbooks. *The Annual bulletin of the Faculty of the Humanities, Matsuyama Shinonome College, 21*, 75-84. (In Japanese.)

Aono, A. (1993). Mother-child relationships in psychology textbooks. *Japanese Psychological Review, 36*, 288-315. (In Japanese).

Aono, A. (2003). The effects of gender and status on interpersonal distance: From the viewpoint of oppression hypothesis. *Japanese Journal of Social Psychology, 19*, 51-58. (In Japanese.)

Aono, A. (2006). Women's status in the psychological world. In A. Aono & Y. Takako (Eds.), *Towards a feminist psychology* (pp. 121-129). Kyoto: Kamogawa-Shuppan. (In Japanese.)

Austin, S., & Prilleltensky, I. (2001). Diverse origins, common aims: The challenge of critical psychology. *Radical Psychology, 2*(2). Retrieved from http://www.radicalpsychology.org/vol2-2/austin-prilleltensky.html

Baars, B. J. (1986). *The cognitive revolution in psychology.* New York: Guilford Press.

Banister, P., Burman, E., Parker, I., Taylor, M., & Tindall, C. (1994). *Qualitative methods in psychology: A research guide*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Bem, S. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Counseling and Clinical Psychology, 42*, 155-162.

Bowlby, J. (1988). *A secure base: Parent-child attachment and healthy human developmental*. New York: Basic Books.

Broverman, I. K., Vogel, S. R., Broverman, D. M., Clarkson, F. E., & Rosenkrantz, P. S. (1972). Sex-role stereotypes: A current appraisal. *Journal of Social Issues, 28*, 59-78.

Burgess, C. (2008). Celebrating 'multicultural Japan': Writings on 'minorities' and the discourse on 'difference'. *Electronic Journal of Contemporary Japanese Studies*, December 10.

Burgess, C. (2010). The 'illusion' of homogeneous Japan and national character: Discourse as a tool to transcend the 'myth' vs. 'reality' binary. *Japan Focus*, March 1.

Burman, E. (2008). *Deconstructing developmental psychology* (2nd ed.) London and New York: Routledge.

Burr, V. (1995). *An introduction to social constructionism*. London: Routledge.

Camic, P. M., Rhodes, J. E., & Yardly, L. (Eds.). (2003). *Qualitative research in psychology*. Washington: American Psychological Association.

Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD). (2001). Concluding observations of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination: Japan. Fifty-eighth session, International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, United Nations, United Nations. Retrieved from: http://www.unhchr.ch/tbs/doc.nsf/(Symbol)/CERD.C.304.Add.114.En?Opendocument

Danziger, K. (1997). *Naming the mind: How psychology found its language.* London: Sage.

Diene, D. (2006). Racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and all forms of discrimination. *Report of the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance*. Addendum Mission to Japan, Commission on Human Rights, United Nations Economic and Social Council. Retrieved from: http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/G06/103/96/PDF/G0610396.pdf?OpenElement.

Friedan, B. (1963). *The feminine mystique*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Frieze, I. H., & Ramsey, S. J. (1976). Nonverbal maintenance of traditional sex roles. *Journal of Social Issues, 32,* 133-141.

Gergen, K. J. (1991). Emerging challenges for theory and psychology. *Theory & psychology,1*, 13-35.

Hamada, S. (1986). *Children testifying*. Tokyo: Nihonhyouronsha. (In Japanese.)

Hamada, S. (1988). *False confession in the Sayama case*. Tokyo: Nihonhyouronsha. (In Japanese.)

Henley, N.M. (1977). *Body politics: Power, sex, and nonverbal communicatio*n. Englewood Cliffs, JJ: Prentice-Hall.

Human Rights Committee. (2008). Concluding observations of Human Rights Committee: Japan. Ninety-fourth Session, International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, United Nations, Geneva. Retrieved from: http://www.ohchr.org/EN/countries/AsiaRegion/Pages/JPIndex.aspx.

Igarashi, Y. (2006). Role of critical psychology in Japan: Protest against positivistic psychology and search for new knowledge of the mind. *Annual Review of Critical Psychology, 5*, 156-166. Available at: www.discourseunit.com/arcp/5

Igarashi, Y. (2011). What is critica1 psychology?: The critical psychology movement around the world and its possibilities in Japan. *The Japanese Journal of Psychological Science, 33*(2), 1-14. (In Japanese.)

Ishikida, M. Y. (2005). *Living together: Minority people and disadvantaged groups in Japan*. New York: I Universe, Inc.

Kashiwagi, K. (1967). An investigation concerning of sex role in the cognitive development of adolescence. *Japanese Journal of Educational Psychology, 15,* 193-202. (In Japanese.)

Kukla, K. (2001). *Methods of theoretical psychology.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Lim, Y. (2009). Reinventing Korean roots and Zainich routes: The invisible diaspora among naturalized Japanese of Korean descent**.** In S. Ryang & J. Lie (Eds.)**,** *Diaspora without homeland: Being Korean in Japan* (pp. 81–106)*.* Berkley, CA: University of California Press.

Parker, I. (2005). *Qualitative psychology: Introducing radical research.* Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Prilleltensky, I. (1989). Psychology and the status quo. *American Psychologist*, *44*(5), 795-802.

Slife, B. D. (2000). The practice of theoretical psychology. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology, 20*(2), 97-115.

Stam, H. J. (2000). Theoretical psychology. In K. Pawlik & M.R. Rosenzweig (Eds.), *International handbook of psychology*. London: Sage.

Suenaga, T. (1971). Introduction. In B. Yagi & T. Suenaga (Eds.), *History and contemporary*

*trends of psychology (Psychology lecture series 1)*. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press. (In Japanese.)

Suzuki, S. (2007). *Conversation analysis and discourse analysis*. Tokyo: Shin-yo-sha. (In Japanese.)

Tajfel, H. (2010). The social psychology of minorities. In T. Postmes & N. R. Branscombe (Eds.), *Rediscovering social identity* (pp. 143-172). New York: Psychological Press.

Takano, M. (1993). Does the third period report accurately reflect the human rights condition in Japan?. In *Human Rights in Japan from the Perspective of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights: Counter-Report to the Third Japanese Government Report* (pp. 1-6). Buraku Liberation Research Institute, Osaka: Liberation Publishing House.

Teshima, T. (1993). From the assimilation policy to the guarantee of the rights of the Ainu as indigenous people. In *Human Rights in Japan from the Perspective of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights: Counter-Report to the Third Japanese Government Report* (pp. 29-36). Buraku Liberation Research Institute, Osaka: Liberation Publishing House.

Tin Tin Htun (in press). Social identities of minority others in Japan: Listening to the narratives of Ainu, Buraku, and Zainichi Koreans. *Japan Forum*.

Tomonaga, K. (1993). From partial solution to radical solution of the buraku issue. In *Human Rights in Japan from the Perspective of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights: Counter-Report to the Third Japanese Government Report* (pp. 7-19). Buraku Liberation Research Institute, Osaka: Liberation Publishing House.

Unger, R. (Ed.). (2000). *The handbook of psychology of women and gender*. New York: Wiley.

Wetherall, W. (2008). The racialization of Japan. In D.B. Willis & S. Murphy-Shigematsu (Eds.), *Transcultural Japan at the borderlands of race, gender and identity* (pp. 264-281). London:Routledge

Wetherall, W. (2007). Race in Japan's two constitutions. Retrieved from: http://members.jcom.home.ne.jp/yosha/yr/race/Race_constitution_Japan.html

Willig, C. (2001). *Introducing qualitative research in psychology: Adventures in theory and method*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Wooffitt, R. (2005). *Conversation analysis and discourse analysis: A comparative and critical introduction*. London: Sage.

Yamada, T., & Yoshii, H. (Eds.). *Ethnomethodology on exclusion and discrimination*. Tokyo: Shin-yo-sha. (In Japanese).

**Contact details:**
**Yasuhiro Igarashi**
Yamano College of Aesthetics
E-mail: veh03661@nifty.com

**Atsuko Aono**
Fukuyama University
E-mail: aaono@fuhc.fukuyama-u.ac.jp

**Tin Tin Htun**
Temple University, Japan Campus
E-mail: tintinhtun@gmail.com

**Satoshi Suzuki**
Tokyo University of Agriculture
E-mail: suzukis@nodai.ac.jp

**Hajime Tanabe**
Shizuoka University
E-mail: jhtanab@ipc.shizuoka.ac.jp