



# CONTINUITIES AND CHANGES IN PARENT-CHILD RELATIONSHIPS AND KINSHIP IN POSTWAR JAPAN:

## Examining Bilateral Hypotheses by Analyzing the National Family Survey (NFRJ-S01)

SHI Liping

### ■ Abstract

This study aimed at examining two hypotheses that have predicted the changes in parent-child relationships and kinship in postwar Japan and at clarifying the structure of parent-child relationships and trends of changes by comparing parent-child relationships of different birth cohorts. The hypotheses, both based on the dissolution of the stem family system and the fact that parents therefore have become less likely to live with their first-born son, were: (1) support from parents is equally shared among children, and (2) support between married daughters and their parents has become more active. The data used is NFRJ-S01 (National Family Research of Japan, 2001 Special). The major findings were that: (a) First-born sons tended to live with their parents even though co-residence with the husband's parents has declined, and (b) Existing support from the wife's parents has become more active after the 1950 birth cohort. These results indicate a possibility that the stem family system and kinship (*shinrui*) co-exist even today, offering evidence against Hypothesis 1 and call for a modification of Hypothesis 2.

### ■ KEY WORDS

parent-child relationships and kinship, dual-structure theory, stem family system

## I . Introduction

In the half-century following the end of World War II, the social environment surrounding the Japanese family has changed greatly. In particular, environmental changes including the interrelationship between the legal system, industrial structure and demographic factors have had a major impact on the structure and function of the family. Further, it has been said that since the 1960s, the Japanese family system has

dramatically converted from a stem family system to a conjugal family system, and that major change has been realized in the relationships between parent and child and kinship (Morioka [1983] 2000, Ochiai [1994] 2004).

However, the course of action of these changes within parent-child and kinship relations is not entirely clear. In regard to the questions of just what the fundamental structure of parent-child

---

and kinship relations was, under the stem family system, and precisely how that structure was maintained or changed after the war, there has been, until the present, no common agreement.

Regarding changes in postwar parent-child and kinship relations, from a theoretical view that differs from what has previously been used, two hypotheses have been posited in relations to bilateral characteristics. One hypothesis contends that the close relationship with and support from the daughter or the parents of wife appeared with the dissolution of the stem family system (Morioka [1983] 2000, 1993; Mitani 1991). A second hypothesis holds that relationships with and support from the daughter or the parents of wife were conducted under the stem family system but that these relationships were considered to have been actualized with the dissolution of the stem family system and the relaxation of bonding of joint group of *ie (dozoku)* (Kitano 1951, Mitsuyoshi 1966). These two hypotheses diverge in their judgments as to whether or not relationships and support on behalf of the daughter or the parents of wife existed under the stem family system, and investigation by empirical

research is called for.

Moreover, both of these bilateral hypotheses presuppose a symmetrical parent-child and kinship relations resulting from the dissolution of the stem family system. However, empirical research since 1990 has reported an asymmetrical parent-child relationship in which there is co-residence with the first-born son (Tabuchi and Nakazato 2004, Shi 2006) and support and close parent-child relations with the daughter or the parents of wife (Nishioka 1997, Shirahase 2005). There is an inconsistency between the bilateral hypotheses which presuppose symmetricalness in parent-child and kinship relations and the reports from empirical research showing asymmetry in the parent-child relationship. Investigation of the validity of these hypotheses is called for.

Therefore, in this article, utilizing the date of a nationwide survey, by comparing parent-child relations among birth cohorts, I will investigate the two hypotheses in regard to bilateralness and the fundamental structure of the postwar parent-child and kinship relations and the trends of the changes that have occurred.

## II. The debate concerning bilateral parent-child and kinship relations and the view of empirical research

In regard to the changes of parent-child and kinship relations since World War II, two hypotheses of bilateralness have been put forth from two different theoretical points of view.

Ochiai ([1994] 2004) explains the changes in family and kinship from the view of demographic factors, conjecturing that the decrease in the number of siblings in the low-birth rate and low-death rate generation born following 1950 brought on the dissolution of the stem family system and the bilateral nature of parent-child relationships.

Living together with the first-born son, matters of succession and inheritance as well as social relations centered mainly around the first-born son, but once the low-birth rate and low-death rate generation reached adulthood in the 1970s, the consideration of succession as something special began to face. Ochiai contends that due to circumstances related to jobs and issues of housing, even the first-born son began to cease residing with his parents, the succession and inheritance and social relationships that had once

centered on the first-born son began to expand to include children other than the first-born son, and that the disparity between the first-born son and the other children, as well as those between the sons and daughters, began to disappear.

This argument resembles the assertion by Morioka ([1983] 2000) regarding the change of the kinship relationship from the paternal line to bilateral line. Morioka asserts that around 1960 Japanese family and kinship relationships converted from a family system that was a stem family to a conjugal family system, and as a result there was a change from a patrilineal kinship system which gave priority to the first-born son to a bilateral kinship system. Within the kinship relationship of the stem family system, the succeeding child was limited to male children and male children received priority, so kinship relationships tended to be composed with bias toward the husband's side of the family, but in kinship under the conjugal family system, a bilateral expansion can be seen which is not biased toward either the husband's or the wife's side.

However, from an angle that differs from this argument of "from paternal line to bilateral line," another bilateral hypothesis was posited considerably earlier. Already in traditional Japanese village society in the 1940s, among kinship organizations while joint group of *ie* (*dozoku*) stressed the paternal line<sup>1</sup>, there were also bilateral relationships based on blood and marriage. These allotted formal functions (relationships between household (*ie*) and household) and informal functions (individual contact and mutual support) which coexisted while reciprocally complementing one another (Kitano 1940, Masaoka 1968, Yonemura 1974, Fujimi 1975).

In this research, the dual structure of the kinship organization comprised of joint group of *ie* (*dozoku*) and relatives (*shinrui*) was taken

as originating in the structural characteristic of the household (*ie*), the stem family.<sup>2</sup> In other words, within the household there was a patriarchal dimension (a "patrilineal united body") and a conjugal family-type dimension composed of husband, wife and children (a "conjugal family united body"). As a result of the former, a patrilineal, unilateral joint group of *ie* (*dozoku*) came into being, while as a result of the latter, it could be taken as consisting of a bilateral kinship relationship (Kitano 1965, Mitsuyoshi 1966). Consequently, during a period such as prior to World War II, when the stem family system is in effect, the joint group of *ie* (*dozoku*) is strengthened, and bilateral kinship relationships are dormant. However, when the stem family system weakens and the joint group of *ie* (*dozoku*) breaks up, the cooperative functions possessed by the kinship relationships (individual contact and mutual support), that is, a bilateral tendency, are actualized (Kitano 1951, Mitsuyoshi 1966). This change is taken as an irreversible process, so together with the dissolution of the stem family system, the patriarchal tendency in intergenerational relations dies away, and a bilateral kinship relationship become widespread.

In this way, the dual-structure theory takes the view that a bilateral kinship relationship originally existed within traditional society, and in that respect it differs from the bilateral hypothesis of Morioka and Ochiai which contends that there was a change "from patriarchal to bilateral." However, both assume the dissolution of the stem family system and suppose that the intergenerational relationship thereafter changes from one that is asymmetrical to one that is symmetrical, so the difference is not a major one.

In other words, according to the argument of Morioka and Ochiai, formerly parents lived with the first-born son and priority was given to the carrying out of inheritance, succession,

---

social relations and support. But since the 1960s and 1970s, at the same time that the stem family system was breaking up and the pattern of living with the first-born son was disappearing, in terms of socializing and support between the parent and child, the gap between the first-born son and the other siblings and that between sons and daughters began to disappear. In other words, the parent-child and kinship relationships were conjectured to be bilateral, both in terms of relations with the husband's family and the wife's family and in terms of relations between the siblings. (In the present article, this is referred to as "Hypothesis 1.")

In contrast with this, in the dual-structure theory of kinship organization, parents lived with their first-born son as well as carrying on social relationships with and support of their married daughters and the relatives of wives. But with the dissolution of the stem family system, together with the disappearance of the pattern of giving priority to the first-born son in co-residence and inheritance, the socializing with and support of kinship relatives of daughters and wives came to be carried out more actively. In other words, patriarchal tendencies disappeared and bilateral relations were actualized, and it was conjectured that parent-child relationships were more bilateral in terms of relations with the husband's family and the wife's family and in terms of relationships between siblings. (In the present article, this is referred to as "Hypothesis 2.")

However, following that (after 1990), the results of empirical research indicate a parent-child relationship that differs from these two hypotheses. In regard to relations with daughters, there is a large amount of socializing with and support of daughters and parents of wives

(Nishioka 1997, Okubo 2004, Shirahase 2005), and that has come to be seen as resulting from the dissolution of the stem family system (Mitani 1991, Okubo 2004). On the other hand, the "first-born son model" is strong, and the rate of co-residence with the first-born son is high (Tabuchi and Nakazato 2004, Shi 2006). Furthermore, there is a large portion of common residence begins midway through the marriage. That is the reason why some scholars argue that the Japanese family system is "a modified stem family" system (Nasu 1972), and some argue that the stem family norms still remain (Shirahase 2005), and further that they remain intact (Kato 2003b, 2006).

To summarize research to date: (1) There is a disparity in theoretical viewpoint between the two bilateral hypotheses and it remains undetermined whether under the stem family system social interaction and support existed vis-à-vis the kinfolk of the daughters or wives. (2) A discrepancy can be seen in the views conjectured of the symmetry of parent-child and kinship relationships and the asymmetrical parent-child relationships reported by empirical research, and this can be raised as problematic. A reappraisal of the validity of both hypotheses and an examination of the consistency between the hypotheses and empirical evidence is called for.

Accordingly, by employing national survey data and comparing parent-child and kinship relationships at the same life stage among different birth cohorts, this article will investigate the two bilateral hypotheses regarding the changes in parent-child and kinship relationships since World War II, which we have seen thus far, and will clarify the fundamental structure and trends in the changes of parent-child and kinship relationships.

### III. Analysis of positive evidence by means of data from the National Family Research Survey

#### 1. Data summary and applied variables

##### (1) Data outline

This article employs data from the National Family Research of Japan “*Sengo Nihon no kazoku no ayumi*” (“Trails of Families in Post-war Japan,” NFRJ-S01) organized primarily by the NFRJ Committee of the Japan Society of Family Research. In performing analysis, individual sample data were provided by the SSJ Data Archive affiliated with the Center for Social Research, University of Tokyo.

This survey was carried out between January and March 2002, using the leave and pick-up method, taking a sample of 5,000 women between the ages of 32 and 81 as of December 31, 2001 (born between January 1, 1920, and December 31, 1969) chosen by the two-stage stratified sampling method. Collected surveys totaled 3,475, an effective collection rate 69.5% (Kato 2003a). This article excludes unmarried women and takes as its analytical sample 3,351 married women.

##### (2) Employed variables

As dependent variables, four variables of two types were employed: whether subjects were or were not living with either the husband’s or wife’s parents (during child raising), and whether or not they received support in child raising from the parents of either the husband or wife.

Concerning the matter of residing or not residing with the husband’s or wife’s parents, the circumstances were grasped at the time when the oldest child of the subject was one year old. The head instruction read as follows: “Select from the following any items that applied to the persons

living together with you, including yourself and your child, at the time when your first child was one year old.” Those who indicated they lived with either “husband’s father” or “husband’s mother” were taken as living with “husband’s parents,” and those indicating they lived with their “own father” or “own mother” were taken as living with “wife’s parents.”

Concerning the matter of whether or not the subject did or did not receive support with childcare, the survey inquired about the circumstances when the oldest child was less than three years old. “When your first child was small (less than three years of age), which of the people below on a routine basis took care of or looked after your child? Check all persons to whom this applies.” Following those instructions, those who marked “husband’s father and mother” were taken as having “received childcare support from husband’s parents,” and those who marked “own father and mother” were taken as having “received childcare support from wife’s parents.”

The independent variables used were age of wife at marriage, wife’s birth cohort, number of husband’s and wife’s siblings, composition of husband’s and wife’s siblings, wife’s original social strata (father’s occupation when she was 15 years old), husband’s occupation (at time of marriage), wife’s occupation (when the oldest child was one year old), husband’s and wife’s educational background, region of residence<sup>3</sup> (when the oldest child was one year old), scale of city (when the oldest child was one year old), and couple’s family name (following marriage).

In this article, in order to determine generational changes in parent-child relationships, focus is placed on differences among birth cohorts,

---

and where there is a difference among cohorts, this is taken as a change in parent-child relationships. Because the cohort considered in this is only the “birth cohort,” henceforth references to it will be abbreviated to “cohort.”

Further, in order to classify the symmetry (or asymmetry) among siblings, based on whether or not the husband’s position in his family was or was not that of first-born son and whether or not the wife had male siblings, four types of sibling compositions were reconstituted: husband as first-born son and wife with male siblings, husband as first-born son and wife without male siblings, husband as second or third son and wife with male siblings, and husband as second or third son and wife without male siblings.

The married couple’s family name was employed as a variable indicating succession. In regard to the married couple’s family name, only 0.9% responded that “each kept their own family names” or “other,” so these two items were excluded from analysis.

In addition, in the analysis of childcare support, to broadly stipulate the degree of childcare support from both sets of parents the relation between the residences of the couple and both party’s parents was added as a variable by asking whether at the time the oldest child was one year old the couple “co-residing with husband’s parents” or “co-residing with wife’s parents”, or “husband’s parents nearby” or “wife’s parents nearby”, or “parents living distant.”<sup>4</sup>

## **2. Demographic change: Actual state of reduction of numbers of siblings**

Table 2 shows, by birth cohort, the number of the wife’s siblings who reached adulthood, the composition of the couple’s siblings and the parent-child relationship. The mode of the number of the wife’s adult siblings for the 1920-29 cohort

and 1930-39 cohort was “6 or more,” but this changed to “4-5” and then for the 1950-59 cohort the figure reached “2-3.” The average number of siblings for wives in the 1920-29 cohort and 1930-39 cohort was 5.2, decreasing to 3.2 in the 1950-59 cohort and further to 2.7 in the 1960-69 cohort.

Accompanying the decline in the numbers of siblings, the percentage of those without adult male siblings through the 1940-49 cohort was approximately 10%, thereafter changing to about 30%. Couples in which “husband as first-born son and wife without male siblings” and “husband as second or third sons and wife without male siblings” increased from the 1950-59 cohort forward.

## **3. Descriptive analysis of co-residence and childcare support from parents**

Next we examine by birth cohort of the wife the rates of co-residence with the parents of both parties and the percentage of childcare support from parents. As can be seen in Table 2, the percentages of co-residence with the husband’s parents grows lower the younger the cohort. The percentage of co-residence with the wife’s parents also declined, but there was not as large a difference among cohorts as there was for that living with the husband’s parents. The childcare support from the husband’s parents remains fairly stable over the cohorts from 33.1% to 38.2%, but that from the wife’s parents rises from 22.9% for the 1920-29 cohort to 40.7% for the 1950-59 cohort to 50.6% for the 1960-69 cohort.

When one compares the husband’s and wife’s sides in terms of parent-child relationships, the rate of co-residence with husband’s parents is consistently higher. On the other hand, childcare support rates until the 1940-49 cohort were high for the husband’s parents but from the 1950-59 cohort, the childcare rates for the wife’s parents

became higher.

From Table 2 we can verify that with the 1950-59 cohort as a demarcation line, the number of the wife's adult siblings and the composition of the couple's siblings changes greatly, and there is a trend toward activation of childcare by the wife's parents. However, is there a trend toward symmetry among siblings, in parent-child and kinship relations as conjectured in Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 2? In the following, this article will divide the subjects into the older 1920-49 cohort and younger 1950-69 cohort and look at how parent-child relationships changed as a result of the composition of the couple's siblings.

Table 3 shows the rates of co-residence with parents and childcare support from parents according to wife's birth cohort and according to the composition of the couple's siblings. In the older cohort, the rates of co-residence with the husband's parents and the wife's parents are high. (Only among the "husband as second or third son and wife without male siblings" couples does the rate of co-residence with the husband's parents rise from 7.1% in the older cohort to 9.9% in the younger cohort.) However, in all of the cohorts, couples in which the husband is the first-born son in high in rate of co-residence with the husband's parents, and couple in which the "husband as second or third son and wife without male siblings" show high rates of co-residence with the wife's parents.<sup>5</sup> In comparing the husband's side with the wife's side, with the exception of couples in which the "husband as second or third son and the wife without male siblings," the rates of co-residence with the husband's parents are consistently high.

The childcare support rates from the husband's parents are lower the younger the cohort among first-born son couples, but among couples in which the husband is the second or third son, the rates are higher by contrast. On the one hand, childcare

support rates from the wife's parents among the younger cohorts are high. However, among all cohorts, first-born son couples have high support rates from the husband's family, and couples in which the "husband as the second or third son and the wife without male siblings" have high support rates from the wife's parents.<sup>6</sup> Further, when one compares childcare support provided by the husband's family with that of the wife's family, the first-born son couple in the older cohort receives a large amount of childcare support from the husband's family, but in the younger cohort, the first-born son couple receives almost the same amount of support from both sides of the family. On the other hand, in both older and younger cohorts, couples in which the husband is the second or third son receive a large amount of childcare support from the wife's family.

Because it can be assumed that childcare support from parents is greatly affected by living with parents, only those couples living separate from their parents were considered in the calculation of childcare support rates (See Table 3, C). In the younger cohorts, a large percentage received support from parents on one side or the other. Whereas across all cohorts couples of first-born sons tended to receive preferential treatment, in the older cohort, parents of the wife provided equal amounts of support to their daughters except those couples in which the "husband as the first-born son and the wife with male siblings." In the younger cohorts, the wife's parents provided preferential support to couples in which the "husband as the second or third son and the wife without male siblings."<sup>7</sup> Further, in the comparison of husband and wife's parents (excluding the older cohort of first-born son couples who received virtually the same amount of support from parents on both sides), the second and third-son couples in the older cohort and the first-born son couples and the second or third-son

---

couples of the younger cohort tended to receive a large amount of support from the wife's parents.

For reasons of space, a table will be omitted here, but let me introduce the chi-square test significant factors ( $p < .05$ ) from the cross-totaled results of rates of residence with parents, rates of childcare support from parents and factors shown in Table 1.

Those couples in which the husband has a small number of siblings show high rates in both co-residence with the husband's parents and childcare support from the husband's parents. The same trend can be found for couples living with the wife's parents. Further, among couples in which the husband is self-employed, the husband and wife have low levels of schooling, residents of eastern Japan and residents of rural districts, rates of co-residence with the husband's parents and rates of childcare support from the husband's parents are high. On the other hand, among couples in which the husband has a low level of schooling and those who live in rural areas, the percentage living with the wife's family is high. Further, childcare support by the wife's parents is high among couples in which the husband is not self-employed, in which the wife has a full-time occupation with a firm or organization, and in which both husband and wife have advanced academic backgrounds.

#### **4. Multivariable analysis of the changes in parent-child relationships between cohorts**

From the descriptive analysis above, percentages of co-residence with husband's (or wife's) parents are lower the younger the cohort is, while by contrast the rates of childcare support from the wife's family are higher. However, we have seen that first-born son couples show a consistently high rate of co-residence with the husband's

parents (while second or third-son husbands whose wives have no male siblings reside with the wife's parent), and even in terms of childcare support, first-born son couples receive preferential treatment from the husband's parents, while couples in which second or third son husbands whose wives have no male siblings receive preferential treatment in childcare from the wife's parents.

In order to investigate whether it is possible to verify a disparity in parent-child relationships as a result of birth cohort and the composition of the couple's siblings, even setting aside the impact of social and economic factors and region of residence, I carried out logistic regression analysis. Model 1 carried out analysis of all subjects, Model 2 covered the older cohorts born between 1920 and 1949, and Model 3 covered the younger cohorts born between 1950 and 1969.

Table 4a indicates the results of logistic regression analysis concerning the existence or nonexistence of co-residence with parents. The variables showing statistical significance regarding co-residence with parents are the composition of the couple's siblings, the scale of the city, and the couple's family name. In both the older and younger cohort, the first-born son couple had a higher percentage of co-residence with the husband's parents than did couples in which the husband was a second or third son. (The odds rate was five times or higher.) On the other hand, couples in which the husband was a second or third son and the wife had no male siblings showed a higher rate of living with the wife's parents than did other couples. Residents of rural areas (agricultural, mountain and fishing villages) showed higher rates of co-residence with the husband's parents and with the wife's parents than couples living in other places. Those using the wife's family name had higher rates of co-residence with the wife's parents than those who did not.

In addition, the older cohorts and those with small numbers of husband's siblings were higher than their counterparts in the rates of co-residence with the husband's parents. Further, in the older cohort, those in which the husband was self-employed showed higher rate of co-residence with the husband's parents in comparison with those who were not self-employed, while those living with the wife's parents (compared with employees of enterprises and organizations) were, in contrast, lower. In the younger cohort, where the wives were full-time employees of companies and organizations, compared with those who were not so employed, had high rates of co-residence with the husband's parents and that of co-residence with the wife's parents.

The results of analysis of childcare support were shown in Table 4b. The relation with the residence of both sets of parents was added as variables. Variables showing a statistically significant impact on childcare support from parents are the composition of the husband and wife's siblings and the relation with residence of both sets of parents.

Support from the husband's parents was

given preferentially to the first-born son couples. In the younger cohort, couples in which the husband was a second or third son and in which the wife had male siblings showed a tendency for receiving lower rates of support than the couples in which the husband was the first-born son. On the other hand, in terms of support from the wife's parents, in the older cohort, couples of all daughters showed similar rates, whereas in the younger cohort, couples in which the husband was a second or third son and the wife had no male siblings received priority. Couples co-residing with the husband's parents had the highest rates of receiving support from the husband's parents, but in contrast had the lowest rates of support from the wife's parents.

Moreover, the post-1950 cohort and those couples in which the wife had few siblings showed higher rates of childcare support from the wife's parents than did other respective groups. In addition, wives from agricultural, forestry, and fishing backgrounds, or temporary, unemployed or unknown backgrounds, in comparison with others also had lower rates of receiving childcare support from the wife's parents.

## IV. Conclusion and Discussion

The following is a summary of the analysis results above.

- (1) Disparity among cohorts. Co-residence with the husband's parents decreased from 45.1% in the 1920-29 cohort to 18.7% in the 1960-69 cohort, while childcare support rates from the wife's parents rose from 22.9% in the 1920-29 cohort to 50.6% in the 1960-69 cohort, co-residence rates with the husband's parents were lower and, in contrast, childcare support rates from the wife's parents were high in the younger cohort.
- (2) Continuation of the pattern of residence

with a particular child. Across all cohorts, there was a discernible pattern in which first-born son couples had high rates of co-residence with the husband's parents, and in which couples in which the husband was a second or third son and the wife had no male siblings there was a high rate of co-residence with the wife's parents.

- (3) Existence and surfacing of childcare support by the wife's parents. In the older cohort, compared to 38.2% childcare support from the husband's parents, there was a 22.9% childcare support rate from the wife's parents, and

---

particularly among couples in which the husband was a second or third son, the wife's parents showed higher childcare support rates than that of the husband's parents. Within the younger cohort, the wife's parents' childcare support rates increased greatly, surpassing the levels of the husband's parents.

(4) Asymmetry of husband's parents and wife's parents. Excluding the couples in which the husband is a second or third son and the wife has no male siblings, in terms of residence, there was a consistent predominance of co-residence with the husband's parents. On the other hand, whereas rates of childcare support were once higher for the husband's parents, within the younger cohort, the rates for the wife's parents have to the contrary become the higher percentage.

(5) Asymmetry among siblings within parent-child relationships. There are consistently high rates for first-born son couples living with the husband's parents and second or third-son husbands with wives who have no male siblings living with the wife's parents. In regard to childcare, priority in support from the husband's parents was given to the first-born son couple, but in the younger cohort, among the couples in which the husband was a second or third son and the wife had male siblings, compared to the first-born son couples, the probability of receiving support remained low. On the other hand, support from the wife's parents, in the older cohort was given equally to all married-daughter couples, but in the younger cohort, was given to couples in which the husbands were second or third sons and the wives had no male siblings.

As stated above, the two bilateral hypotheses presumed, regarding the changes in post-World War II Japanese parent-child relationships and kinship, that with the dissolution of the stem family system the parent-child and kinship relationships would shift from an asymmetrical pattern to a

more symmetrical pattern. However, the analysis results of the present article indicated a prospective view that differs from these hypotheses. Focusing now on the three aspects of symmetry in parent-child relationships, the dissolution of the stem family system and support from the wife's parents, I will advance my argument through a comparison of the hypotheses and the findings of the analysis.

First, in regard to the symmetry of the parent-child and kinship relationships, analysis result (4), asymmetry of husband's parents and wife's parents, and (5), asymmetry among siblings within parent-child relationships, disprove the assertion of Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 2 that there is symmetry in parent-child relations. The results of the analysis indicate that there is a lack of symmetry between the parents of the husband and wife, and among the siblings themselves in the parent-child and kinship relationship of the low-birth rate and low-death rate generation born after 1950.

Second, in regard to the dissolution of the stem family system, Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 2 both assume that system would break up. However, the analysis of the present article has revealed that the pattern of co-residence with a particular child remains extant across all cohorts, and further that among those who have assumed the wife's family name the percentage of those co-residing with the wife's parents is high. Further, inheritance by the co-residing child is frequent (Tsutsumi 2001, Kato 2003b). In other words, parents of families in which there is a first-born son reside with that son, and the first-born son falls heir to the parents. On the other hand, in households with a daughter and no son, the parents live with the daughter and her husband who is a second or third son, and inheritance and succession to the family name<sup>8</sup> is conveyed to this couple. These results suggest that the concepts of continuity and succession of the household (*ie*) continue to exist and one can

contend that the stem family system is maintained.

True enough, one observes a tendency toward a low probability of the younger cohort co-residing with their parents. However, that does not necessarily mean that the stem family system has broken up. The reason is that the decline in the co-residence rate in this article is a phenomenon brought about by a change from co-residence with parents from the time of marriage to co-residence commencing some years after the marriage, and there is a large possibility that the co-residence rates will further increase among the younger cohorts as time passes. The analysis of Kato (2003b, 2006), which employs the same data as this article, makes clear that the younger cohort has a low rate of co-residence at the time of marriage but that at the point of the 15th year following marriage, this cohort reaches virtually the same rate of co-residence as the older cohorts, and that co-residence starting at marriage, true for the older cohort, has shifted to mid-marriage co-residence among the younger cohort. Because the co-residence rates employed by this article are those at the time when the oldest child is one year old, if we assume that on average the first child is born 2.2 years after marriage, one may conclude that the co-residence rates of the younger cohort will climb thereafter.

That is to say, due to the change from the postwar period when co-residence commenced at marriage to co-residence commencing midstream, a drop in co-residence rates at the time of the oldest child is one year old occurred. However, the fact that the pattern of living with a particular child has not vanished and that co-residence is strongly connected with succession to the family name (and inheritance) suggests that the stem family system continues to exist.

Finally, in regard to support from the wife's family, analysis result (3) of this article, "the existence and surfacing of childcare support by

the wife's parents," supports not the conjecture of Hypothesis 1, "from paternal line to bilateral line," but rather the existence of bilateral kinship relations expressed in Hypothesis 2. This latter hypothesis, however, sees the surfacing of social relations with the wife's parents and support as resulting from the dissolution of the stem family system (as well as the relaxation of bonding of joint group of *ie (dozoku)*). But because the analytical result of this article did not corroborate the dissolution of the stem family system, it is necessary to search elsewhere for a reason explaining why support from the wife's family surfaces.

Based on the analysis of this article, it is possible to conclude that one reason why the wife's parents' support surfaced lies in the decrease in the number of siblings. This point follows the conjecture of Ochiai ([1994] 2004). Beginning with the 1950 cohort, in which sibling numbers decreased, childcare support rates for the wife's parents increase greatly, and analysis confirm that those with few siblings receive a large amount of childcare support from parents (particularly the wife's parents). A second reason that may be considered is that as rates of co-residence with the husband's parents during child-raising years decline, conditions become more favorable for receiving childcare support from the wife's parents. As the analytical results show, rates are high for receiving support from parents when they are living with or nearby parents. However, co-residence with the husband's parents has the reverse effect of inhibiting support from the wife's parents. Consequently, in the older cohorts, because co-residence with the husband's parents was frequent, overall support by the husband's parents had high rates, but among couples in which the husband was a second or third son, for whom co-residence with the husband's parents was infrequent, the rates of support from the wife's

---

parents were higher than from the husband's parents. Furthermore, within the younger cohorts, because co-residence with the husband's parents during child-raising years was low, one can say that it became easier for the wife's parents to implement support and this brought about the higher rates of support.

In other words, as a result of the decrease in the number of siblings and a decline in rates of co-residence with the husband's parents during the child-raising period, rates for couples receiving support from the wife's parents increase. However, this does not mean that there is a uniform increase for all daughters. Actually in the younger cohort, couples in which the husband is a second or third son and the wife has no male siblings, who have the character of successorship, have the highest rates of receiving childcare support. This may suggest that as a result of the decline in the number of siblings it has become increasingly important, for each family, to secure a successor.

Even in the present day, first-born son couples can be seen to co-reside with the husband's parents (or couples in which the husband is a second or third son and the wife has no male siblings co-residing with the wife's parents), and a strong connection can be observed between co-residence and succession to the family name (or inheritance), which suggests the continuation of the stem family system. On the other hand, it is reasonable to assume that as a result of the decrease in the number of siblings and changes in the rates of co-residence (period of co-residence), through support, relations with the wife's parents grew closer. Even now, there is an observable pattern of co-residence with a particular child and support from the wife's parents, and it can be said that the stem family system coexists with bilateral kinship relationships. Consequently, it is necessary to revise, as outlined above, the conventional dual-

structure theory of kinship which holds that in the traditional village society the stem family system coexisted with bilateral kinship relationships, but that the stem family breaks up and as a result a bilateral kinship relationship becomes manifest.

Further, the parent-child and kinship relationship does not become symmetrical as conjectured by the two bilateral hypotheses. While a large number of couples live with the husband's parents, a large number receive support from the wife's parents in terms of childcare. Couples in which the husband is the first-born son co-reside preferentially with the husband's parents and receive childcare support from the husband's parents, but couples in which the husband is a second or third son and in which the wife has no male siblings co-reside preferentially with the wife's parents and receive childcare support from her parents.

Analysis in this article verifies that daughter and wife's parent support existed under the stem family system and that it has grown even more active in the present day. However, is this sort of bilateral kinship relationship a phenomenon that is particular to Japan? Doubt remains as to whether it might be a universal phenomenon. If a bilateral kinship relationship, as grasped by the dual-structure theory, consists of a dual structure of households, formed in the dimension of the conjugal family composed of a couple and their children, because couple and child relationships exist in every country and society, the same thing can be observed in common in other societies. On the other hand, if bilateral kinship relationships originate in Japan's non-patrilineal kinship relationships (Ito 2007), then one would presume it would be conspicuously lacking in societies with paternal descent groups (for example, China and Korea). In future study, through an international comparison of parent-child and kinship relationships between Japan, China and Korea, to

determine what sort of correlation there may be between the principles of co-residence, succession and inheritance and the cooperative aspects of social connectedness and support, I hope to further clarify the distinguishing features of Japanese kinship relationships.

### **Acknowledgements**

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to the many people who offered valuable suggestions and advice at the various stages of analysis and writing of this paper.

The present article is a revised and translated version of a Japanese article published in 2008 by the Japanese Journal of Family Sociology 20 (2), pp. 20-33. The author has obtained permission from the Japan Society of Family Sociology for this republication in English.

Table 1. Statistics of Variables Used in Analysis

						% (N)
<b>Dependent variables</b>						Total
Rates of co-residence (Eldest child age one)	Husband's parents	29.2(3177)	Wife's parents	6.3(3351)		
Childcare support rates (Eldest child age three or under)	Husband's parents	35.2(3152)	Wife's parents	35.2(3152)		
<b>Independent variables</b>						
Age of wife at marriage	20 or under	21-23	24-26	27-29	30 or above	
	9.0	28.1	35.6	15.7	11.5	100(3327)
Wife's birth cohort	1920-29	1930-39	1940-49	1950-59	1960-69	
	9.2	20.0	27.7	23.4	19.8	100(3351)
Number of husband's siblings (At time of marriage)	1-2	3-4	5 or more			
	27.8	37.3	34.8			
Number of wife's siblings (Adults)	23.2	40.1	36.7			
Composition of couple's siblings	Husband first- born son, wife with male siblings	Husband first- born son, wife with no male siblings	Husband second or third son, wife with male siblings	Husband second or third son, wife with no male siblings		
	40.0	9.9	40.6	9.5		
Wife's original social strata (Father's occupation at age 15)	Ordinary employee	Executive or above	Non- agriculture self-employed	Agriculture, forestry, fishing	Temporary, unemployed, unknown	
	27.8	14.0	19.7	25.3	13.2	100(3318)
Husband's occupation (At time of marriage)	Self-employed (Agriculture, non- agriculture)	Large company or organization	Small and medium-size company or organization	Temporary, unemployed		
	18.5	35.9	42.1	3.5		
Wife's occupation (At time of eldest child at age one)	Unemployed	Company or organization	Self- employed, temporary			
	72.6	15.0	12.4			
Education level	Middle School	High School	Junior College, university or above			
Husband	25.7	41.6	32.7			
Wife	25.5	50.9	23.6			
Region of residence (Eldest child at age one)	East Japan	57.9	West Japan	42.1		
Scale of city (Eldest child at age one)	Rural village	Provincial city	Major metropolis, central city			
	25.0	40.0	35.0			
Couple's family name	Husband's name	95.2	Wife's name	4.8		
Relation with residence of both sets of parents (Eldest child at age one)	Co-residing with husband's parents	Co-residing with wife's parents	Husband's parents nearby	Wife's parents nearby	Parents living distant	
	29.5	6.5	11.1	8.6	44.2	100(3145)

Note: "Relation with residence of both sets of parents" is used only in analysis of childcare support. Couples "co-residing" with parents are separated into those residing with the husband's parents and the wife's parents, with those living with both sets of parents considered to be residing with the husband's parents. Those not residing with parents are divided into those living near the husband's parents and those living near the wife's parents, with those living near both sets of parents considered to be residing near the husband's parents. Those not living near either set of parents are considered living at a distance.

Table 2. Number of wife's siblings, composition of couple's siblings, and parent-child relation viewed by wife's birth cohort

	Wife's birth cohort					% (N)
	1920-29	1930-39	1940-49	1950-59	1960-69	
Number of wife's adult siblings						Total
1	0.0	1.4	0.9	0.5	0.3	0.7
2-3	24.7	19.9	36.1	69.4	87.9	49.6
4-5	32.4	34.2	37.6	22.4	9.7	27.5
6 or more	42.8	44.5	25.4	7.7	2.1	22.2
Total	100(299)	100(649)	100(883)	100(751)	100(619)	100(3201)
Average number of wife's siblings	5.2	5.2	4.4	3.2	2.7	4.0
Percentage of those without male siblings	8.8(297)	10.3(638)	11.2(873)	28.1(747)	34.7(617)	19.4(3172)
Composition of couple's siblings						
Husband first-born son, wife with male siblings	37.9	39.3	39.4	39.8	42.6	40.0
Husband first-born son, wife with no male siblings	2.9	3.6	4.3	13.5	23.7	9.9
Husband as second or third son, wife with male siblings	53.3	50.1	49.0	32.4	22.4	40.6
Husband as second or third son, wife with no male siblings	5.9	6.9	7.3	14.3	11.3	9.5
Total	100(272)	100(605)	100(817)	100(698)	100(566)	100(2958)
Percentage of co-residence with parents (eldest child at age one)						
Husband's parents	45.1(286)	33.2(641)	29.8(889)	27.6(742)	18.7(619)	29.2(3177)
Wife's parents	8.8(307)	8.5(670)	5.5(927)	5.4(783)	5.0(664)	6.3(3351)
Percentage of childcare support from parents (eldest child at age three or under)						
Husband's parents	38.2(280)	34.4(634)	33.1(882)	36.2(738)	36.6(618)	35.2(3152)
Wife's parents	22.9(280)	27.3(634)	29.8(882)	40.7(738)	50.6(618)	35.3(3152)

Note: The wife herself is included in the number of adult siblings and the average number of siblings.

Table 3. Rates of co-residence with parents and childcare support according to wife's birth cohort and composition of couple's siblings

	Composition of couple's siblings				% (N)
	Husband first-born son, wife with male siblings	Husband first-born son, wife with no male siblings	Husband second or third son, wife with male siblings	Husband second or third son, wife with no male siblings	
a) Rates of co-residence (Eldest child at age one)					
1920-49 cohort					
Husband's parents	56.7(635)	49.2( 63)	16.9(810)	7.1(113)	
Wife's parents	2.4(663)	6.2( 65)	5.2(848)	27.1(118)	
1950-69 cohort					
Husband's parents	36.7(493)	25.1(211)	12.2(336)	9.9(152)	
Wife's parents	1.5(519)	3.1(228)	3.4(353)	20.7(164)	
b) Childcare support rates (Eldest child at age three or under)					
1920-49 cohort					
Husband's parents	54.0(630)	51.6( 62)	20.0(801)	10.8(111)	
Wife's parents	18.9(630)	33.9( 62)	29.8(801)	45.9(111)	
1950-69 cohort					
Husband's parents	46.3(492)	42.6(209)	22.8(334)	23.2(151)	
Wife's parents	39.2(492)	42.1(209)	44.9(334)	63.6(151)	
c) Childcare support rates (Eldest child at age three or under; limited to children living apart)					
1920-49 cohort					
Husband's parents	18.0(272)	28.1( 32)	9.8(665)	6.8(103)	
Wife's parents	17.9(614)	29.3( 58)	26.7(757)	29.1( 79)	
1950-69 cohort					
Husband's parents	26.4(311)	32.7(156)	16.0(293)	17.5(137)	
Wife's parents	38.2(484)	40.9(203)	43.5(322)	54.7(117)	

Note: In addition to being limited to those living separately from their parents, this calculation is made for childcare support rates from those parents.

Table 4a. Logistic regression analysis of whether there is co-residence with parents (Eldest child at age one)

	Co-residence with husband's parents			Co-residence with wife's parents		
	Model 1 (all subjects)	Model 2 (1920-49 cohort)	Model 3 (1950-69 cohort)	Model 1 (all subjects)	Model 2 (1920-49 cohort)	Model 3 (1950-69 cohort)
	Exp (B)	Exp (B)	Exp (B)	Exp (B)	Exp (B)	Exp (B)
Age of wife at marriage						
20 or under	0.94	1.03	0.44 +	1.41	1.46	2.00
21-23	1.33 *	1.08	1.67 *	0.70	0.72	0.64
[24-26]	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
27-29	0.78	0.70	0.83	0.99	0.93	1.04
30 or above	0.94	1.12	0.80	1.20	1.53	0.97
Wife's birth cohort						
1920-29	1.67 *	1.65 *		1.15	1.11	
1930-39	1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
1940-49	1.08	1.02		0.77	0.75	
1950-59	0.84		1.00	0.35 **		1.00
1960-69	0.43 ***		0.61 **	0.82		2.58 *
Number of husband's siblings (At marriage)						
[5 or more]	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
3-4	1.47 **	1.38 *	1.65	1.09	0.97	1.63
1-2	1.92 ***	2.31 ***	2.02 *	0.55	0.45	0.90
Number of wife's siblings (Adults)						
[5 or more]	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
3-4	1.07	1.06	1.25	1.25	1.05	4.28
1-2	0.96	0.99	1.14	1.52	1.32	5.09
Composition of couple's siblings						
[Husband first-born son, wife with male siblings]	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Husband first-born son, wife with no male siblings	0.79	0.88	0.78	1.65	1.95	1.69
Husband second or third son, wife with male siblings	0.20 ***	0.19 ***	0.20 ***	1.48	1.26	2.27
Husband second or third son, wife with no male siblings	0.17 ***	0.10 ***	0.23 ***	3.51 ***	3.52 **	3.72 *
Wife's original social stata (Father's occupation at age 15)						
[Ordinary company employee]	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Executive or above	0.81	0.91	0.75	0.99	0.87	0.69
Non-agriculture self-employed	0.86	0.92	0.81	1.24	0.75	2.98 *
Agriculture, forestry, fishing	0.90	0.79	1.28	0.71	0.42 +	1.57
Temporary, unemployed, unknown	0.99	0.97	1.05	1.04	0.71	1.70
Husband's occupation (At marriage)						
[Self-employed (Agriculture and non-agriculture)]	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Large company or organization	0.43 ***	0.33 ***	0.73	1.59	2.24 +	0.62
Small and medium-sized company or organization	0.55 ***	0.42 ***	0.89	1.90 +	2.59 *	0.75
Temporary, unemployed	0.23 ***	0.19 ***	0.35	0.23	0.20	0.52
Wife's occupation (Eldest child at age one)						
[Unemployed]	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Company or organization	1.47 **	0.97	2.49 ***	1.66	0.89	4.30 ***
Self-employed, temporary	1.10	0.95	1.42	1.10	0.89	1.77
Husband's education						
[Middle school]	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
High school	1.01	1.08	0.74	0.88	0.74	1.83
Junior college, university or above	0.89	1.08	0.61	1.24	1.28	2.04
Wife's education						
[Middle school]	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
High school	1.15	1.12	0.54	1.30	1.02	3.40
Junior college, university or above	0.92	1.16	0.39 *	0.72	0.80	1.26
Region of residence (Eldest child at age one)						
[East Japan]	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
West Japan	0.65 ***	0.77 +	0.51 ***	0.79	0.57 +	1.53
Scale of city (Eldest child at age one)						
[Rural village]	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Provincial city	0.18 ***	0.21 ***	0.13 ***	0.47 **	0.54	0.35 *
Metropolis or central city	0.10 ***	0.10 ***	0.08 ***	0.38 ***	0.29 **	0.48
Couple's family name						
[Husband's family name]	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Wife's family name	0.02 ***	0.02 ***	0.00	40.37 ***	44.82 ***	68.00 ***
Costant	6.35 ***	7.88 ***	8.30 ***	0.03 ***	0.05 ***	0.00 ***
-2 Log Likelihood	2115.35	1213.81	852.50	645.68	393.19	225.42
Model Chi-square	870.78 ***	548.97 ***	347.31 ***	378.10 ***	226.61 ***	176.71 ***
n	2413	1362	1051	2413	1362	1051

Note: +p<.1 \*p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.005

Table 4b. Logistic regression analysis of childcare support from parents (Eldest child less than three)

	Childcare support from husband's parents			Childcare support from wife's parents		
	Model 1 (all subjects) Exp (B)	Model 2 (1920-49 cohort) Exp (B)	Model 3 (1950-69 cohort) Exp (B)	Model 1 (all subjects) Exp (B)	Model 2 (1920-49 cohort) Exp (B)	Model 3 (1950-69 cohort) Exp (B)
Age of wife at marriage						
20 or under	1.10	1.47	0.42 *	1.12	1.09	1.27
21-23	0.95	1.06	0.78	1.19	1.42 *	0.90
[24-26]	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
27-29	1.05	0.90	1.07	1.03	0.94	1.03
30 or above	0.97	1.06	0.86	0.95	0.94	0.97
Wife's birth cohort						
1920-29	0.79	0.72		0.77	0.74	
1930-39	1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
1940-49	0.86	0.85		1.18	1.17	
1950-59	0.98		1.00	1.67 ***		1.00
1960-69	1.08		1.07	2.16 ***		1.28 +
Number of husband's siblings (At marriage)						
[5 or more]	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
3-4	1.40 *	1.43 *	1.42	1.03	1.01	1.03
1-2	1.21	1.29	1.17	1.12	1.39	1.00
Number of wife's siblings (Adults)						
[5 or more]	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
3-4	0.93	0.99	0.93	1.20	1.34 +	1.11
1-2	1.30	1.61	1.17	1.49 **	1.02	1.71 *
Composition of couple's siblings						
[Husband first-born son, wife with male siblings]	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Husband first-born son, wife with no male siblings	1.32	1.19	1.40	0.99	1.58	0.84
Husband second or third son, wife with male siblings	0.50 ***	0.52 ***	0.49 ***	1.24 +	1.33	1.13
Husband second or third son, wife with no male siblings	0.58 *	0.33 **	0.75	1.48 *	1.18	1.79 *
Wife's original social stata (Father's occupation at age 15)						
[Ordinary company employee]	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Executive or above	0.81	0.97	0.75	1.07	1.22	0.95
Non-agriculture self-employed	0.85	1.04	0.77	1.01	0.91	1.16
Agriculture, forestry, fishing	1.07	1.30	0.93	0.58 ***	0.59 **	0.54 ***
Temporary, unemployed, unknown	1.01	1.33	0.92	0.62 **	0.55 *	0.72
Husband's occupation (At marriage)						
[Self-employed (Agriculture and non-agriculture)]	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Large company or organization	0.92	1.08	0.85	1.07	1.02	1.11
Small and medium-sized company or organization	0.88	0.91	0.89	1.02	1.05	0.98
Temporary, unemployed	0.70	0.59	1.05	1.04	0.75	1.53
Wife's occupation (Eldest child at age one)						
[Unemployed]	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Company or organization	1.41 *	1.20	1.84 **	1.39 *	1.39 +	1.35
Self-employed, temporary	1.07	1.07	1.02	0.87	0.81	1.03
Husband's education						
[Middle school]	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
High school	1.35 +	1.50 +	1.10	0.96	0.81	1.28
Junior college, university or above	1.21	1.32	1.01	0.99	0.96	1.16
Wife's education						
[Middle school]	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
High school	1.00	1.16	0.56	1.42 *	1.30	1.79
Junior college, university or above	1.00	1.10	0.51	1.12	1.29	1.27
Region of residence (Eldest child at age one)						
[East Japan]	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
West Japan	1.03	0.92	1.11	1.18	1.26	1.17
Scale of city (Eldest child at age one)						
[Rural village]	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Provincial city	0.76 +	0.64 *	0.94	0.85	0.99	0.75
Metropolis or central city	0.54 ***	0.36 ***	0.81	0.79	0.88	0.70
Couple's family name						
[Husband's family name]	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Wife's family name	0.55	0.22 +	0.85	1.67	2.61 *	1.03
Relation with residence of both sets of parents (Eldest child at age one)						
[Co-residence with husband's parents]	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Husband's parents nearby	0.25 ***	0.17 ***	0.44 ***	1.91 ***	2.36 ***	1.63 *
Co-residence with wife's parents	0.04 ***	0.05 ***	0.04 ***	21.13 ***	19.75 ***	35.14 ***
Wife's parents nearby	0.05 ***	0.03 ***	0.07 ***	8.12 ***	9.74 ***	6.28 ***
Parents living distant	0.05 ***	0.04 ***	0.07 ***	1.68 ***	1.64 ***	1.69 **
Constant	4.15 ***	3.94 ***	5.90 ***	0.13 ***	0.11 ***	0.19 ***
-2 Log Likelihood	2064.63	1025.58	997.55	2583.05	1299.14	1250.64
Model Chi-square	1063.63 ***	731.48 ***	373.42 ***	497.17 ***	283.27 ***	176.06 ***
n	2381	1342	1039	2381	1342	1039

Note: "Relation with residence of both sets of parents" is used only in analysis of childcare support. Couples "co-residing" with parents are separated into those residing with the husband's parents and the wife's parents, with those living with both sets of parents considered to be residing with the husband's parents. Those not residing with parents are divided into those living near the husband's parents and those living near the wife's parents, with those living near both sets of parents considered to be residing near the husband's parents. Those not living near either set of parents are considered living at a distance.

+p<.1 \*p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.005

## References

- Fujimi, Sumiko (1975) "Aiji Maki to Oyako: Yamanashi-ken Kitakoma-gun Sutamacho Hishi," in Kitano Seiichi and Masaoka Kanji (eds.) *'Ie' to shinzoku soshiki*, Waseda Daigaku Shuppanbu, pp. 227-332.
- Ito, Abito (2007) *Bunka jinruigaku de yomu Nihon no minzoku shakai*, Yuhikaku Sensho.
- Kato, Akihiko (2003a) "Chosa dezain to sanpuringu," in Matsuda (Kumagaya) Sonoko Kenkyu daihyosha, *Zenkoku chosa 'Sengo Nihon no kazoku no ayumi' (NFRJ-S01)*, Nihon kazoku shakaigaku gakkai zenkoku kazoku chosa (NFRJ) iinkai, pp. 1-11.
- Kato, Akihiko (2003b) *Kazoku hendo no shakaigakuteki kenkyu—Gendai Nihon kazoku no jizoku to henyō*, in Waseda Daigaku Daigakuin Bungaku Kenkyuka Hakase Ronbun.
- Kato, Akihiko (2006) "Sengo Nihon kazoku no kiseki," in Tomita Takeshi and Li Jonfa (eds.) *Kazoku no henyō to jenda—shoshi koreika to gurobaruka no naka de*, Nihon Hyoronsha, pp. 1-30.
- Kitano, Seiichi (1940) "Koshu sanson no dozoku soshiki to oyakata kokata kanko," in *Minzoku gaku nenpo* 2: pp. 41-95.
- Kitano, Seiichi (1951) "Dozoku soshiki to hoken isei," in Nihon Jimbun Gakkai (ed.) *Hoken isei*, Yuhikaku, pp. 175-195.
- Kitano, Seiichi (1965) "Nihon no ie to kazoku," in *Osaka Daigaku bungakubu kiyo* 11: pp. 3-49.
- Masaoka, Kanji (1968) "Sanson shakai ni okeru dozoku to shinzoku," in *Shakaigaku hyoron* 74: pp. 22-41.
- Mitani, Tetsuo (1991) "Toshi ni okeru oyako do-bekkyo to shinzoku kankei no Nihonteki tokushitsu," in *Kazoku shakaigaku kenkyu* 3: pp. 41-49.
- Mitsuyoshi, Toshiyuki (1966) "Kazoku to shinzoku," in Obayashi Kaoru and Masuda Kokichi (eds.) *Kazoku shakaigaku*, Kawashima Shoten, pp. 170-187.
- Morioka, Kiyomi [1983] (2000) "Kazoku bunseki no tegakari—ruikei to bunseki," in Morioka Kyomi and Mochizuki Takashi, *Atarashii kazoku shakaigaku yonteihan*, Baifukan, pp. 9-18.
- Morioka, Kiyomi (1993) *Gendai kazoku hendoron*, Mineruba Shobo.
- Nakano, Takashi (1964) *Shoka dozoku no kenkyu—noren wo meguru ie kenkyu*, Miraisha.
- Nasu, Soichi (1972) "Gendai shakai to rojin no kazoku hendo," in Nasu Shuichi and Masuda Kokichi (eds.) *Rojin to kazoku no shakaigaku*, Kakiuchi Shuppan, pp. 1-42.
- Nishioka, Hachiro (1997) "Kazoku kino no henka," in Ato Makoto and Kanekiyo Hiroyuki (eds.) *Jinko hendo to kazoku*, Taimeidou, pp. 25-45.
- Okubo, Takaji (2004) "Kaigo keiken no 'sokeika'," in Watanabe Hideki, Inaba Akihiko, and Shimazaki Naoko (eds.), *Gendai kazoku no kozo to hendo—Zenkoku kazoku chosa 'NFRJ98' ni yoru keiryō bunseki*, Tokyo Daigaku Shuppankai, pp. 159-172.
- Ochiai, Emiko [1994] (2004) *21 seiki kazoku e (daisanpan)*, Yuhikaku.
- Shirahase, Sawako (2005) *Shoshi korei shakai no mienai kakusa—jenda, sedai, kaiso no yukue*, Tokyo Daigaku Shuppankai.
- Shi, liping (2006) "Seidai kan kankei ni okeru hitaishosei no saiko—Nihon no oyako kankei ha soukeiteki ni natta ka?," in Nihon Kazoku Shakai Gakkai, *Dai nikai kazoku nit suite no zenkoku chosa (NFRJ03)*, *Dainiji hokokusho* 2, Oyako kyodai sapoto nettowaku, pp. 101-120.
- Tabuchi, Rokuro, and Nakazato Hideki (2004) "Rojin to seijinsi to no kyoju kankei—dokyō, rinkyō, kinkyō, enkyō wo megutte," in Watanabe Hideki, Inaba Akihiko and Shimazaki Naoko (eds.) *Gendai kazoku no kozo to henyō—Zenkoku kazoku chosa [NFRJ98] ni yoru keiryō bunseki*, Tokyo Daigaku Shuppankai, pp. 121-147.
- Tsutsumi, Masae (2001) "Noson kazoku ni okeru sedai keisho no jisho bunseki—hito, mono, kokoro no sansokumen wo chushin ni," in *Yamanashi kenritsu joshi tanki dai kiyo* 34: pp. 63-76.
- Yonemura, Shoji (1974) "Dozoku wo meguru mondai (1)—ie, dozoku to sosen suihai to no kankei wo shu to shite," in *Shakaigaku hyoron* 25 (1), pp. 18-39.

## Notes:

- 1 Nakano (1964) holds that the joint group of *ie* (*dozoku*) is a bond of households composed on the basis of the households' genealogy, and that this is different from kinship relationships. However, Nakano also recognizes that kinship relationships exist together with the joint group of *ie* (*dozoku*) and that the two performed different functions.
- 2 There are a wide variety of definitions of household (*ie*), but the present article provisionally employs the definition of Morioka ([1983] 2000), which takes it to be the form of traditional Japanese family life, and takes it as the Japanese pattern of the stem family system.
- 3 East Japan is taken as those prefectures east of and including Fukui, Gifu and Aichi prefectures, and West Japan as those west of and including Kyoto, Shiga and Mie prefectures. Hokkaido is excluded from this analysis.
- 4 "Relation with residence of both sets of parents" is used only in analysis of childcare support. Couples "co-residing" with parents are separated into those residing with the husband's parents and the wife's parents, with those living with both sets of parents considered to be residing with the husband's parents. Those not residing with parents are divided into those living near the husband's parents and those living near the wife's parents, with those living near both sets of parents considered to be residing near the husband's parents. Those not living near either set of parents are considered living at a distance.
- 5 Depending on the birth cohort, there was a statistical significance according to chi-square test in the rates of co-residence with either the husband's or wife's parents for all cohorts, and in terms of the composition of the couple's siblings, there was a statistical significance in the difference in rates of cohabitation with either the husband's or wife's parents ( $p < .05$ ).
- 6 Chi-square test showed a statistical significance in the difference in rates of childcare support from the wife's parents according to birth cohort, and in the difference in rates of childcare support rates from the husband's and wife's parents according to the composition of the couple's siblings ( $p < .05$ ).
- 7 Chi-square test showed a statistical significance in the difference in childcare support rates from the husband's or wife's parents according to the birth cohort and the

---

composition of the couple's siblings ( $p < .05$ ).

8 Of those couples living with the wife's parents, 52.9% take the wife's family name, and especially among the couples living with the wife's parents in which the husband is the second or third son and the wife has no male siblings, 82.8% take the wife's family name.