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Akemi Kishimoto
The purpose of this current study was to investigate the level of acceptance among professionals in Japan for initiatives and services for families experiencing divorce. Questionnaires were mailed to 1963 professionals. Seventy questionnaires were returned from Family Court Officers \(n = 3\), Counselors at the Family Problem Information Centers \(n = 8\), family law attorneys \(n = 2\), university faculty \(n = 53\), and unspecified \(n = 4\). Results are summarized as follows: laws and rules about divorce in Japanese society, including historical aspects; focusing on children’s interests; visitation and post-divorce relationships; educating the public, parents, and high school students; and parenting plans and education programs for parents. Respondents supported offering the option of dual parental authority; requiring parents to develop a contract on visitation and child-rearing expenses; encouraging parent/child relationships post-divorce; educating parents about the needs of children post-divorce; focusing the goals and the contents of education programs for divorcing parents on the well-being of children; and promoting parenting plans as means to encourage positive parent/child relationships post-divorce. Limitations of this study and implications for practice and future research are also discussed.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Overview

Divorce is a family transition experienced by many across the world. Over the past five decades the rate of divorce has increased in many countries, including Japan and the United States (Fuess, 2004; Kitson, 2006). In 2005, the rate of divorce in Japan was 2.08 divorces per 1,000 total population, compared to a high of 2.3 in 2002 and a low of .73 in 1963 (Ministry of Health, Labor and Welfare, 2007a). In 2005, the rate of divorce in the U.S. was 3.6 divorces per 1,000 total population (Munson & Sutton, 2006) compared to a high of 5.3 in 1979 and 1981, and to 2.6 in 1950 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2002).

Divorce that involves minor children is of particular interest to U.S. court systems, tasked with protection of minor children. Toward this end, the U.S. courts have established a number of initiatives to assist families during the transition of divorce and separation. Such initiatives include, but are not limited to, parenting plans, education programs, mediation, collaborative law, and parenting coordinators (Blaisure & Saposnek, 2007).

In Japan, while Family Courts offer mediation services, other interventions, such as submission of a parenting plan or education programs for divorcing parents, are not available through the Family Court system. Moreover, divorcing parents in Japan are not
required to develop an agreement about parenting time, and it is typical for custody to be held by one parent and for the non-custodial parent to have little contact with his or her child post-divorce.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this current study was to investigate the level of acceptance among Family Court Officers, Counselors at the Family Problem Information Centers, family law attorneys, and university faculty in Japan for initiatives and services for families experiencing divorce. Four groups of professionals were surveyed about their attitudes towards current Japanese divorce laws and rules; parent-child relationships post-divorce; divorce in Japanese society; education for divorcing parents, including possible program goals, content, location, and instructors; common issues in families; and the future role of Family Courts.

Rationale

It is important to determine if professionals who work with or study families see a need for more initiatives to assist families experiencing divorce and, if so, the shape they think such initiatives should take. There is evidence of a growing interest in and need for services in Japan. However, limited data exist to guide the development of services for divorcing parents.

Recent additions to the legal types of divorce (Ministry of Health, Labor and Welfare, 2007a) and the accompanying discourse surrounding the examination of divorce-related regulations (Fuess, 2004) suggest that further initiatives on the behalf of
families experiencing divorce may be more appealing to the public and to the professionals who work with families than in the past. Japan has a long history of treating marriage and divorce primarily as a private family matter, and secondarily as a matter requiring involvement of others outside of the family (see Fuess, 2004 for a detailed discussion of the history of divorce in Japan).

Perpetuation of the family lineage was more important than the perpetuation of a marriage. Longstanding social and legal norms considered divorce to end the relationship between children and the non-custodial parent. If the father retained custody of the children, typical until the early 1960s, then the family lineage would continue; if not, the father would end contact with the children and refocus on continuing the family lineage with children from a second marriage (Fuess, 2004).

Divorce did not have the religious or moral connotations found in societies strongly influenced by Christianity. Consequently, marriage and divorces were reported to a Family Registry Office and did not need outside approval, judicial or otherwise (see Fuess for exceptions, e.g., Samurai class during the Edo Period).

Divorce in Japan today continues to be a private matter, although now it is a private matter under the control of the individuals rather than under control of the “father of the house.” If the partners agree to dissolve a marriage they can do so by submitting to the Family Registry Office divorce by mutual consent paperwork. As long as the paperwork is completed correctly and fully, including the line that asks for the name of custodial parent, the couple is then divorced without any judicial involvement. Recent data indicates that 90.7% of divorces in Japan occur through divorce by mutual consent.
(Ministry of Health, Labor and Welfare, 2000, 2007a), and 60% of divorced couples in Japan had children (Ministry of Health, Labor and Welfare, 2000).

Given that most divorces occur outside of the purview of the judicial system in Japan, limited information is available about the average and range of experience of families post-divorce. The few studies published prior to 1990 reported parents’ confusion on how to best help their children, and children wanting more information (Naio, 2006). In the 1990s, Family Problem Information Center (as cited in Naio, 2006) staff collected data from participants (n = 280) in a seminar on divorce. Seventy-eight percent of them supported children’s visiting their non-custodial parent. The government of Japan also sponsored a study of custody of minor children whose parents divorced by mutual consent. In 1997, 69.6% of men and 66.8% of women who had parental authority after divorce reported worrying about issues related to children arising from the divorce (Ministry of Health, Labor and Welfare, 1997). Specific worries included spending “too little time” together (47.4% men and 42.1% women) and children’s “emotional problems” (40.2% men and 43.5% women). Moreover, 28.6% of men and 73% of women worried about “financial problems” (Ministry of Health, Labor and Welfare, 1997). Divorced mothers reported worrying about both children and financial problems. Given these concerns of parents and children, more information is needed to determine the best way to provide support to them.

Meanwhile, Suzuki (2006) noted that a variety of family forms have existed in Japan in every generation. She has argued that Japanese are aware of the socio-historical expectation of uniformity in family life yet are beginning to acknowledge the diversity of “real families” (Suzuki, 2006). For example, the need to educate divorcing parents about
children’s adjustment to parental divorce is becoming apparent to at least some school
teachers. During my 12-year experience as an elementary school teacher in Japan, I had
many students in my classes whose parents divorced. I saw students who were seriously
hurt because of their parents’ divorce. The family transition of divorce was not easy for
my students, and most students displayed negative attitudes toward schoolwork and
relationships with friends, low self-esteem, and various negative feelings. I believed and
still believe that those students needed help and guidance from their parents and from
others in the larger community to better adjust to their parents’ divorce. For example,
when I was a fourth grade teacher, a student experienced parental divorce during the
summer vacation. On the first day back to school, the student said to me, “Miss
Masubuchi (my maiden name), the worst thing in the world happened to me. Because of
it. I want to die.” I asked the student the reason he said what he did. “My father and
mother divorced.”

No studies on the topic of education for divorcing parents were identified in a
literature search or through contact with faculty at Japanese universities. However, a
growing interest in parental and child adjustment post-divorce is evident as a few private
agencies and individuals begin to offer seminars, newsletters, and websites on this topic.
Fathers who are interested in maintaining relationships with their children and wanting
the option of joint custody are banding together to advocate for changes in the law (Naoi,
2006).

The Family Problem Information Center publishes an informative news letter
three times a year, and also offers educational seminars once a year. A seminar costs are
approximately $10 including take-home materials. Ikeuchi (2005) described running the
School for Divorce that offers counseling services for couples, divorced people, and harassment in the workplace and an educational seminar once a month. The educational seminar consisted of four class sessions, each costing about $30. If a participant attended all four classes, the tuition would be discounted from $120 to $100.

One U.S.-based program for divorcing parents, “Children in the Middle,” is reported to have been bought and presumably is in use by a private practitioner in Tokyo, and by a counseling and advocacy program through the Marine Corps Community Service at the U.S. military base in Okinawa (The Center for Divorce Education, 2007).

Web-based resources for parents exist but focus primarily on the legal aspects of obtaining a divorce. Exceptions include Internet sites run by Shinkawa (2005) and Tanaka (2005) who offer information and resources for parents during and after divorce.

When considering what, if any, services should be made available to families experiencing divorce it is important to remember “because the cultural heritage of Japan is so very different, a simple translation of Western family counseling methods is ill advised” (Hayes & Kameguchi, 2005, p. 298). Naoi (2006) also noted that, “Japanese parents might initially be skeptical of therapeutic groups led by professionals who have not experienced divorce themselves” (p. 101). For example, in a national survey of single parents, of mothers who talked to others, 66% talked with relatives, 30% talked with friends, 2% talked with professionals, and 2% talked with “others.” Of fathers who talked with others, 68% talked with relatives, 28% talked with friends, 1% talked with professionals, 3% talked with “others” (Ministry of Health, Labor and Welfare, 2007c). Thus, research is needed to determine culturally sensitive services for divorcing parents in Japan.
Definition of Terms

Visitation—The term *parenting time* is commonly used in the U.S., replacing the term *visitation* and the idea that one parent “visits” her or his child. However, the term *parenting time* is not commonly used in Japan, nor is the idea common that divorced parents should “co-parent” or that both parents should be involved in parenting children post-divorce. Confucianism has influenced Japanese perspectives toward family life. Children are the means by which a family lineage continues. When there is a divorce, the children cannot continue two lineages, so they are seen as “strangers” to the non-custodial parent (Ikeuchi, 2005). Therefore, *visitation* as a term conveys a common type of relationship found between non-custodial parents and children after divorce. Divorcing parents in Japan can divorce, and many do, without developing a contract of visitation.

Family Courts—The judicial system in Japan includes Family Courts. In Japan, there is one Supreme Court (Tokyo), 8 High Courts with 6 branch offices and an Intellectual Property High Court, 50 District Courts with 203 branch offices, 50 Family Courts with 203 branch offices and 77 local offices, and 438 Summary Courts. Fifty Family Courts and 203 branch offices are in the same place of District Courts. Seventy-seven local offices are in the same place of the part of Summary Courts.

Family Courts focus on domestic relation cases. “Typical examples of domestic relation cases are listed as follows: guardianship for adults, permission to adopt a minor, requesting the expense for bringing up a child, designation of the person who has parental authority and alteration thereof, partition of estate, marital relationship disputes, and divorce” (Supreme Court of Japan, 2006, ¶3).
A Family Register—All Japanese record the addition and subtraction of family members by submitting information to the officials in charge of family registration. Family registrations are located in ward offices, city halls, town halls, and village halls. When a couple marries, the couple must choose one family name for both partners and register a joint legal domicile. When a couple divorces, one of them reverts to her or his previous name. But if persons wish to continue using their marital name, they only need to notify their ward, city, or village office within three months of the divorce and they will be allowed to keep it. If a couple has children, and the couple plans to divorce, the children can keep the family name. When the custodial parent wants to change the children’s name, the parent needs to apply before the divorce (Toshitani, 2007).

Kyogi-Rikon—Divorce by Mutual Consent, Divorce by Agreement, Divorce by Mutual Agreement, and Consensual Divorce. The Japanese term Kyogi-Rikon has been translated as divorce by mutual consent (Naoi, 2006), divorce by agreement (Cabinet Secretariat, n.d.), divorce by mutual agreement (Ministry of Health, Labor and Welfare, 2007a), and consensual divorce (Fuess, 2004). This present study uses the English translation divorce by mutual consent when referring to Kyogi-Rikon.

Youikuh—Child Rearing Expenses and Child Support. In Japan, the term youikuh is translated as child-rearing expenses. The equivalent meaning in the U.S is child support; however, in this present study, the term child-rearing expenses is used.

Overview of Thesis

Chapter II reviews the literature of family studies on the topic of divorce. The differences in the prevalence of divorce, the law systems and children’s and parents’
reaction to divorce between the U.S. and Japan are described. Chapter III explains the methodology of the data collection. Chapter IV describes the results of the data collection. Finally, Chapter V discusses findings and implications of the study, including the possibility of educational programs for divorcing parents in Japan. Limitations of this study and suggestions for future research are also presented.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Japan

Prevalence of Divorce

The divorce rate in Japan has fluctuated since the 1800s. During the Meiji Period (1868-1912), the establishment of a Ministry of Justice, a court system, the Meiji Civil Code of 1896, and the Civil Code of 1898 blended the structures of Japanese and Western governments (Fuess, 2004; Naoi, 2006). Divorce then became codified, including the practice of “divorce by mutual consent,” and the right of divorce was made more accessible to wives.

Prior to the 1898 Civil Code that provided a unifying national law defining marriage and divorce, definitions varied across Japan of when a marriage was entered into (e.g., after a written contract was drawn up, at the start of cohabitation, or after the birth of a child). Although the definition of marriage differed,

all statistical indicators show a high divorce rate during the 1880s and 1890s, followed by a sudden change around 1898, when the national Diet passed a civil code and new laws on family registration, and then a gradual decline until the 1940s. Even by today’s standards, the prevalence of divorce in the late nineteenth century appears extraordinary . . . the record mark of 3.39 [per 1,000 population] in 1883. Japan’s nineteenth-century peak overshadows the divorce rates of European countries during the twentieth century and has been eclipsed only by the divorce rate of the United States since the 1970s. (Fuess, 2004, p. 3)
As a comparison to the divorce rate of 3.39 in 1883 in Japan, the U.S. divorce rate in 2005 was 3.6 (Munson & Sutton, 2006). By 1898 the divorce rate in Japan had decreased to 1.53 and continued to do so until 1963 when the divorce rate reached 0.73, except for a brief increase just after the conclusion of World War II. Since 1964, Japan’s divorce rate increased until 2002 when it peaked at 2.3 and then began decreasing to a rate of 2.08 in 2005 (see Figure 1; Ministry of Health, Labor and Welfare, 2007a).

Figure 1. Divorce Rate in Japan

One feature of divorce in Japan that has remained the same over this time is the practice of divorce by mutual consent. The hallmarks of Japan’s divorce by mutual consent are the simple procedures (i.e., the lack of court involvement) and the expectation couples should have the freedom to divorce if they so wish (Fuess, 2004). The 91% of couples who file divorce by mutual consent do so by presenting their completed paperwork to their Family Registry. The moment the completed paperwork is handed over, the couple is divorced.
Courts only become involved in divorce matters when a divorce is contested or parents cannot agree about custody, because marriage and divorce are considered private. During the Edo Period (1600-1867) such matters were private *family* matters, but with the Civil Code of 1898 and the New Civil Code of 1948, these matters are private concerns of the *individuals*. During the Edo period, custody either followed family lineage (i.e., either the “house of the father,” or the “house of the mother” if the husband had married into her family—see Fuess, 2004 for a discussion of in-marrying husbands), or assigned custody of child(ren) to the same sex parent (Fuess, 2004).

The Civil Code of 1898 allowed parents to determine custody arrangements in divorce by mutual consent and this practice continues. Civil Law 819 requires parents to designate one custodial parent. However, when the court becomes involved in the divorce process, they are to consider what is best for the children.

The length of marriage prior to divorce has increased since the 1800s, resulting in an increase in the number of children affected by parental divorce. During the Edo and Meiji Periods, divorce often occurred within the first few years of marriage and often prior to the birth of children. National data on the number of children affected by parental divorce are not available prior to World War II, although regional data suggest approximately 20% of divorcing couples had children (Fuess, 2004). Of couples who divorced in 2005, 58.8% had children (Ministry of Health, Labor and Welfare, 2007a).

Prior to the middle of the 20th century, parental authority was most often held by fathers. Since then, parental authority has switched from fathers to mothers. In 2005, 81.2% of divorced mothers had parental authority, 15% of fathers had it, and 3.7% of other had it (Ministry of Health, Labor and Welfare, 2007a). With this switch in parental
authority has come an increase in the number of single-mother families. For example, from 1998 to 2003, the number of single-mother families increased by 28.3% (Ministry of Health, Labor and Welfare, 2006).

**Perspective Toward Marriage and Divorce**

Japanese society has been described as having the phenomenon of declining birth rates and increasing aging population (see Figure 2; Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications, 2006). In 2005, 13.6% of the population was under 15 years of age, 65.3% of the population was 15 to 64, and 21% of the population was 65 or over. An increasing tendency to delay marriage and a tendency to stay single are listed as two of the reasons for declining birth rate (Cabinet Office, Government of Japan, 2002a).

What are the important factors for Japanese when they marry? Figure 3 lists the factors. *Personality similarity* is chosen by most people as an important factor (64.8% men, 63.8% women). Men also chose *family is the priority* (32%), *different personality* (24.2%), and *doing housework* (23.7%). Women also chose *stability of income* (53.5%), *family is the priority* (25.4%), and *the same hobby* (22.3%) (Cabinet Office, Government of Japan, 1998).

Although both men and women considered the partner’s personality an important factor in marriage, they differed in other factors. For example, men expected women to concentrate on family and home, and they did not expect a lot of financial stability from women. However, a majority of women expected financial security from men.

In 2006, 19,730 husbands and 45,440 wives petitioned the Family Courts for divorce. The Family Courts asked them to choose three reasons for the petition
Figure 2. Population in 2005

Figure 3. Factors Considered Important to Marriage
Personality clash was the most common reason chosen by husbands and wives, although it was chosen by a majority of husbands (62.6%) but not by a majority of wives (44.2%). The second and third most common reason chosen by husbands were adultery (17.8%) and bad relationships with relatives (15.5%). For wives, the next most common reasons were domestic violence (28.6%) and adultery (26.1%) (Courts in Japan, n.d.a).

Figure 4. Reasons Given for Divorce Petition in 2006

Factors influencing the decision to marry and reasons given for seeking a divorce overlap. Personality compatibility appears to be a main factor in both the decision to
marry and to divorce. For women, financial stability is the second most common factor considered in the decision to marry; meanwhile, nearly a quarter of women who petitioned the Family Court in 2006 for a divorce cited their husbands’ failure to pay living expenses as a reason for divorce.

The Cabinet Office of the Government of Japan conducts a National Survey on Life Style Preferences every year in which 5,000 people between the ages of 15 to 79 are randomly selected and invited to participate. In 2001, the following question about divorce was included in the survey: “What do you think about the idea that divorce should be avoided as much as possible?” Of 3,988 participants, 23.3% strongly agreed, 31.9% slightly agreed, 30.5% were neutral, 7.7% slightly disagreed, 6.4% strongly disagreed, and 0.2% had no answer. Fifty-five percent of all respondents strongly or slightly agreed with the statement that divorce should be avoided. As noted in Figure 5, a greater percentage of fathers than mothers strongly or slightly agreed (Cabinet Office, Government of Japan, 2002b).

The National Survey on Life Style Preference (see Figure 6; Cabinet Office, Government of Japan, 2005) conducted in the 2004-05 academic year (i.e., April 2004 to March 2005), queried 3,670 participants and included the following question about divorce: “Recently, the number of divorces is increasing. What do you think of the phenomenon? Please choose one that you think applies.”

1. When a marriage has issues, it is better to dissolve the relationship.
2. The phenomenon is the reflection of people who come to value their own life.
3. It is unavoidable because society’s sense of resistance to divorce is getting weak.
4. It is undesirable because it means the bonds of family have become weak.
5. It is undesirable because there is the possibility that children become victims.
6. Once a couple marries, a husband and a wife should do their best and keep the relationship until the death of one of them.
7. Other.
8. I do not know.

Figure 5. The Rates that Agree with Avoiding Divorce by Gender and Number of Children

According to the Cabinet Office, Government of Japan (2005), selections 1 and 2 reflected a positive attitude toward divorce; selection 3 was considered a neutral response; and selections 4, 5, and 6 reflected a negative attitude toward divorce. The same question was also asked in the 1992 survey. Compared to 1992, a positive attitude toward divorce is increasing and a negative attitude toward divorce is decreasing in Japan. In 1992, 33% of respondents reported a positive attitude toward divorce compared with 41.4% in 2005. In 1992, 56% of respondents reported a negative attitude toward divorce compared with 46.4% in 2005. As of 2005, Japanese attitudes toward divorce are split between positive
Figure 6. 1992 and 2005 National Surveys on Life Style: Attitudes Toward Divorce

and negative. Divorce continues to be controversial in Japan; the percentage of Japanese reporting a positive attitude toward divorce (41.4%) is nearly the same as the percentage of those reporting a negative attitude (46.4%).

A recent regional study also found a positive attitude toward divorce. In a random survey of Tokyo residents, Odagiri's survey revealed a positive attitude toward divorce in a majority of those surveyed. Odagiri (2004) conducted a mail survey on perspectives
toward divorce, marriage, gender roles, and affection between husband and wife. She divided Tokyo into 50 areas and randomly selected 20 people to invite to participate in the research. A total of 1,000 people ages 30 to 69 were invited to participate, and 501 people did so.

Odagiri (2004) concluded that “the tendency of accepting divorce was recognized. The clear prejudice and opposition toward divorce or divorced families were weak” (p. 5). Specifically, a majority of respondents agreed with four statements. “Divorce is fine if the divorce leads to happiness.” “In the recent society, divorce likely happens.” “The parent in the divorced family has the roles of both father and mother; therefore, the parent may have a hard time.” And, “[d]ivorce is better for the children than exposing them to parents’ ongoing fighting.” Likewise, a majority of respondents disagreed with four other statements. “People who experienced divorce are losers.” “Divorcing is shameful.” “I do not want to have relationships with divorced people.” And, “I do not know how to relate with divorced people.”

Divorce Process

As of 2004, divorce is granted through one of six processes: divorce by mutual consent (kyougi-rikon), divorce through family court mediation (tyoutei-rikon), divorce by decision of Family Court Judge (shinpan-rikon), divorce by out-of-court settlement (wakai-rikon), divorce with no more objection (seikyuu no nindaku-rikon), and divorce by judgment (hannketu-rikon). Prior to 2004, divorce was granted through one of four processes (Murayama, 1999; Toshitani, 2007).
Approximately 90% of divorces occur through *divorce by mutual consent*. Of the remaining divorces, 9% occur by *divorce through family court mediation*, less than 1% are granted through *divorce by judgment*, and 1% occur through *divorce by trial*. These percentages have varied little since 1950, with a slight increase in couples using *divorce through family court* (see Figure 7; Ministry of Health, Labor and Welfare, 2000, 2007a).
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Figure 8 is a flow chart of the types of divorces available in Japan based on Article 766 of the Civil Code (Cabinet Secretariat, n.d.). In *divorce by consent*, the couple indicates a desire to divorce by completing and submitting a divorce notice to a “koseki-gakari” (an official in charge of a family register) in the area’s city hall, ward office, or town office. The divorce is final as soon as the notice is submitted.

When the desire to divorce is not mutual, the partner wanting to divorce can petition the family court. In *divorce through family court mediation*, the couple meets
Figure 8. Flow Chart of the Six Types of Legal Divorce in Japan
with an examiner from the family court and explains their situation. Examiners
investigate the facts and evidence of the situation, and these details are used in the
negotiation process. The goal of the mediation is to develop an official agreement about
the division of property and parental authority if there are children.

Family Courts Officers help members of a mediation committee (see Figure 9). A
mediation committee consists of two Domestic Relation Conciliation Officers and a
judge, and this committee mediates between divorcing husbands and wives. Domestic
Relation Conciliation Officers are chosen by Family Courts, and they work for each
claimed case. Compared to Domestic Relation Conciliation Officers, Family Courts
Officers work for the Family Court. Family Court Officers investigate the family’s
background information, including any history of problems, how the child has been
raised, and family’s living conditions. Family Courts are requested not only to solve the
specific petitions on a legal level, but to settle the petitions with consideration to the
family’s background (Courts in Japan, 2005c).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge</th>
<th>Works for the courts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Relation Conciliation Officers</td>
<td>Work for the case</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

↑↑↑ Support/Help to mediate

Family Courts Officers

*Investigate each case’s background*
*They work for Family Courts*

*Figure 9. A Mediation Committee*
When mediation fails to produce an agreement between the partners, the Family Court exercises the authority to require the couple to appear in front of a judge. However, this process is optional when the judge decides that the couple should divorce; less than 1% of divorce by judgment occurred in 1998. Even if the divorce was decided by the judge, one of spouses can oppose the divorce by filing an objection within two weeks by the judgment. In this case, the divorce does not occur. If the partners differ on their desire to divorce, their case will be sent to trial. However, *divorce by judgment* will occur at this point if one of the partners fails to appear in front of the judge after multiple opportunities.

Finally, in *divorce by trial* one partner sues the other for divorce; however, the partner wanting to divorce must claim to the court one of five reasons to justify a divorce: (1) infidelity; (2) maliciously kicked out by spouse; (3) nothing more is heard of the spouse and whether the spouse is dead or alive is unclear for three years or more; (4) the spouse suffers from severe mental illness and there is no hope of recovering; and (5) for reasons of great importance, the couple cannot continue their marriage. Moreover, the court is able to reject the claim for divorce, even if the couple has one of the first four reasons, by deciding that the couple should continue their marriage on the basis of all circumstances considered. Article 766 of the Civil Code states:

1. If parents divorce by agreement, the matter of who will have custody over a child and any other necessary matters regarding custody shall be determined by that agreement. If agreement has not been made, or cannot be made, this shall be determined by the family court.

2. If the family court finds it necessary for the children’s interests, it may change who will take custody over the child and order any other proper disposition regarding custody.
3. The rights and duties of parents beyond the scope of custody may not be altered by the provisions of the preceding two paragraphs.  

(Cabinet Secretariat, n.d., pp. 11-12)

Visitation in Japanese Law

Divorcing couples in Japan may obtain a *divorce by mutual consent* without contact with the Family Court and without filing an agreement that outlines custody, parenting time, and other details. Couples may develop an official agreement through the use of an attorney, but the prevalence of this practice is unknown. The only identified study of divorcing parents in Japan was conducted by Shinkawa (2005), who runs an Internet site for divorcing and divorced parents. She posted an online questionnaire about agreements, custody, child-rearing expenses, and parental contact with children. Given the design of the study, the results cannot be generalized, but they do provide some insight into practices of divorcing parents in Japan. Of the 343 parents who responded, 57% (*n* = 195) indicated they had developed an agreement on visitation. However, in practice, 23% (82 of the 343 parents) indicated having irregular visitations, 19% (*n* = 67) indicated having regular visitations, 12% (*n* = 42) parents indicated wanting to investigate the possibility of having visitation, and 149 (43%) parents indicated no interest in investigating the possibility of having visitations.

According to the Judicial Statistics (Courts in Japan, n.d.b, 2005a, 2005b), divorcing parents and relatives can petition the Family Court to obtain child-rearing and support expenses, and visitation; to determine the handover of the children; and to designate the custodial parent. Table 1 shows the number of petitioners in 2002, 2004, and 2006 and the types of petitions submitted.
Table 1

*Types of Petitions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Petition</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child-rearing expenses/support expenses</td>
<td>14261</td>
<td>16861</td>
<td>15372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitation</td>
<td>3184</td>
<td>4419</td>
<td>5197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handover the children</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designating the custodian</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>1095</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A parent or relative may submit one or more petitions.

In 2004, the number of divorcing couples with children was 161,298 (Ministry of Health, Labor and Welfare, 2007a). Of these divorcing couples, 10% petitioned the court for child-rearing or support expenses, and 3% petitioned for parenting time. Petitions involving child-rearing expenses were three to four times more common than petitions involving parenting time (Courts in Japan, n.d.b, 2005a, 2005b). A fewer number of parenting-time petitions filed in Family Court does not necessarily mean that only those non-custodial parents filing parenting-time petitions see their children after divorce, because it is possible for a divorcing couple to develop an agreement about parenting time without going through the Family Court. Even if a couple goes through the Family Court process, the couple may develop an agreement about parenting time by a verbal promise or a legally recognized contract with an attorney.

Under the current Japanese Law, it is not guaranteed that children will see non-custodial parents after divorce because it depends on the parents’ will. Government and prefectures do not have parenting-time guidelines, even though Japan is one of countries
that ratified the Convention of the Rights of the Child, ratified in 1994 (Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, 2007). Article 9-3 of the Convention states the following:

Stated Parties shall respect the right of the child who is separated from one or both parents to maintain personal relations and direct contact with both parents on a regular basis, except if it is contrary to the child’s best interest. (Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, 2007, ¶9)

Given the silence of the Japanese Civil Code on encouraging or requiring parents to develop parenting agreements, the Code does not seem to be carrying out the intent of Article 9-3 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

At present, parents divorcing in Japan are not required to develop a parenting plan. However, there is an effort by some politicians to pass a law a contract about child-rearing expenses and visitation to be a condition of divorce (Izumi, 2005). There appears to be some grass-roots support for such a law. For example, an Internet resource for non-custodial parents, particularly fathers, “Father’s Website” (www.fatherswebsite.com) is advocating for a dual-parental authority system (i.e., shared legal custody) in which parents share parental authority. It is possible for a custodial parent to refuse visitation easily under the current Japanese system (Tanaka, 2005). Even in the process of divorcing through the Family Courts, custodial parents commonly refuse to allow visitation to occur in preparation to fight for parental authority (Ishida, 2002).

In the U.S., when a couple has high conflict, some efforts are made to ease the conflicts between the parents through educational program, mediation by the family court, and referral to private counselors. However, in Japan, sometimes Family Courts reject a claim of visitation when the child exhibits insecurity, or sometimes Family Courts order indirect visitations, such as pictures and videos, to help children who feel insecure. (Tanase, 2007, p. 124)
Confucianism has strongly influenced family life in Japan, including the importance of family stability and family lineage through the eldest son. This influence is seen even in the first generation of Japanese Americans, “Issei” (Shibusawa, 2005; Kitano & Kitano, 1998). Ikeuchi (2005), who owns an educational organization for families, runs an Internet source for families experiencing relationships problems. Once a month, the organization offers a seminar about such topics as law issues, financial problems, and visitation for divorcing and divorced people. Ikeuchi noted the following about the influence of Confucianism on post-divorce visitation in Japan:

Japanese society has the background of Confucianism which values family succession. As long as the couple stays married, their children are treated well as successors, however, once the parents divorce, the children become strangers. [When parents hold different perspectives on post-divorce relationships, i.e., one follows a traditional perspective and the other an American or European belief in shared parenting time post-divorce] just ignoring their cultural background and praising the American and European parenting time idea does not result in successful visitation in Japan. (Ikeuchi, 2005, p. 97)

Ikeuchi (2005) also stated that extended family members such as grandparents can influence their adult children’s attitudes about custody and the appropriateness of post-divorce contact between non-custodial parents and children. She linked such influence to other influences in Japanese culture on the lives of individuals:

There is no place for each person to become mature in Japanese country. It is just only different from each family’s education in their home. It depends on what kind of education is offered in each family. School education expects to become uniformity and cooperation for a long time. Community also expects not to do different from other people. In the society, a company teaches members to understand company’s principal, and to live to follow company’s management policy. In the environment, it is difficult to mature by one’s effort therefore there is a history that most people in Japan are familiar with being raised. (Ikeuchi, 2005, pp. 98-99)
Thus, given the socio-historical expectations of uniformity and that custody should reside with one parent and non-custodial parents should give up interaction with their children post-divorce, divorcing parents may find it difficult to imagine how they themselves could cooperative as co-parents post-divorce (Fuess, 2004; Ikeuchi, 2005).

Parental Authority

Prior to World War II, parental authority in Japan was assigned to the “father in the house” when a couple divorced (Hiroi, 2002). However, with the introduction of the New Civil Code in 1948, parental authority was considered a matter for negotiation between the partners of the divorcing couple. After the introduction of the New Civil Code, a slow shift in who held parental authority began. By 1950, five years after the World War II, 48.7% of fathers had the parental authority, 40.3% of mothers had it, and 11% of others had it (see Figure 10). By 1965, approximately the same percentage of mothers and fathers held parental authority. After 1970, the percentage of mothers holding parental authority continued to increase (Ministry of Health, Labor and Welfare, 2007a). As it was noted earlier in this chapter, today over 80% of mothers and less than 20% of fathers have parental authority.

Hiroi (2002) questioned why fathers would relinquish their children so easily after divorce. She argued that Japanese had valued perpetuating the family lineage due to the influence of Confucianism. She suggested that some may believe mothers, through higher rates of holding parental authority, have destroyed the idea of patriarchy in Japan (Ueno, 1990, as cited by Hiroi, 2002).
However, the view of feminism denied it, and fathers refused and abandoned to raise the children and to support the children financially. In the 1970s, 60% of men who divorced married women who had not been married before, therefore the possibility of having another child might be high. Men would then choose the new family line, and sever old relationships. However, after the 1980s, the rate of divorced men marrying women who had not been married before was decreasing, and in 2000, half of divorced men married divorced women. (Hirai, 2002, pp. 172-174)


Hiroi’s perspective toward increasing number of fathers who fought for parental authority was a new strategy to keep the fathers’ family line (Hiroi, 2002). However, Naoi (2006), citing the increase in the number of support groups for non-custodial parents,
interpreted changes in fathers’ attitudes as indicating they want to have closer relationships with their children post-divorce.

According to Article 820, the Right and Duty of Care and Education, in Section 2 (Effective of Parental Authority) of Chapter IV (Parental Authority) of the current Japanese Civil Code, “A person who exercises parental authority holds the right, and bears the duty, to care for and educate the child” (Cabinet Secretariat, n.d., p. 32).

Economic Conditions Post Divorce

The Ministry of Health, Labor and Welfare (2007b) did a survey of single-parent families in 2006. Cluster sampling was used, and the same areas as the Census 2000 were chosen, and 1,746 families participated in this survey: 1,517 single-mother families, 199 single-father families, 30 other custodial families (e.g., grandparents raising grandchildren). The average of single mother’s annual income was 1,710,000 (approximately $17,100), and a single father’s income was 3,980,000 (approximately $39,800). The average of single mother’s income was under half of the single father’s income. Of 1,517, 465 single mothers worked full-time, and 482 worked part-time. Part-time working single mothers received 43% less annual income than full-time working single mothers.

Data about child-rearing expenses were obtained for 1,209 of the single mothers. Of these, 469 (38.8%) single mothers reported that fathers promised to provide child-rearing expenses, 705 (58.3%) single mothers reported that fathers did not promise to provide child-rearing expenses, and details for 35 (2.9%) were unknown.
Developing a contract and divorcing are separate processes. Of the 1,209 single mothers, 84% \((n = 1012)\) divorced by mutual consent, and 16% \((n = 197)\) divorced by going through Family Court processes. Among the single mothers who divorced by consent, 31.2% \((n = 316)\) were promised child rearing expenses (however, it was not clear whether the promise was official or not) and 65.7% \((n = 665)\) were not promised. Meanwhile, among the single mothers who divorced by going through Family Court processes, 77.7% \((n = 153)\) were promised child-rearing expenses, and 20.3% \((n = 40)\) were not promised.

Of the 1,209 single mothers, 59.1% \((n = 714)\) had never received child-rearing payments. Only 19% \((n = 230)\) of the 1209 single mothers were currently receiving child rearing expenses, and 16% \((n = 194)\) had received payments in the past but not currently. Of those single mothers who had been promised child rearing expenses, 46.1% currently received child rearing expenses, 29.6% had received at least one payment in the past, and 20.5% had never received child rearing expenses.

Housing is another factor to consider in determining a family’s financial condition. Of 1,517 single parents, 34.7% \((n = 527)\) single mothers had their own houses, whereas 58.3% \((n = 116)\) single fathers had their own houses (Ministry of Health, Labor and Welfare, 2007b). Considering factors such as annual income, child-rearing expenses, and housing, it may be said that single mothers’ economic condition is more severely limited than single fathers’.
Odagiri (2005) conducted two qualitative research studies on children whose parents divorced. In the first study, she interviewed 11 children, ages 16 to 22, who experienced parental divorce. The children’s reactions post-divorce included an emotional reaction in which they described feeling grief, anxiety, and anger. They also reported low self-esteem and changing their perspective toward marriage. Some children were told that their parents endured the marriage and did not divorce earlier for sake of the children. However, “no children felt love from the parents when they were told that the parents wanted to divorce but they did not because of the children” (Odagiri, 2005, p. 24).

In the second study, Odagiri observed children in two camps for children whose parents divorced. In the spring camp, Odagiri observed for 3 nights and 4 days, and in the summer camp, she observed for 5 nights and 6 days. Each camp had between 25 to 30 children. The spring camp included children as young as 3 years old, and in summer camp, the youngest children were in the 4th grade (i.e., 10 years old). The oldest were in their lower 20s. This second study focused on the relationship between children and their custodial mothers. The types of the relationships described by the children were categorized into three groups. The first group were children who sought independence from their mothers as soon as possible and looked for someone to love other than their parent, however, they could not find someone so they then isolated themselves. The children in the second group were pulled into the mother’s emotional instability. These children were unable to become independent. The last group was children who took on a
parental role, supporting their mothers, and did not have a life equivalent to their age. Some children reported that when they were younger, they wanted to see their fathers, but they could not ask their mothers because of worrying about the mother’s feelings and because of conflict between the mother and the father. When fathers did not try to see their children, the children blamed the fathers and “felt anger, and some of them felt that he or she was not important to the father” (Odagiri, 2005, p. 31). The researcher concluded that weak relationships between fathers and children led to “low self-esteem” (Odagiri, 2005, p. 31).

Family Problem Information Center (2005) issued a study based on a convenience sample of divorcing parents and children who experienced parental divorce. Data were collected from 101 parents (most of whom were in their 30s and 40s) and 96 children (most of whom were between 10 and 30 years of age but also included adult children who were in their 70s and 80s). Fifty-six people were interviewed, 19 provided data by answering a hardcopy questionnaire, and 122 participated through an online survey. The children listed feeling safe in their home and maturing as positive aspects of their parents’ divorce. They also listed insecure feelings, sadness, blaming and hating themselves as negative aspects of their parents’ divorce. Seventy-one parents (70%) reported that they explained the divorce to the children, and 28 (28%) did not. Twenty-seven children (28%) had wanted more explanation from their parents even though the parents attempted to explain the reasons for the divorce. The authors of this study concluded that “the parents should explain about the divorce accurately” (Family Problem Information Center, 2005, p. 3). Seventeen children had fathers as their custodial parent. Eight of the 17 had visitations by the mothers, and 7 of the 8 had positive feelings toward the visitations.
Another 8 children whose custodial parent was the father had “no explanation about the divorce from their mother” (Family Problem Information Center, 2005, p. 5), and some of them complained about receiving no explanation about the divorce and felt abandoned by their mothers. Seventy children had mothers as their custodial parent; of these, 41 had visitations by the fathers. Thirty-one of 41 children (75%) felt positive about the visitations. Six of them had negative feelings because of the attitude or behaviors of the fathers, such as being drunk when they talked with their children (Family Problem Information Center, 2005).

Divorce and Parents

Odagiri (2001) mentioned that “there were few studies about divorce which has a psychological angle in Japan” (Odagiri, 2001, p. 14). In an attempt to add to the literature, she did structured interviews with 31 divorced mothers from September 2000 to July 2001 in two cities. Most mothers felt free and independent after divorce, but they also felt economically insecure. The mothers were especially concerned the children’s feelings of loss because in most cases they could not see their fathers. She identified four stages after divorce among the mothers. First, they felt shock as a result of the divorce. During the second stage, they struggled with their emotions, and felt various negative feelings such as grief, anger, and depression. During the third stage, the mothers started to accept divorce. In the fourth stage, they were able to talk about their divorce to neighbors and friends and participate in a divorce support group. They also tried to contribute to society by using their experiences (e.g., volunteering). Sometimes the mothers did not progress
through these steps in order, and, at the time of the interview, some of them had not reached last stages (Odagiri, 2001).

The Family Problem Information Center (FPIC) is a public-service organization to support healthy family life. The employees, referred to as counselors, are retired Family Court Officers. This organization reaches out a helping hand and gives advice to persons who are worried about family issues, including people in the process of divorcing. “In the process of divorcing” is defined as couples who divorce by mutual consent, divorce by mediation through Family Courts, divorce by judgment by judges in Family Courts, and divorce by trial (including, reconciliation in trial, accept and agreement in trial, and judgment in trial). FPICs offer annual educational seminars on topics such as the principle of visitation, avoiding placing children in the middle of parents’ dilemmas, and divorce in middle-aged and elderly people. The Centers also provide information on family life through the distribution of a free magazine.

United States

Prevalence of Divorce

The U.S. has one of the highest rates of divorce when compared with other countries (DeGenova & Rice, 2005). Divorce affects many parents and children in the U.S. Approximately 1 million divorces occur in the U.S. annually. These divorces represent the 2% of married couples who divorce (Amato & Irving, 2006) and the more than 1 million children who are affected by parental divorce each year (Amato, 2000).
The number of people who are divorced continues to increase in the U.S. In 2006, 13.1% (22.8 million) of the population 18 years and over was divorced, up from 8.3% (15.1 million) in 1990 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2008). More than half of the people who are separated and recently divorced are in the category of ages 25 to 44, and “most of these women live with their own children under 18 (64 percent of separated and 57 percent of divorced women)” (Kreider & Fields, 2002, p. 14).

Division and Children

Hundreds of studies on children and parental divorced have been published for the past 50 years (Amato, 2000). As a result, much is known about the impact of this family transition on adults and children. Rather than a one-time event, divorce is a process that begins with relationship dissolution and continues after the legal divorce has been granted (Amato, 2000). Former spouses must renegotiate relationships post-divorce if they have children. Numerous stressors can negatively influence co-parental relationships and how parents interact with their children (Adamson & Pasley, 2006). Children’s adjustment to parental divorce appears to be particularly influenced by the post-divorce quality of parenting and the level of inter-parental conflict (Adamsons & Pasley, 2006; Amato, 2000; Oesterreich, 1996).

Children whose parents divorce have an increased risk of “lower educational attainment, greater marital discord, and poorer quality relationships with mothers and fathers” (Amato & Cheadle, 2005, p. 202). It is important to prevent long-term negative outcomes for both parents and children. “Divorce can be seen as having an important impact on public health, and interventions that prevent the negative effects of divorce on
children have major public health significance” (Haine, Sandler, Wolchik, Tein, & Dawson-McClure, 2003, p. 397).

**Process for Obtaining a Divorce**

In contrast to Japan’s history, the regulation of marriage and thus divorce in the Western countries has been greatly influenced by Christianity. Although early Christianity clearly denounced divorce and polygamy, from its establishment through the Middle Ages, the Catholic church often accommodated local customs that allowed for divorce, even no-fault equivalents, and what is now called cohabitation, particularly when such customs concerned the “common folk” (Coontz, 2005, p. 104). However, eventually the Church’s regulation of marriage and divorce spread, along with the assumption that both should fall under the purview of church and, eventually, civil law (Coontz, 2005), and that divorce did not sever parental ties and responsibilities to children.

In the United States, each state governs the granting of marriage licenses and divorces. No-fault divorce laws are found in all states except New York (which will grant a divorce after the couple has a decree of separation and has lived apart for at least a year, thus enabling couples to avoid identifying fault), and many states continue to have fault-based grounds for divorce. Most states require a waiting period of 6 to 12 months before granting a divorce. During this time, parents of minor children often develop a parenting plan that outlines custody arrangements, parenting time schedules, contact procedures, financial arrangements, and other details (Garon, Donner, & Peacock, 2000; Saucy & Saucy, 2005).
Education Programs

Education for divorcing parents is widely offered in the U.S., and evidence suggests that education programs may reduce reported inter-parental conflict and increase parental involvement with children. In addition, divorcing parents in most states are required to develop an agreement about parenting time.

Educating parents to support their children during divorce to improve their adjustment was a motivating factor in the establishment of programs for divorcing parents in the U.S. Started nearly 40 years ago, U.S., court-connected education programs for divorcing parents rapidly increased in the 1990s (Geasler & Blaisure, 1999). Two national studies found that programs were typically offered at the county level, and mandatory attendance was required in some locations, on the basis of state law, local court rule, or a judge’s directive. Most programs charged parents a fee and offered a sliding scale.

Approximately one-half of U.S. counties offered a program, and programs were found in every state (Blaisure & Geasler, 1996; Geasler & Blaisure, 1999).

Evidence suggests that empirically-based programs that concentrate on developing parents’ skills are more likely to affect levels of inter-parental conflict than those programs that focused on morals or are “affect-based” (Kelly & Emery, 2003, p. 360). For example, the Children in the Middle program focuses on teaching skills to keep children out of the middle of parental conflict (Kramer, Arbuthnot, Gordon, Rousis, & Hoza, 1998).

It is evident that mandatory educational program for divorcing parents can teach useful skills that parents are able to learn and use in difficult post divorce family situations. To extent that the use of these skills reduces their own frustrations, anger, and depression and reduces the stresses imposed on children and ex-
spouses, appreciable benefits will accrue not only to the divorcing families but to their schools, courts, and communities. (Arbuthnot & Gordon, 1996, p. 80)

Studies on this program suggest that such skills could be taught and parents who participated in this program reported less conflict with the co-parents than those who did not participate (Arbuthnot & Gordon, 1996; Kramer et al., 1998). Programs may be most useful for parents who report high levels of conflict, triangulate children into their conflict, and exhibit low adaptive parenting (Kremer & Kowal, 1998).

Most programs in use across the U.S. have not undergone thorough and rigorous study due to the cost and difficulty of conducting research in the field. Consumer satisfaction questionnaires to which parents respond at the end of a program or after a one or two months are commonly used as formative evaluations. Parents have reported feeling positive about the program they attended, thinking it should be required, learning about the effects of inappropriate parental conflict, intending to use the information and skills presented, and increasing cooperation with the other parent (see Blaisure & Geasler, 2006).

However, even if education programs and parenting plans are common and regarded as beneficial in the U.S., caution is needed when considering introducing such ideas to another country because of differences in cultural backgrounds (Ikeuchi, 2005). Therefore, it is important to obtain reactions from professionals in Japan who know the dynamics of divorcing and separating families and Japan’s divorce laws in order to determine the type of support that might be useful to divorcing parents.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this current study was to investigate the level of acceptance among professionals in Japan for initiatives and services for families experiencing divorce. Four groups of professionals were invited to participate in a self-administered, paper and pencil survey about their attitudes towards: current Japanese divorce laws and rules; parent-child relationships post-divorce; divorce in Japanese society; education for divorcing parents, including possible program goals, content, location, and instructors; common issues in families; and the future role of Family Courts. Respondents completed questionnaires anonymously and returned them by mail. Returned questionnaires were coded and data were analyzed.

Recruitment

Inclusion Criteria

The following groups of professionals were invited to participate in this study.

Family Court Officers. Family Court Officers investigate various kinds of problems facing divorcing families. Japan has a total of 330 Family Courts: 50 main offices, 203 branch offices, and 77 local offices. The number of the Officers in a Family Court and the names of Officers are not made public, although it is understood that there are approximately five Officers in an office. Therefore, to obtain responses from Family
Court Officers, the researcher sent five research packets to each of the 330 offices \((n = 1,650)\).

*Family Problem Information Center Counselors.* There are nine FPICs in Japan, and five research packets were sent to each office. A total of 45 FPIC counselors were invited to participate in the study.

*Attorneys.* In Japan, attorneys are not easily identified by their specialty areas (e.g., family, business, and criminal). While a list of attorneys in Japan exits, it does not indicate an attorney’s area of expertise, therefore, the Internet was used to find attorneys who advertise that they practice divorce law. Multiple Internet searches resulted in the identification of 40 attorneys who practice divorce law and use web-based advertising of their services.

Supporting the process of divorce is one of the attorney’s tasks whether the process is in a Family Court or not. Not all divorcing people hire an attorney because of the cost. However, attorneys are allowed to represent their clients in Family Court and so they are familiar with the issues facing divorcing parents. Even though a person does not go through the Family Court process for a divorce (i.e., divorces by mutual consent), she or he can consult lawyers to solve the problems related to divorce.

*Faculty.* Faculty members who study families and family dynamics in Japan are typically found in the disciplines of Home Economics and Family Sociology. Professor Suzuki from Yokohama National University provided the researcher with two lists of faculty and their areas of interests in these disciplines. With her help, the researcher identified 232 faculties whose areas of expertise or interest most closely aligned with the topic of this study (i.e., divorce). All faculty who belonged to the Council on Family
Relations of the Japan Society of Home Economics and were included in the list of professors were invited to participate in this study. From the Japan Society of Family Sociology list, faculty with interest areas listed as "divorce," "family stress," "family law," "family policy," "family relations," "parent/child relations," and "family issues," are included, while faculty with interest areas listed as "family finances," "nursing," "family history," "gender," "ethnicity," "age," "family medical treatment," and "sexuality" were not included in the list of faculty to be invited to participate in this study.

*Data Collection Procedures*

While in Japan, the researcher mailed 1,967 research packets over the course of a week. Research packets were mailed to 1,650 Family Court Officers, 45 FPIC counselors, 40 attorneys, and 232 professors. Each research packet contained the following items that were placed in an envelope: a cover letter addressed to each group (Appendix A); a consent document (see Appendix B that also includes a copy of the approval letter from the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board); a questionnaire (Appendix C); a self-addressed, stamped envelope; and a small bookmark as thank-you gift. The return envelopes had a stamp that was effective for one month. All return envelopes were addressed to the researcher’s home address in Japan.

Five research packets were mailed to each Family Court Office and to each FPIC. These five research packets, each in their own envelope, were placed within a larger envelope along with a letter (Appendix D) asking the person who opened the envelope to
distribute the research packets to each Family Court Officer or FPIC counselor in that office. Names of Officers and counselors were unknown.

Individual research packets were mailed directly to attorneys and professors. These research packets were addressed specifically to each individual. The research packet sent to faculty also contained a letter of introduction written by a faculty member, Suzuki (Appendix E), a member of the Council on Family Relations of the Japan Society of Home Economics and the Japan Society of Family Sociology.

All items in the research packet (i.e., cover letter, consent document, questionnaire), the letters to the Family Court Office and to the FPICs, and Professor Suzuki’s introduction letter were in Japanese. The Japanese and English translations of these items are found in the Appendices. The questionnaire was copied in different colors for each professional group to allow for easy calculation of return rate by profession.

A month after the initial mailing, a reminder postcard (Appendix F) was sent to all Family Courts and Family Problem Information Centers. Three questionnaires were returned.

Instrumentation

The 39-item questionnaire contained structured questions and space for additional comments. Questions 1-3 requested demographic information (i.e., age, gender, and profession).

Questions 4 to 10 addressed “laws and rules about divorce” and were based on the work by Toshitani (2007), Tanase (2007), and Ishida (2002). Respondents chose between two or three responses for questions 3-8. For example, respondents were asked to choose
one of three reactions to the current parental authority law: *I approve of the current law that gives parental authority to one of the parents, I prefer that the law be change so that one or both parents could have parental authority, and I prefer that the law be changed in this way...*."

Question 9 had four statements to which respondents were asked to choose from response items ranging on a 5-point Likert-scale: 1 (*important*), 2 (*slightly important*), 3 (*neutral*), 4 (*slightly not important*), and 5 (*not important*). These statements concerned the determination of parental authority, custody, visitation, and child rearing expenses either by parents or by the Family Court on the well-being of children. Question 10 was a checklist from which respondents indicated the details they believed should be in an agreement between parents.

Questions 11 to 24 related to “post-divorce relationships between the parents and children” and were based on the work of Tanase (2007) and Colorado Foundation for Families and Children (2004). Respondents chose between two (i.e., *I agree* or *I disagree*) or three (i.e., *more negative than positive effects, an equal number of negative and positive effects*, and *more positive than negative effects*) responses for questions 11 to 16.

Question 17 had response items ranging on a 5-point Likert-scale from 1 (*agree*) to 3 (*neutral*) and 5 (*disagree*). Question 18 was a checklist from which respondents indicated the ways a non-custodial parent could maintain a close relationship with her or his child. Question 19 asked respondents to consider how a parenting plan might be different from the current visitation contract and to choose from a 3-response rating scale (i.e., *it might be less detailed, it might be the same, and it might be more detailed*).
Question 20 asked respondents to consider the impact of a parenting plan versus a visitation contract and to choose from a 3-response rating scale (i.e., less fulfilling, the same, or more fulfilling). Question 21 addressed parents’ reactions to developing a parenting plan and respondents were asked to choose from a 3-response rating scale (i.e., most parents might disagree, most parents might be neutral, and most parents might agree). Question 22 asked about the amount of education parents might need to develop a parenting plan and respondents are asked to choose from a 3-response rating scale (i.e., no education, some education, and a lot of education). Question 23 was a checklist from which respondents indicated those who should be educated about the need for children to have a relationship with both parents. Question 24 concerned Family Court actions when parents have high conflict. It had five statements to which respondents were asked to choose from a 5-response rating scale with responses from 1 (agree) to 3 (neutral) and 5 (disagree).

Questions 25 to 27 addressed “divorce in Japanese society.” These questions were developed to address the expectation that Japanese divorcing parents rely on tradition to guide their thoughts about post-divorce relationships. The question about an effect of Japanese culture on parents’ attitude toward divorce was based on Ikeuchi’s (2005) observations.

Question 25 concerned reasons for less contact between non-custodial parents and their children. It had four statements with response items ranging on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (agree) to 3 (neutral) and 5 (disagree). Question 26 asked respondents if they thought that Japanese Government was following Article 9-3 of the Convention of the Rights of the Child and encouraging children’s contact with both parents post-divorce.
Response items ranged on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (agree) to 3 (neutral) and 5 (disagree). Question 27 asked respondents to comment on the response selected in question 26.

Questions 28 and 29 concerned the goals of parent education in Japan and were based on previous research conducted by Blaisure and Geasler (1996). Each question had nine responses to which respondents were asked to indicate whether the response was important, neutral, or not important.

Questions 30-34 concerned how education for divorcing parents should be conducted and were based on previous research conducted by Geasler and Blaisure (1999). Question 30 asked respondents to indicate if education about divorcing parents should be required by law and for whom. Question 31 asked who should receive education and respondents were asked to select all that apply from a checklist. Question 32 asked if parents should attend education programs for divorcing parents together or separately. Questions 33 and 34 asked about the timing of offering education for those who pursue divorce by mutual consent or through the Family Court. Four possible responses were: 2 weeks, 1 month, 3 months, and 6 months. Question 34 asked respondents to select from a checklist the locations where parent education could be held. Question 35 asked respondents to select from a checklist the teaching strategies that should be used. Question 36 asked respondents to select from a checklist those professionals who could be possible presenters of educational programs.

Questions 37 asked about issues common to divorcing parents in the U.S. in order to determine if such issues are common in Japan. This question had five statements to which respondents are asked to choose from a 3-response rating scale (i.e., common,
neutral, and not common). Question 38 was an open-ended question, asking respondents to describe other common issues they see between divorcing parents. Question 39 asked about future roles or functions of Family Courts. Respondents were asked to select all appropriate answers from a checklist (Courts in Japan, 2005c).

Protection of Respondents

Returned questionnaires were not traceable to individuals for three main reasons. First, the research packets were sent to Family Court Offices and to FPIC and not to individuals because the names of Officers and counselors were unknown. Second, although the research packets sent to attorneys and to faculty were mailed to specific individuals, there were no procedures used to monitor who returned a questionnaire. Finally, the following statement was included in the consent document, “Please do not put your name on the questionnaire or envelope.” Only one person wrote a name and contact information on a returned questionnaire. This information was cut away from the rest of the questionnaire and not recorded. Except for this one instance, participation in this study was anonymous.

Respondents

A total of 1,967 questionnaires were mailed; 5 research packets sent to faculty were returned undelivered for a total of 1,962 mailed questionnaires. Seventy people returned completed or partially completed questionnaires for an overall response rate of 3.6%.
Five respondents did not choose one of the listed four listed professions; they are noted as “Others” in Table 2. One person who was sent a FPIC research packet did not choose “counselor” but rather wrote that she was a retired Family Court Officer. The other four wrote the following: a post-doctor, a retired high school teacher, a Master’s, and a teacher at a special school. These five respondents were calculated into the overall response rate.

Table 2

Return Rate and Profession of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number Sent Research Packets</th>
<th>Research Packets Returned Unopened</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Court Officers</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPICs</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>17.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorneys</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>23.35&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>1,967</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.57&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Response rate is based on 227. <sup>b</sup> Response rate is based on 1,962.

Thirty-five percent of the respondents were male, and 65% were female. The age of participants ranged from 29 to 81 (see Table 3). The overall mean age was 51.8, median age was 49, and mode age was 47. Two respondents did not report their ages, and two others reported their ages as “early 50s” and “late 50s.” Ages of Family Court
Officers \((n = 3)\) ranged from 30 to 47 \((M = 40.7)\), ages of counselors \((n = 8)\) ranged from 63 to 81 \((M = 76.62)\), ages of attorneys \((n = 2)\) ranged from 31 to 44 \((M = 37.5)\), and ages of professors \((n = 49)\) ranged from 31 to 75 \((M = 50.9)\). The highest mean age was for FPIC counselors who are hired after they retire from the Family Court.

Table 3

*Sex and Mean Age of Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Court Officer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Overview

The current study was designed to investigate the level of acceptance among Family Court Officers, Counselors at the Family Problem Information Centers, family law attorneys, and university faculty in Japan for initiatives and services for families experiencing divorce. Four groups of professionals were surveyed about their attitudes towards current Japanese divorce laws and rules; parent-child relationships post-divorce; divorce in Japanese society; education for divorcing parents, including possible program goals, content, location, and instructors; common issues in families; and the future role of Family Courts. Results are reported through the use of descriptive statistics. Due to a low response, results will be presented for the sample as a whole and not by profession.

Responses to Questions about Divorce Laws and Rules in Japan

The following data concern respondents’ views on divorce laws and rules that address parental authority, visitation agreements, child-rearing expenses, divorce by consent, and custody. As noted in Table 4, 69% of the respondents indicated that they would prefer a change in the law to allow one or both parents to have parental authority. Another 10% (n = 7) also indicated a preference that the law change and provided details on how they prefer the law to change.
Table 4

Preference for a Change in the Civil Law (Article 819)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of Those Responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prefer parental authority assigned to one parent</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer law to change to allow one or both parents to have parental authority</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer a change in the law as indicated in comment area</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three indicated both parents should have parental authority, one of which suggested limitation to this policy in cases of domestic violence. One respondent suggested that children's opinions should be taken into account when determining parental authority; another suggested that the concept of parental authority needs to be examined to determine if only parents can have parental authority; and finally, one suggested that the local city or town be given parental authority in some circumstances. One respondent indicated a preference for a change in the law but did not indicate any details in how the law should be changed.

Seventy-one percent of respondents indicated that parents should be required by law to develop a visitation contract (Table 5). One respondent indicated that there should be exceptions to this requirement for situations involving domestic violence, alcohol abuse, and when it does not promote the welfare of the children.
Table 5

Preference for Visitation Law

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of Those Responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There should not be a law that requires parents to develop a visitation contract</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There should be a law that requires parents to develop a visitation contract</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fifty percent of respondents indicated that the term visitation should be changed to the term of parenting plan (see Table 6). Of 19 who prefer to change the term visitation, 7 suggested Menkai-kouryu (i.e., interviewing and interchanging), 2 indicated Oyako-kouryu (i.e., interchange between parents and children), 1 indicated Mensetu-kouryu (i.e., interviewing and interchanging), 1 indicated Kouryu-keikaku (interchanging plan), 1 indicated Mensetsu-ken (i.e., the right to see the children). Seven respondents indicated that the current term should be changed, but did not describe any details in how the term should be changed.

Sixty-eight percent of respondents indicated the current system of divorce by consent should be continued, and 31.7% indicated preference of change the current system (see Table 7).

Of the 20 who indicated that the current system of divorce by consent should be changed, 16 provided ideas on how the system should change. These ideas are listed in Table 8.
Table 6

*Preference for Term of Visitation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of Those Who Responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use visitation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change visitation to something else</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change visitation to parenting plan</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7

*Preference for Divorce by Consent When the Couple Has Children*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of Those Responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current system should be continued</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current system should be changed other</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions about the importance of determining parental authority, custody, contract for visitation, and contract for child-rearing expenses had response items ranging on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (*important*) to 3 (*neutral*) and 5 (*not important*). Means and distribution frequencies are reported in Table 9. Lower mean scores indicate more item importance, and higher mean scores indicate less item importance. The mean response for determining parental authority was between *important* and *slightly important* \((M = 1.5, SD = 0.79)\). Sixty-three percent indicated that determining parental authority
Table 8

*Additional Ideas about Possible Changes to Divorce by Mutual Consent*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideas</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Courts should be involved in divorce by mutual consent</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents who obtain a divorce by mutual consent should be required to</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>develop a parenting plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents who obtain a divorce by consent should be required to develop</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a contract regarding child rearing expenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process of divorce by consent should involve the right of children</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to state their opinion about their living conditions after divorce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents obtaining a divorce by consent should be supervised by legal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There should be a system that requires and oversees payment child</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rearing expenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulations are needed when parenting plans do not function smoothly</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

was *important*, and 23% indicated it was *slightly important*. No one indicated it was not important.

The mean response for determining custody was between *important* and *slightly important* \((M = 1.5, SD = 0.92)\). Sixty-six percent indicated determining custody was *important*, and 16% indicated it was *slightly important*. Six percent chose *neutral*, and 7% did not answer the question.

The mean response for determining visitation was *slightly important* \((M = 1.6, SD = 0.93)\). Fifty-seven percent indicated that determining a contract of visitation was *important*, and 27% indicated it was *slightly important*. Compared to other items, the rate of *important* was the lowest on determining a contract of visitation. However, including
Table 9

Importance of Determining Parental Authority, Custody, Visitation, and Child-Rearing Expenses on Children's Well-Being

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Slightly Important</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Not Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Mean Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Court or parents determine parental</td>
<td>44 (62.9%)</td>
<td>16 (22.9%)</td>
<td>3 (4.3%)</td>
<td>3 (4.3%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>4 (5.7%)</td>
<td>1.5 (0.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court or parents determine custody</td>
<td>46 (65.7%)</td>
<td>11 (15.7%)</td>
<td>4 (5.7%)</td>
<td>3 (4.3%)</td>
<td>1 (1.4%)</td>
<td>5 (7.1%)</td>
<td>1.5 (0.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contract for visitation</td>
<td>40 (57.1%)</td>
<td>19 (27.1%)</td>
<td>2 (2.9%)</td>
<td>4 (5.7%)</td>
<td>1 (1.4%)</td>
<td>4 (5.7%)</td>
<td>1.6 (0.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court or parents determine contract</td>
<td>57 (81.4%)</td>
<td>9 (12.9%)</td>
<td>2 (2.9%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (2.9%)</td>
<td>1.2 (0.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for child-rearing expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

slightly important, the percentage was 84%. It was higher than important and slightly important on determining custody (81%). The mean response for determining child-rearing expenses was important \((M = 1.2, SD = 0.47)\). Eighty-one percent indicated that determining contract of child rearing expenses was important, and 13% indicated it was slightly important. Both slightly not important and not important were zero. Moreover, the percentage of important and slightly important was the highest (94.3%) in the selections of this question.
Respondents were asked to choose from a list of details those they thought it should be included in a contract of visitation. Respondents could choose as many of the six details listed as they wished as well as add other details. Sixty-eight respondents answered this question. Table 10 lists the details in order of frequency. Four respondents added a detail: Re-examining the contract as the children grow. Two respondents added two other details: staying over the night with non-custodial parent and responsibility for the visitation’s fee, and transportation and visitation’s place. One respondent indicated staying over the night with non-custodial parent, and another respondent indicated transportation. One respondent added, meeting to discuss discipline; and another respondent added, meeting to discuss parenting. One respondent suggested a monthly visitation schedule, and another respondent suggested that children have “the right to reuse a visitation.” Two wrote comments indicating that the parents have to understand the importance of visitation, and one wrote a comment indicating that the contract of visitation is meaningless because the contract is not performed in the most cases.

Responses to Questions about Post-Divorce Relationships Between Parents and Children

The following data concern respondents’ views on post-divorce relationships between the parents and children that address tendency of post-divorce relationships in Japan, activities to develop close relationships, the impact of parenting plan, the best opportunity to educate parents about the importance of post-divorce relationships, and Family Courts’ decisions for the couples who have high conflict to develop a better relationships between the parents and children.
Table 10

*Details to Include in a Visitation Agreement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of visitation</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in activities in children’s school</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of visitation</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The day of visitation (e.g., second Saturday of the month)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting schedule in weekly basis</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting schedule for holidays</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When re-examine the contract as the children grow</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staying over the night with non-custodial parent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility for the visitation’s fee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The place for the visitation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting for discussing about discipline</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting for discussing about parenting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting schedule for a month</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The right that the children can refuse the visitation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of respondents answering question</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 notes the respondents’ reactions to the question about possible effects on children who see both parents after divorce. Sixty-five percent of respondents indicated
that the children who see both parents after divorce were affected more positive than negative.

Table 11

*Effects on Children Who See Both Parents after Divorce*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of Those Responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More negative than positive effects</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An equal amount of negative and positive effects</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More positive than negative effects</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were asked to choose whether they agree or disagree with the following statement: it is best for children if they are raised by one custodial parent because it is a more stable environment than if children see both parents (see Table 12). Eighty-four percent of respondents indicated that they disagreed with the statement. Thirty-one respondents wrote comments indicating that their beliefs depend on the factors of a case. Factors mentioned included, the children’s age and will, the parents’ age and situation, the reason of divorce, and relationships between the parents and children. If the relationships between the children and the parents are good, most respondents agreed with that the children see both parents. A secure situation is also listed as a factor, and five comments mentioned seeing both parents is important for the children as long as the children’s welfare is not at risk. Two indicated that both parents and children have a right to see each other. One indicated that custodial parents should have a supportive attitude.
for visitation. Six respondents indicated a difficulty of responding to this question because it was stated in general terms. One respondent indicated that custodial parent’s remarriage might cause issues.

Table 12

_Belief that It Is Best for Children to Be Raised by One Custodial Parent_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of Those Responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents were asked whether they agree that it is in a child’s best interest if both parents have ongoing post-divorce relationships with the child (see Table 13). Eighty-three percent of the respondents agreed that it was. Twenty-one comments indicated that it depended on the case, therefore it was difficult to decide and discuss in general terms. The factors respondents noting as being important to their thinking about this issue were children’s situation, parents’ age, reason of divorce, and relationships between the father and mother. If the relationships between the parents and children were not bad, the respondents agreed with the idea. Respondents who disagreed listed the following reasons: divorce, alcoholism, domestic violence, and falling into serious debt.

The respondents were asked the preference toward the statement’s idea that it is in the child’s best interest if there is limited contact with the non-custodial parent so that the child can become comfortable in the new family structure (see Table 14). Sixty-six percent of respondents disagreed with this idea, and 33% supported this idea.
Table 13

*Preference that Both Parents Have a Post-Divorce Relationship with the Child*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of Those Responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14

*Limited Contact with Non-Custodial Parent*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Twenty-four respondents wrote comments, and 15 mentioned the decision would be case by case. Two respondents indicated that it was difficult to discuss this idea in general terms. Children's age, ability to understand, situation, emotion, parents' age, reason of divorce were listed as factors to be considered when making a decision. Two indicated that some cases needed limitations. One indicated that the custodial parent needed to have a supportive attitude toward visitation, and the children should see many relatives as long as the children's welfare was not violated. One also indicated that children seeing both parents after divorce was natural.
The respondents were asked if seeing both parents after separation would decrease children’s stress and sense of loss (see Table 15). Seventy-seven percent of respondents agreed with the idea, and 23% disagreed with it. Eighteen respondents wrote comments. Of these 18, 5 agreed with the idea, 4 disagreed with the idea, 2 of them chose both agree and disagree, and 7 did not choose a selection. The 5 respondents who agreed with the idea indicated that the parents’ attitude was a key (e.g., parents needed to set aside their conflicts). It was also case by case. One indicated the authority between the custodial parent and non-custodial parent should be recognized to prevent parents from being influenced by children’s selfish decisions. Of the 4 respondents who disagreed with the idea, 3 mentioned it was case by case, and 1 mentioned the relationship between the parents and the children before divorce should be considered. The 2 respondents who chose both agree and disagree, commented that it depended on the case. Of the 7 respondents who did not choose any selection, 5 commented it was case by case, 1 chose neutral, and 1 indicated agreement if the parents’ attitude was proper.

Table 15

Contact with Both Parents after Separation Decreases Children’s Stress and Sense of Loss

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of Those Responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The respondents were to respond to the following statement: in the case of divorce because of domestic violence, it is proper to have visitation between the non-custodial parent and the children as long as the children’s security and welfare were protected (see Table 16). Thirty-eight percent of respondents agreed with the idea, and 62% of respondents disagreed with the idea. Eighteen respondents wrote comments. Of these 18, 5 agreed with the statement, 7 disagreed, and 6 did not choose any selections. Five respondents who wrote comments and agreed with the idea indicated the children’s security and welfare had to be protected totally in order to agree with this idea. The type of domestic violence, current effects, and relationships between the parent and children should be considered. Seven respondents who wrote comments and disagreed with the idea indicated that the possibility of domestic violence violated the custodial parent and children again, and it was difficult to ensure that children’s security and welfare could be thoroughly protected. Six respondents who wrote comments and did not make any selection indicated difficulty in believing children’s security and welfare could be protected. The type of domestic violence and after care should be considered.

Table 16

Visitation in Cases of Domestic Violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of Those Responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The respondents were asked to determine if fathers and mothers should have a relationship with their children after divorce. This question excluded were those divorces that included domestic violence or drug, alcohol, and sexual abuse (see Table 17). Response items ranged on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (agree) to 3 (neutral) and 5 (disagree). The means and standard deviations are reported in Table 17. A lower mean indicated more item agreement and higher mean scores indicated more item disagreement. The mean response for this question was between agree and slightly agree ($M = 1.6$, $SD = 0.70$). Fifty-three percent of respondents indicated agree, 34% of respondents slightly agreed, 7% indicated neutral, and 1% slightly disagreed. No one indicated disagree, and 4% of respondents did not answer it. More than 85% of respondents indicated they agreed or slightly agreed with having a post-divorce relationship between the parents and children when the divorce did not include domestic violence or drug, alcohol, sexual abuses.

Table 17

*Level of Agreement about Parent-Child Relationship Post-Divorce*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number and Percentage of Respondents</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>No Answer</th>
<th>Mean Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Both father and mother should have a relationship with children after divorce</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6 (0.70)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents were asked to choose from a list of activities those they thought would promote a close relationship between non-custodial parents and their children. Respondents could choose as many of the 13 activities listed as they wished as well as add other activities. Sixty-one respondents answered this question. Table 18 lists the activities in order of frequency. One respondent added 2 other activities: telephone and email contact. Thirteen respondents wrote comments indicating that activities should be chosen with the child's age, gender, and specific wishes in mind.

The respondents were asked to determine whether a parenting plan differed from the current visitation contract (see Table 19). Eighty-three percent of respondents indicated that a parenting plan was more detailed than a contract of visitation, 145 indicated that it was not different, and 3% indicated that a parenting plan was less detailed than a visitation contract. Eleven respondents wrote comments: one of them indicated there was no difference, 6 indicated a parenting plan was more detailed than a visitation contract, and 4 indicated that they did not know what a parenting plan was. A respondent who chose no difference commented that the he or she did not understand what a parenting plan was, and disagreed with a too detailed contract because it offered less flexibility. Of the 6 respondents who indicted that a parenting plan was more detailed than a visitation contract, 3 commented that parenting plan had longer aspects. Still 2 of them indicated that they did not know what a parenting plan was. One described that she or he imaged that the word meant it was more detailed.

The respondents were asked to determine whether a parenting plan had a different impact on parent and child relationships than the current visitation contract (see Table 20). Sixteen percent of respondents indicated that the relationships were no
Table 18

*Activities Non-Custodial Parents Should Do with Their Children*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have dinner with the children</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give advice</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listen to children’s talking</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play with the children</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children stay over the night in non-custodial parent’s house</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in school events</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take care of children</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help with the children’s activities (for example, practicing soccer together)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervise homework</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in the school’s parent/teacher association</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate as a parent volunteer in the children’s class</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask the school to send school report</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop off and pick up children from their activity</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other* telephone and email contact</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of respondents answering question</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

different, and 84% indicated that the relationships were more fulfilling. Five of respondents wrote comments, and the content of a parenting plan was listed as a factor for the relationship between the parents and children.
Table 19

_Difference Between Parenting Plans and Visitation Contracts_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of Those Responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parenting Plan is less detailed than a visitation contract</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no difference between a parenting plan and a visitation contract</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting Plan is more detailed than a visitation contract</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20

_Beliefs about the Impact of a Parenting Plan on Parent/Child Relationships_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of Those Responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The parent/child relationship might be less fulfilling</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no difference</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The parent/child relationship might be more fulfilling</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents were asked to determine how divorcing parents would react to having to develop a parenting plan (Table 21). Twenty-two respondents indicated that most parents might disagree with it, 55% of respondents indicated that most parents might be neutral, and 22% indicated that most parents might agree with it. Seventeen
respondents wrote comments, and 2 of them chose that most parents might disagree with it, 7 chose neutral, 2 chose that most parents might agree with it, and 6 did not answer it. A majority of the comments indicated that it depended on the case. The parents’ personality, relationship, and desire for a close relationship with the children might affect their attitude toward developing a parenting plan.

Table 21

*Parents’ Possible Reaction toward Developing a Parenting Plan*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of Those Responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most parents might disagree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most parents might be neutral</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most parents might agree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents were asked to determine how much education divorcing parents would need to develop a parenting plan (see Table 22). Three percent of respondents indicated that no education was needed, 36% indicated that some education was needed, and 61% indicated that a lot of education was needed. Nine of respondents wrote comments. Of the 9, 2 of them chose some education, 3 chose a lot of education, and 4 did not answer. Two of them who chose some education mentioned the target of the education, and 1 commented that the education should be offered when the couple married or become pregnant. Another commented that the education should be for the parent who wanted to have the education. Two respondent who chose a lot of education
mentioned that education about having the relationship with their children was needed, and one respondent who chose a lot to education asked the meaning of education. In the 4 of no answers, 2 mentioned that education was not needed, but the attitude as a parent was needed. One of them indicated it depends on the case, and another indicated difficulty with answering this question.

Table 22

*Amount of Education Needed about Developing a Parenting Plan*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of Those Responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some education</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot of education</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were asked to choose from a list of effective ways to education those they thought would promote a sense that the need for children to have a relationship with both parents after the divorce. Respondents could choose as many of the ways listed as they wished as well as add other ideas (see Table 23). Sixty-six respondents answered this question. Seventy-four percent of respondents indicated that education for public was an effective way, 68% indicated that education for divorcing parents, and 53% indicated education in Home Economics for high school students. Four respondents added one activity each: education in elementary and junior high school, seminars for families, family education in various ways, and in combination with sexuality education.
Table 23

*Effective Ways to Educate Parents about Children’s Need to Have a Relationship with Both Parents Post-Divorce*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education for the public</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education for divorcing parents</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education in Home Economics for high school students</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education for newly marriage couples</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education for the children who experienced parental divorce</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education in elementary and junior high school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars for families</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family education in various ways</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In combination with sexuality education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>66</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The question asking respondents’ perspectives on the Family Courts’ possible actions for couples who have high conflict had response items ranging on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (agree) to 3 (neutral) and 5 (disagree). The mean and distribution frequencies are reported in Table 24. A lower mean score indicated more item agreement, and higher mean scores indicated more item disagreement. High conflict is defined in this case as distrusting one another, having strong anger toward one another, and being competitive during the court process. Courts in Japan have rejected a claim of visitation
when the child exhibits insecurity and have ordered indirect visitation. The rest of selections were listed as possible future actions.

Table 24

*Possible Actions by Family Courts for the Couples with High Conflict*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number and Percentage of Respondents</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Mean Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reject a claim of visitation when the child exhibits insecurity</td>
<td>18 (25.7%)</td>
<td>26 (37.1%)</td>
<td>14 (20%)</td>
<td>8 (11.4%)</td>
<td>1 (1.4%)</td>
<td>3 (4.3%)</td>
<td>2.2 (1.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order indirect visitations, such as pictures and videos, to help children who feel insecure</td>
<td>23 (32.9%)</td>
<td>25 (35.7%)</td>
<td>14 (20%)</td>
<td>2 (2.9%)</td>
<td>2 (2.9%)</td>
<td>4 (5.7%)</td>
<td>2.0 (0.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send couples to education program, together or separately would reduce parental conflict</td>
<td>27 (38.6%)</td>
<td>25 (35.7%)</td>
<td>13 (18.6%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (1.4%)</td>
<td>4 (5.7%)</td>
<td>1.8 (0.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require parents to attend counseling, together or separately would reduce parental conflict</td>
<td>29 (41.4%)</td>
<td>21 (30%)</td>
<td>12 (17.1%)</td>
<td>1 (1.4%)</td>
<td>2 (2.9%)</td>
<td>5 (7.1%)</td>
<td>1.9 (0.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require parents to develop a parenting plan</td>
<td>18 (25.7%)</td>
<td>26 (37.1%)</td>
<td>19 (27.1%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (2.9%)</td>
<td>5 (7.1%)</td>
<td>2.1 (0.92)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The mean response for whether it was appropriate for the Family Court to reject a claim of visitation when the child exhibits insecurity was *slightly agree* \( (M = 2.2, \ SD = 1.04) \). Sixty-three percent of respondents showed positive perspective toward rejecting a claim of visitation.

The mean response for whether it was appropriate for the Family Court to order indirect visitations, such as pictures and videos, to help children who feel insecure was *slightly agree* \( (M = 2.0, \ SD = 0.98) \). Sixty-nine percent of respondents showed positive perspective toward ordering indirect visitation.

The mean response for sending couples to an education program, either together or separately during the Family Court process or after the divorce was granted, would reduce parental conflict was *slightly agree* \( (M = 1.8, \ SD = 0.85) \). Seventy-four percent of respondents showed positive perspective toward sending couples to an educational program.

The mean response for requiring parents to attend counseling, either together or separately during the Family Court process or after the divorce was granted, would reduce parental conflict was *slightly agree* \( (M = 1.9, \ SD = 0.98) \). Seventy-four percent of respondents showed positive perspective toward requiring parents to attend counseling.

The mean response for if it would be helpful to parents if the Family Court required them to develop a parenting plan was *slightly agree* \( (M = 2.1, \ SD = 0.92) \). Sixty-three percent of respondents showed positive perspective toward requiring parents to develop parenting plan.
Responses to Questions about Divorce in Japanese Society

The following data concerns respondents’ views on divorce in Japanese society. The respondents were asked their perspective toward the Japanese culture’s influences on post-divorce relationship between the children and parents. This question had response items ranging on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (agree) to 3 (neutral) and 5 (disagree). The means are reported in Table 25. A lower mean score indicated more item agreement, and higher mean scores indicated more item disagreement. The mean response by respondents to the item that children whose parents divorce tend not to see their non-custodial parent enough after divorce was slightly agree (\(M = 1.8, SD = 0.96\)). Seventy-three percent of respondents agreed or slightly agreed with the statement.

The mean response for the tendency that non-custodial parents to think of their children as someone else’s children after divorce and therefore it became one of reasons visitation was not enforced was between slightly agree and neutral (\(M = 2.7, SD = 1.2\)). Forty-four percent of respondents chose agree or slightly agree, 23% of them chose neutral, and 21% of them chose slightly disagree or disagree.

The mean response for the question whether parents allow their anger to keep them from visiting their children or allowing visitations to occur was between agree and slightly agree (\(M = 1.5, SD = 0.8\)). Eighty-three percent of respondents chose agree or disagree for the statement; therefore, most of respondents agreed with the tendency that parents’ anger influenced visitations.

The mean response for given the socio-historical expectation of uniformity, divorcing parents find it difficult to imagine how they themselves could cooperate as
Table 25

*Tendency of Japanese Culture to Affect Parents’ Attitude*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number and Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children tend not to see their non-custodial parent enough after divorce.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(31.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One reason that visitation is not enforced is tendency of non-custodial parents to think of their children as someone else’s after divorce.

|                                                                 |       |                |         |                  |         |             |                          |
|                                                                 | 10    | 21             | 16      | 9                | 6       | 8           | 2.7                       |
|                                                                 | (14.3%) | (30%) | (22.9%)    | (12.9%)        | (8.6%) | (11.4%)     | (1.2)                    |

Parents allow their anger to keep them from visiting their children or allowing visitations to occur.

|                                                                 |       |                |         |                  |         |             |                          |
|                                                                 | 37    | 21             | 3       | 1                | 1       | 7           | 1.5                       |
|                                                                 | (52.9%) | (30%) | (4.3%)    | (1.4%)        | (1.4%) | (10%)       | (0.8)                    |

Given the socio-historical expectation of uniformity, divorcing parents find it difficult to imagine how to cooperate as co-parents post-divorce.

|                                                                 |       |                |         |                  |         |             |                          |
|                                                                 | 19    | 26             | 12      | 0                | 4       | 9           | 2.1                       |
|                                                                 | (27.1%) | (37.1%) | (17.1%)  | (0%)             | (5.7%)  | (12.9%)     | (1.05)                   |
co-parents post-divorce was *slightly agree* \((M = 2.1, SD = 1.05)\). Sixty-four percent of respondents chose agree or disagree in influence of socio-historical expectation toward the parenting in post-divorce, 17% chose neutral, and 6% chose disagree.

The respondents were asked to indicate whether Japanese government guaranteed Article 9-3 in the Right of the Child. This question had response items ranging on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (*agree*) to 3 (*neutral*) and 5 (*disagree*). The mean and distribution frequencies are reported in Table 26. A lower mean score indicated more item agreement, and higher mean scores indicated more item disagreement. The mean response was between *neutral* and *slightly disagree* \((M = 3.4, SD = 1.28)\). Slightly disagree had the highest percentage (35.7%). Excluding *no response*, all selections were over 10%.

Table 26

*Respondents' Opinion about Guaranteeing the Right of the Child*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Japanese government guarantees Article 9-3 for divorcing children</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(11.4%)</td>
<td>(12.9%)</td>
<td>(17.1%)</td>
<td>(35.7%)</td>
<td>(18.6%)</td>
<td>(4.3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the respondents who agreed that the Japanese government guaranteed Article 9-3, 7 wrote comments. They commented that Japanese government supported Article 9-3
through the administrative procedures, such as developing a contract of visitation if the parents so wished.

Of the respondents who slightly agreed that the Japanese government guaranteed Article 9-3, 7 respondents wrote the following comments: the Family Courts encouraged couples to develop a contract of visitation, and it affected the couples divorcing by mutual consent; a Family Court will open a visitation center as a test case; mediating custody and contracts of visitation were clearly written in Family Courts; and Japanese law supports it [Article 9-3], but Japanese people do not acknowledge it. According to the comments of those who chose agree and slightly agree, Japanese laws and systems supported Article 9-3 and especially Family Courts that performed it.

Of the respondents who chose neutral, 6 wrote comments. Two respondents mentioned that the Japanese government guaranteed the right, but Japanese people and society did not guarantee it, and the parents were left with the responsibility. However, 1 commented that protecting children’s rights was not enough in Japan. One indicated that it depended on the case.

Of the respondents who slightly disagreed that the Japanese government guaranteed Article 9-3, 14 respondents wrote comments. Of the 14, 3 commented that the Right of Child was not understood correctly by people in Japan. Also, 6 respondents considered the power between the parents’ rights and children’s rights; for example, parents’ situation took priority over the children’s rights, and children’s will is not considered. Three respondents mentioned that children did not see both parents enough after divorce.
Of the respondents who disagreed that the Japanese government guaranteed Article 9-3, 9 respondents wrote comments. Of these 9, 4 respondents commented that law was not enough, i.e., Civil Law did not define right of visitation. Two respondents discussed changing the system of single parental authority. Two mentioned that visitation was not guaranteed for children, and 1 mentioned children’s will and position were not respected. (See Figure 11.)

![Graph showing percentage of respondents](image)

**Figure 11.** Respondents’ Opinion about Guaranteeing the Right of the Child

Responses to Questions about Conducting Education for Divorcing Parents

The following data concern possible goals and contents for parent education in Japan. The respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which a goal was important. Table 27 lists the goals and the level of their importance. The question about the importance of determining the goals of the educational programs had response items ranging on a 3-point Likert scale from 1 (*important*) to 2 (*neutral*) and 3 (*not important*). Means are reported in Table 27. Lower mean scores indicate more item importance, and higher mean scores indicate less item importance.
Table 27

*Possible Goals of Educational Program for Divorcing Parents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce children’s exposure to parental conflict</td>
<td>62 (88.6%)</td>
<td>3 (4.3%)</td>
<td>5 (7.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate divorce adjustment for children</td>
<td>59 (84.3%)</td>
<td>5 (7.1%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase knowledge of the effect of divorce on children</td>
<td>55 (78.6%)</td>
<td>6 (8.6%)</td>
<td>3 (4.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve parenting and co-parenting skills</td>
<td>54 (77.1%)</td>
<td>8 (11.4%)</td>
<td>1 (1.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate divorce adjustment for parents</td>
<td>52 (74.3%)</td>
<td>11 (15.7%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevent or reduce behavioral problems in children</td>
<td>41 (58.6%)</td>
<td>17 (24.3%)</td>
<td>5 (7.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase parental communication</td>
<td>38 (54.3%)</td>
<td>21 (30%)</td>
<td>4 (5.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase understanding of court procedures and legal standards</td>
<td>29 (41.4%)</td>
<td>27 (38.6%)</td>
<td>6 (8.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease complaints to the court and relitigation rates</td>
<td>11 (15.7%)</td>
<td>32 (45.7%)</td>
<td>18 (25.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents understanding children’s un-calm emotions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding diversification of values and living</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The mean response for reducing children’s exposure to parental conflict was *important* \((M = 1.0, SD = 0.21)\). Eighty-nine percent of respondents indicated that it was an important goal for educational program for divorcing parents. The mean response for facilitating divorce adjustment for children was *important* \((M = 1.1, SD = 0.27)\), and 84.3% of respondents chose *important*. The mean response for increasing knowledge of the effect of divorce on children was *important* \((M = 1.2, SD = 0.5)\), and 78.5% of respondents chose *important*. The mean response for improving parenting and co-parenting skills was *important* \((M = 1.2, SD = 0.41)\), and 77.8% of respondents chose *important*. The mean response for facilitating divorce adjustment for parents was *important* \((M = 1.2, SD = 0.38)\), and 74.3% of respondents chose *important*. The mean response for preventing or reducing behavioral problem in children was between *important* and *neutral* \((M = 1.4, SD = 0.64)\), and 58.6% of respondents chose *important*. The mean response for increasing parental communication was between *important* and *neutral* \((M = 1.5, SD = 0.62)\), and 54.3% of respondents chose *important*. The mean response for increasing understanding of court procedures and legal standards was between *important* and *neutral* \((M = 1.6, SD = 0.66)\), and 41.4% of respondents chose *important*. The mean response for decreasing complaints to the court and relegation rate was *neutral* \((M = 2.1, SD = 0.69)\), and 45.5% of respondents chose *neutral*. Excluding the goal of decreasing complaints to the court and relegation rates, other goals had higher rates in *important* than *neutral* and *not important*. Eighty-nine percent of respondents indicated that reducing children’s exposure to parental conflict was an important goal for educational program for divorcing parents. Two of respondents wrote other ideas as a
goal, and one of them was included in the Table 27. Another goal was to understand diversification of values and living, but its level of importance was not indicated.

Questions about the importance of determining contents of the educational programs had response items ranging on a 3-point Likert scale from 1 (important) to 2 (neutral) and 3 (not important). Means and distribution frequencies are reported in Table 28. Lower mean scores indicate more item importance, and higher mean scores indicate less item importance.

The mean response for children’s reactions and adjustment to divorce was important ($M = 1.1$, $SD = 0.2$), and 88.9% of respondents chose important. The mean response for responding to children’s reactions to divorce was important ($M = 1.1$, $SD = 0.24$), and 85.7% of respondents chose important. The mean response for cooperative and parallel parenting was important ($M = 1.1$, $SD = 0.27$), and 85.7% of respondents chose important. The mean response for custody and visitation was important ($M = 1.2$, $SD = 0.38$), and 77.1% of respondents chose important. The mean response for parenting plan was important ($M = 1.2$, $SD = 0.5$), and 77.1% of respondents chose important. The mean response for co-parenting communication skills was important ($M = 1.2$, $SD = 0.5$), and 75.8% of respondents chose important. The mean response for parents’ reactions and adjustment to divorce was between important and neutral ($M = 1.3$, $SD = 0.4$), and 67.1% of respondents chose important and 22.9% of respondents chose neutral. The mean response for parents’ reactions and adjustment to divorce was between important and neutral ($M = 1.3$, $SD = 0.4$), and 67.1% of respondents chose important and 22.9% of respondents chose neutral. The mean response for emotional stages of divorce for adults was between important and neutral ($M = 1.4$, $SD = 0.64$), and 60% of respondents chose
Table 28

Possible Content of an Educational Program for Divorcing Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Number and Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Reactions and Adjustment to Divorce</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(88.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding to Children’s Reactions to Divorce</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(85.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative and Parallel Parenting</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Parallel parenting is when there is no contact</td>
<td>(85.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between the parents, but both parents have</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relationships with the children and raise them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custody and Visitation</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(77.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting Plans</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Parenting plan can include a range of details</td>
<td>(77.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>depending upon the parents’ wishes, but it is a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>detailed contract indicating how both parents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will participate in raising the children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>everyday after divorce.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-parenting Communication Skills</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(75.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ Reactions and Adjustment to Divorce</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(67.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stages of Divorce for Adults</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referrals to Services and Materials</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(40%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other:
- Basic Education for Life

- Parenting Plan after Remarriage
important and 24.2% of respondents chose neutral. The mean response for referrals to services and materials was between important and neutral ($M = 1.7$, $SD = 0.72$), and 40% of respondents chose important and 37.1% of respondents chose neutral.

The percentages of important were higher than neutral and not important in all contents. However, of referral to services and materials, the percentage of important and neutral were close, and the difference was less than 3%.

Basic Education for Life and Parenting Plan after Remarriage were suggested by two respondents.

The following data concern how education for divorcing parents should be conducted. The respondents were asked whether education for divorcing parents should be required by law. Forty-nine percent of respondents indicated that education should be required by law (see Table 29), but that parents’ attendance should be optional.

Table 29

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education should be required for all divorcing parents</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law allows for education but parents’ attendance optional</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education should not be required by law</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>101.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The respondents were asked who should receive education, and Table 30 lists these groups in order of frequency. Eighty-seven percent of respondent indicated that divorcing parents should receive education, and 66% of respondents indicated that parents post-divorce should receive education.

Table 30

*Possible Audiences for Education*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Divorcing parents</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents post-divorce</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never-married parents who are going to separate</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in elementary and Junior high school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorcing, divorced, and never-married parents who want to receive education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school and University students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General public</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of respondents answering question</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents were asked that how should parents attend education programs for divorcing parents (see Table 31). Forty-four percent of respondents indicated that attending education program separately.
The respondents were asked about timing of education for couples who divorce by consent (see Table 32). When education should be offered after the couples submit the divorce notice to the family register. Thirty-two percent of respondents indicated that within a month. The percentage of within two weeks (20%) and within three months (21.5%) were close. Five of respondents wrote "before divorce," and 2 of them wrote “the period should not be set.”

The respondents were asked about timing of education for couples who divorce through Family Court process (Table 33). When education should be offered after the couples first seeks a divorce through family court mediation. Thirty-five percent of respondents chose within a month. Nine of respondents chose other, and 3 of them wrote “before divorce.” Three others wrote, “period should not be set,” “when decide to marry,” and “after mediation is finished.” The rest of others did not mention of the timing of education; however, 1 respondent commented that “the timing of education depends on the person or institution who will offer the education.”

Table 31

*Attendance for Education Program*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of Those Responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Separately</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Together</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not matter</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 32

*Timing of Education for Couples Divorcing by Mutual Consent*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of Those Responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within two weeks</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within a month</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within three months</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within six months</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before divorce</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period should not be set</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents were asked to choose three preferences as places of education (see Table 34). Seventy-six percent of respondents chose Family Courts, and 60% chose counseling offices. Six of respondents chose Other, and of these 6, 2 of them mentioned *non-profit organizations*, and one of them mentioned *universities and colleges*.

Respondents were asked to choose three of the most appropriate teaching strategies for Japanese (see Table 35). *Small group discussion* was the most frequently chosen whereas *large group discussion* which was the least frequently chosen.

The respondents were asked to choose up to four possible types of professionals that should offer education for divorcing parents (Table 36). Seventy-four percent of respondents chose volunteer who experienced Divorce, then counselors, and then Family Court Officers.
Table 33

*Timing of Education for Couples Divorcing through the Family Court Process*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within two weeks</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within a month</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within three months</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within six months</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before divorce</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period should not be set</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When decide to marry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After mediation finished</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>64</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 34

*Possible Places for Education Programs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of Those Responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Courts</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Offices</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Centers</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Centers</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church, temple, shrine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Profit Organizations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities and Colleges</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number of Respondents</strong></td>
<td><strong>68</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 35

Strategies of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of Those Responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Group Discussion</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video or DVD</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role-plays</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill Practice</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handouts</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-awareness Activities</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Assessment Tools</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Material or Website</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Book</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Group Discussion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Respondents</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses to Questions about Common Issues for Divorcing Parents

The following data concern common issues for divorcing parents in Japan, and future roles of Family Courts are discussed. The respondents were asked how common the listed issues for divorcing parents in Japan were. Table 37 lists the issues. Response items ranged on a 3-point Likert scale from 1 (common) to 2 (neutral) and 3 (not common). The mean response for money problems was common ($M = 1.1$, $SD = 0.27$). Eighty-six percent of respondents chose common, and no one indicated that money problems were not common. The mean response for putting down other parent in front of the child was common ($M = 1.2$, $SD = 0.52$), and 74.3% of respondents chose common.
Table 36

*Who Should Offer Education Programs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of Those Responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers who Experienced Divorce</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Court Officers</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Psychiatrists</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Court Mediators</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorneys</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child-care Specialists</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Workers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Counselors</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professors</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatrists</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Court Judges</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers in Elementary, Middle, and High School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Other:
  The educator should be determined by the reason of divorce | 2 | 3.0% |
| Total Number of Respondents                     | 66                    |                              |

The mean response for long distance parenting was common ($M = 1.2, SD = 0.46$), and 68.6% of respondents chose common. The mean response for children carrying messages between parents was between common and neutral ($M = 1.4, SD = 0.79$), and 42.9% of respondents chose common and 28.6% of respondents chose neutral. Nineteen percent of respondents chose not common, which was the highest percentage of any item.
The mean response for quizzing children about other parent and his or her activities was between *common* and *neutral* \( (M = 1.7, SD = 0.7) \), and 40% of respondents chose *common* and 35.7% of respondents chose *neutral*.

Table 37

*Common Issues for Divorcing Parents in Japan*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Common 1</th>
<th>Neutral 2</th>
<th>Not Common 3</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>Mean Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Money Problems</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(85.7%)</td>
<td>(7.1%)</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(7.1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putting Down the Other Parent in Front of the Child</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(74.3%)</td>
<td>(10%)</td>
<td>(4.3%)</td>
<td>(11.4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Distance Parenting</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(68.6%)</td>
<td>(17.1%)</td>
<td>(1.4%)</td>
<td>(12.9%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children Carrying Messages between Parents</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(42.9%)</td>
<td>(28.6%)</td>
<td>(18.6%)</td>
<td>(10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quizzing Children about Other Parent and His or Her Activities</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(40%)</td>
<td>(35.7%)</td>
<td>(11.4%)</td>
<td>(12.9%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents were asked to write other issues that are commonly seen or assumed for divorcing couples in Japan (see Table 38). Twenty-seven respondents wrote concrete examples. One respondent commented about the tendency that in the current law system, most mothers receive parental authority even the mother has a difficult personality, and the preference that mothers receive parental authority should be changed.
Table 38

*Other Possible Issues for Divorcing Parents in Japan*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and Problems</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fighting for parental authority</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandfather and grandmother involved in the issues</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfaithfulness</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward visitation such as custodial parents refuse it and it was rejected because of remarriage</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ personality (e.g., immature)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ psychological problem</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s insecure feelings</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not paying for child rearing expenses</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The problem whether keep the husband’s last name and returning maiden name</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The parents relies on the children</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s psychosomatic disorder</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s desire to dominate women</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents were asked appropriate future role or functions of the Family Courts, and they chose all that reflect their opinion (see Table 39). All of listed roles or functions were over 50%, and “Offer education program for divorcing parents” was chosen by 85% of respondents.
**Table 39**

*Appropriate Future Roles or Functions of Family Courts*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles or Functions</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of Those Responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offer the Education Program for Divorcing Parents</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediation and Judgment for Domestic Matters</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set up the Visitation Center for the Safety Visitation</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer the Education Program for the Children who Experience Divorce</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer the Counseling for Divorcing Parents</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Background Investigations</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer the Counseling for the Children who Experience Divorce</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer the Education Program for the Step Families</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Respondents</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Overview

The purpose of this current study was to investigate the level of acceptance among professionals in Japan for initiatives and services for families experiencing divorce. In this chapter, results are summarized and discussed as follows: laws and rules about divorce in Japanese society, including historical aspects; focusing on children’s interests; visitation and post-divorce relationships; educating the public, parents and high school students in Home Economics; and parenting plans and education programs for parents. Limitations of this study and implications for practice and future research are also discussed.

Laws and Rules about Divorce in Japanese Society
Including Historical Aspects

Prior to WWII, traditional values in Japanese society and families had roots in Confucianism that promoted and expected unity among people, respect of elders and men, and a focus on family rather than on the individual. Patriarchy and the primacy of the family lineage were also emphasized by the Civil Code through such practices as only the “father in the house” could hold parental authority when the couple divorced.
Families saw children primarily as successors, heirs to the family line; therefore, the eldest son was considered the most important child (Hiroi, 2002; Ikeuchi, 2005).

After the WWII, the New Civil Code was introduced in 1948, and parental authority was considered a matter for negotiation between the partners of the divorcing couple; therefore, the New Civil Code took one step toward stopping the facilitation of a male-dominant society. After the introduction of the New Civil Code, a slow shift in parental authority began (Fuess, 2004; Hiroi, 2002). Now, 80% of divorced mothers and less than 20% of divorced fathers hold parental authority (Ministry of Health, Labor and Welfare, 2007a).

However, Japanese society still is influenced by Confucianism, in both positive (e.g., respecting elders) and negative aspects. Hiroi (2002) described that 80% of mothers who had parental authority indicated that fathers still cared about their family line. “Fathers just refused to pay the cost and bring up the children, and received freedom of divorce” (Ueno, 1990, as cited in Hiroi, 2002, p. 172). Until the 1970s, a majority of divorced fathers married never-married women, therefore, the possibility that fathers could begin a new family line was high. After the 1980s, the percentage of marriages between divorced men and never-married women decreased to approximately 30%. However, by 2000, half of divorced men were marrying divorced women, increasing the possibility of divorced men becoming the father of other men’s children (Hiroi, 2002; Ministry of Health, Labor and Welfare, n.d., 2007a). Based on these demographics, an argument can be made that a change in attitude about the importance of the family line is occurring for both men and society at large.
Some argue that with fewer than 20% of fathers having parental authority, most fathers abandoned their responsibility for the cost and bringing up the children while obtaining the freedom of divorce (Ueno, 1990, as cited in Hiroi, 2002). As it was described in Chapter II, single mothers’ economic situations after divorce were more severely limited than single fathers’. Sixty-six percent of couples who divorced by mutual consent and 20% of divorce by going through family court processes did not have a promise of child-rearing expenses. Even when couples had a promise, 20% did not receive child-rearing expenses, and 29.6% were not currently receiving child-rearing expenses.

In this current study 93% of respondents strongly indicated that parents should be required to develop a contract of child-rearing expenses. No respondents indicated that it was “not important” and “slightly not important.” This high percentage supporting child-rearing expenses may reflect an understanding of the severe post-divorce economic situations and a response to the current low rate of paid child-rearing expenses.

As mentioned earlier in this chapter, the influence and practice of patrilineality might be changing in Japan. Only 21.4% of the respondents in this study had positive perspectives toward the current law requiring that only one parent holds parental authority; 78.6% of respondents wish to change the current law. Just over two-thirds of respondents supported the right to choose single or dual parental authority. A majority of respondents wanted the current Japanese law system that assigned parental authority to only one parent changed. Seven decades ago, patriarchy was emphasized by government through the Civil Code, and it is still permeates Japanese culture. Changing the law and
allowing the selection of single or dual parental authority may challenge the patriarchy culture in Japan.

Focusing on Children’s Interest

Responses to questions about child-rearing expenses and parental authority indicate a focus away from values such as patriarchy, unity, family, and respecting men to a refocus on children’s well-being. Responses to questions about education programs for divorcing parents also indicate a focus on the importance of children’s well-being. A majority of respondents believed that goals of an education program should be to reduce children’s exposure to parental conflict, facilitate divorce adjustment for children, and increase knowledge of the effect of divorce on children. A majority of respondents believed that contents of an education program should include the importance of children’s reactions and adjustment to divorce, and responding to children’s reactions to divorce.

When asked about activities non-custodial parents should do to have a relationship with their children, activities to support and facilitate the children’s emotional well-being were supported, and written comments by the respondents conveyed their belief that activities should be chosen with the child’s age, gender, and specific wishes in mind.

Visitation and Post-Divorce Relationships

Respondents strongly supported the idea that parents should be required to develop a contract of visitation. Odagiri (2001) indicated that mothers were especially
concerned about children’s feeling of loss because they could not see their fathers. According to Shinkawa’s (2005) Internet survey, even when parents have a visitation agreement, most do not carry out regular visitation times. Respondents in this present study also indicate their belief that children do not see their non-custodial parent enough after divorce. A majority of respondents indicated that details such as frequency of visitation should be included in a contract of visitation. Establishing a law that parents must develop a contract of visitation may increase the opportunity for children to have more contact with their non-custodial parent.

Respondents in this present study supported the importance of children having contact with both parents post-divorce. Sixty-five percent of respondents indicated their belief that children seeing both parents after divorce had more positive than negative effects, and 83% of respondents agreed that both parents having ongoing post-divorce relationships with their children was in the children’s best interest. Moreover, 77% of respondents indicated that seeing both parents after separation decreases children’s stress and sense of loss, and adjusting to a new family structure is not a reason to keep children from seeing their non-custodial parent. Additionally, 84% of respondents disagreed with the idea that being raised by one custodial parent was best for children because it was a more stable environment. However, in case of divorce by domestic violence, even if the children’s welfare could be protected, 62% of respondents disagreed with having a visitation. If excluding the divorce because of domestic violence or drug, alcohol, and sexual abuse, 87% of respondents agreed or slightly agreed with post-divorce relationship between the parents and children. However, when the couples have high conflict, respondents preferred indirect visitations (e.g., pictures, videos) to be ordered by the
Family Courts. The majority of respondents indicated that it was considered proper to have post-divorce relationships between the parents and children. However, the family’s relationships before divorce should be considered as well.

**Need of Education for the Public, Parents, and High School Students in Home Economics**

Respondents of this study indicated their support for the rights of children to maintain relationships with both parents following divorce. They indicated this support while also acknowledging the continuing influence of cultural factors. As noted above, respondents strongly favored children being raised by both parents post-divorce. This belief is counter to the traditional view that divorce ends the relationship between non-custodial parent and children (Fuess, 2004). However, the respondents slightly agreed with the belief that one of the reasons visitation is not enforced is the tendency for non-custodial parents to think of their children as someone else’s after divorce. The respondents also slightly agreed with the idea that, due to a socio-historical expectation of uniformity, divorcing parents find it difficult to imagine how they themselves could cooperate as co-parents post-divorce.

Respondents noted money problems, putting the other parents down in front of the children, and long distance parenting as common issues facing divorcing parents in Japan. When asked to list other possible problems, four respondents noted the involvement of the grandparents in post-divorce issues. The influence of grandparents toward parents’ attitude and practice of visitation was also noted previously by Ikeuchi (2005).
The majority of respondents indicated that the most effective ways to educate parents about the need for children to have a relationship with both parents post-divorce were educating the public, educating divorcing parents, and educating high school students. The importance of public education seems to indicate an awareness of the influence of the larger society (e.g., grandparents) on families experiencing divorce.

Parenting Plans and Education for Parents

Respondents conveyed their belief that some divorce laws need to be changed. Specifically parents should be provided the opportunity to choose dual parental authority, and should be required to develop a contract for visitation and child-rearing expenses. However, two-third of the respondents wanted divorce by mutual consent to continue. The one-third who wanted divorce by mutual consent to change suggested that family courts should also be involved in divorces by mutual consent, that parents who obtain divorce by mutual consent should be required to develop a parenting plan and a contract regarding child-rearing expenses. Respondents indicated that they perceive parenting plans to be more detailed than visitation contracts and parenting plans might encourage more fulfilling parent/child relationships post-divorce than the current visitation contracts do. However, in order for parents to develop a parenting plan, 35.6% of respondents indicated some education about parenting plans was needed, and 61% of respondents indicated a lot of education was needed.
Limitations

The rate of the data collection is the followings: Family Courts Officers (3/1650, 0.18%), Counselors (8/45, 17.77%), Attorneys (2/40, 5%), and Professors and others (57/232, 24.56%).

Three reasons may explain the low response rate, especially of Family Court Officers. First, Family Court Officers are public officials; therefore, they are discouraged from announcing their own opinion and information through their job. They work under the duty of confidentiality and so may have hesitated to participate in the survey. Also, officers who work in the court system in Japan are expected to follow and operate the current Japanese laws; therefore, they may not consider themselves to be in a position to share their opinions about changing it (Family Court Officer, personal communication, October 15, 2007). Finally, the survey was mailed during the busiest season in Japan and this timing may have negatively affected the response rate. March is the end of an academic year, followed by only two weeks of vacation. A new academic year begins April 1. Businesses follow the same schedule as schools, except for a shorter vacation period. At the end of the academic year, new transfers are usually announced, and some employees have to move their households in order to begin work in a new office.

Another potential limitation of this study is that some respondents left a few questions blank. The respondents were told in the consent document to answer only questions they wished to answer. The question that had the lowest number of responses \( n = 57 \) was the one that asked about the parents’ possible reactions toward the idea of a parenting plan. This may due to parenting plan not having an equivalent term in
Japanese. Seven respondents indicated that they did not understand the meaning of the term *parenting plan* that was translated into Japanese as *Youiku Keikaku*.

The majority of respondents were faculty who were invited to participate in this study because of their membership in either the Council on Family Relations of the Japan Society of Home Economics or the Japan Society of Family Sociology. Consequently, the favorable responses to questions pertaining to the education for divorcing parents and to parent-child relationships post-divorce may reflect the professional identity of the majority of the respondents. This professional identity may have influenced to some degree the choices respondents made regarding the most effective ways to educate Japanese parents about the need for children to have a relationship with both parents post-divorce. The third most popular choice was education in Home Economics for high school students. However, the most common responses to this question were education for the public and education for divorcing parents.

**Implications for Practice**

The results of this study cannot be generalized to the populations surveyed due to the design and to the low response rate. However, as one of the first studies to address education programs and parenting plans, it can serve to promote discussion about services for families experiencing divorce and to suggest ideas for future research.

Based on the results of this study, consideration should be given to providing divorcing parents an option to share parental authority, and to require divorcing parents to develop a more explicit plan regarding the details of custody, visitation, and child-rearing expenses. In the U.S., the practice of developing a parenting plan is commonly known,
and most divorcing parents are required to develop some type of plan. The idea of a parenting plan might become a key to the changing of the system of parental authority and developing a contract of visitation and child-rearing expenses. As noted in Chapter II, 91% of couples divorce by mutual consent in Japan; therefore, additional consideration is needed to determine when submission of a parenting plan would be required (i.e., upon submission of paperwork to the Family Register for a divorce by consent, or at some period of time after the submission of paperwork to the Family Register for a divorce by consent).

Even though the concept of a parenting plan may be a positive one, it is not well known in Japan right now. One-tenth of respondents in this present study indicated that they did not know much about parenting plans, and it was perceived that respondents had difficulty answering the question about parenting plans because of the higher number of no responses than other questions. Therefore, educating not only divorcing parents but the general public might be necessary in preparation for a national discussion to consider the usefulness of parenting plans.

The results of this present study suggest the importance of education. Consideration should be given to educating the public and high school students in Home Economics as indicated by the respondents. Possible ideas to carry out this education include media advertising and writing articles for the popular press (hard copy and the Internet), and discussing the possibility of lesson plans for Home Economics teachers. Lesson plans could include the importance of parents, including non-custodial parents, maintaining relationships with their children post-divorce.
Education should also be offered to separating, divorcing, and divorced parents. Eighty-seven percent of respondents indicated that education should be directed to divorcing parents, 66% indicated education should be directed divorced parents, and 49% indicated education should be directed to never married parents who are going to separate.

As mentioned in Chapter II, education for divorcing parents is widely offered in the U.S. The experience of offering such education programs through family courts in the U.S. may provide a starting point for discussions among parents and professionals.

In the U.S., courts that offer education programs for divorcing parents usually direct parents to these programs after parents file a divorce action but before the divorce is finalized. According to a national survey of county courts, a majority of programs are open to parents who already were divorced but who were petitioning the courts for changes to child support, parenting time, or custody. One-third of the programs surveyed were also open to never-married parents who were engaged in a court action. Approximately two-thirds of counties required parents to attend a program prior to awarding a decree of divorce. Parents were allowed to attend a program together or separately. Typical programs were 2 to 4 hours in length, were held over the course of one or two sessions, and were offered twice per month. A majority of programs focused on supporting children’s adjustment to parental separation and divorce. The professional identity of program facilitators included court workers, family life educators, marriage and family therapists, teachers, attorneys, mediators, psychologists, counselors, social workers, and nurses. Facilitators used a variety of teaching strategies, including lecturing,
showing videos, leading group discussion, engaging parents in role plays, and distributing handouts (Geasler & Blaisure, 1999).

A majority of respondents in this current research suggested that volunteers who have experienced divorce should offer education programs. Respondents also suggested counselors (56%) and Family Court Officers (50%). Typically, Japanese prefer to ask for support from their close relationships (Naoi, 2006); therefore, volunteers who experienced divorce might impress parents more than specialists. However, it might be difficult to expect volunteers to have all of the knowledge and skills necessary to facilitate post-divorce issues and dynamics. Possible standards for facilitators of programs and the best combination of presenters (e.g., counselors and volunteers, men and women) should be discussed and included in any future studies about education programs.

Respondents indicated that education should be offered within at least 3 months of divorce, whether divorce was by mutual consent or through family courts processes. Half of the respondents supported optional attendance; they were split about whether parents should attend together or separately. Attendance policies should be discussed and included in future research. As the teaching strategies, small group discussion was supported by over half of the respondents, and showing videos or DVDs was also supported by nearly half of the respondents. Respondents highly supported the focus on children’s adjustment and children’s rights as a program’s goal and contents.

A majority of respondents indicated that Family Courts and counseling offices were proper locations for education. As for the future role or function of Family Courts, a majority of respondents also expected Family Courts to offer education programs for divorcing parents, and two-thirds of them expected Family Courts to set up visitation
centers. One respondent, a counselor, indicated that there was a proposal to have a visitation center in Family Courts in the future. The possible role of Family Courts in the provision of education services to families experiencing divorce could be discussed and examined in future research.

Implications for Future Research

Research on the public’s and parents’ perspectives on post-divorce relationships between parents and children and post-divorce services is greatly needed. Studies that include divorcing parents, never-married parents, and grandparents would also provide data on how to best serve families.

Possible research designs include surveys, quantitative interviews by telephone. Random selection of research participants is important because most available research on divorcing parents and their children is based on samples of convenience.

Some research on children who experienced parental divorce has been done in Japan. Qualitative data collection methods (e.g., interviews, participant observation) can be an effective way to obtain data on children. More insight into the lives of children whose family has had domestic violence, alcohol/drug/sexual abuse is also needed.

Education efforts and programs for any group (e.g., general public, divorced parents, high school students, children) should include evaluation. Studies of the effectiveness of education of the general public might include survey or focus group designs. Focus groups or qualitative interviews with high school students would provide insight into their reactions to lesson plans. Surveys of high school students could determine the number of students whose parents are divorced and students’ perspectives
on their relationships with their non-custodial parents. Of course, any research with high school students must carefully consider the ethical dimensions of research because they are dependents. Studies of the effectiveness of education programs for divorced, divorcing, and never-married parents should ideally include random assignment to education and control groups and pre- and post-tests and follow-up tests.

Given the low response rate obtained for this current study, additional research on the opinions of Family Court Officers is needed. Likewise, obtaining reactions from judges and mediators would also be beneficial when considering the types and extent of services for families experiencing divorce. These professionals come in contact with the 10% of parents who divorce in ways other than divorce by mutual consent. If professionals who work with the Family Court are reluctant to respond to a survey, perhaps a design using qualitative interviews would be more acceptable.

Also, given the low response rate from attorneys in this study, additional research for attorneys is needed. This researcher was unable to obtain any listing of attorneys by areas of specialty. If a listing does not exist, a survey design using a random selection of all attorneys may be effective. Given that a number of people consult with attorneys about matters related to divorce, attorneys can provide valuable information.

The highest response rate in this present study came from faculty. This response rate may be due to the inclusion a letter of introduction from a faculty member in Japan who was a member of the professional associations to which the research packets were sent. Thus, it is recommended that a letter of introduction from a representative of the group being surveyed be included in any mailings.
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Appendix A

Cover Letter in English and Japanese
March __, 2008

Dear Family Court Officer,
Dear Counselor in Family Problem Information Center
Dear Attorney (who works with divorcing families)
Dear Professor (who concentrates on studying families):

You are invited to learn about a research study on offering education programs to divorcing parents. The student investigator, Akemi Kishimoto, MS, is a graduate student in the department of Family and Consumer Sciences at Western Michigan University in the U.S. and is studying interventions for divorcing families. She has developed a questionnaire to discover the opinions of specialists who work with divorcing families or who study divorcing families, under the guidance of the principal investigator of this research study, Dr. Karen Blaisure, a professor in the department of Family and Consumer Sciences at Western Michigan University.

In the United States, education for the divorcing parents is widely offered through court systems. The investigators would like to know your opinions about the possibility of supporting divorcing parents and their children in Japan through the use of education programs, how such education should be delivered, and what information should be shared.

Please read the enclosed consent document before deciding whether you wish to respond to the questionnaire. We are obligated to you for considering whether to respond to this questionnaire and for considering doing so when you are very busy. It would be most helpful if you do decide to respond, to respond by ___ [date to be determined after HSIRB approval granted].

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Karen Blaisure
Professor

Akemi Kishimoto
Graduate Student
2008年3月 ___日

家庭裁判所調査官様
家族問題情報センターのカウンセラー様
離婚を担当している弁護士様
家族を専門として研究している大学教員様

主任調査員: Karen R. Blaisure, PhD
学生調査員: Akemi Kishimoto MS

調査のお願い

早春の候、皆様にかかわりますご健勝のこととお慶び申し上げます。
離婚する親への教育プログラムの提供に関する調査研究について、ご協力いただくことをお願いいたします。

岸本朱美はアメリカのウェスタンミシガン大学大学院, Department of Family and Consumer Sciences で学び、離婚する家族への教育を専門に研究を進めています。同大学の Department of Family and Consumer Sciences の教員であり、この調査の主任調査員でもある、Dr.Blaisure の指導の下、岸本が調査を作成しました。この調査では、離婚する家族にかかわっている方々、もしくは、その分野について研究されている専門家の皆さんのご意見を伺いたいと考えています。

アメリカでは、離婚する親への教育が、裁判所の組織を通して幅広く提供されています。私たちは、離婚する親への教育プログラムの活用、制度的なことも含めたプログラムの実施方法および内容の検討を通して、日本における離婚を経験する親や子どもたちのための支援の可能性を探りたいと考えています。そのために、皆様のご協力をお願いいたします。

調査に参加されるかどうかを決められる前に、必ず同封の“調査参加にあたっての説明書”をお読み下さい。お忙しい折にこのような依頼を申し上げることはまことに恐縮ではございますが、なにとぞよろしくお願い申し上げます。

調査票を郵送される方は、返信用封筒に入れ、___月___日（　）までにポストに投函していただけたら幸いです。
Appendix B

Consent Document in English and Japanese
and HSIRB Approval Letters
LETTERHEAD

Department of Family and Consumer Sciences
Principal Investigator: Karen R. Blaisure, PhD, LMFT, CFLE
Student Investigator: Akemi Kishimoto

[Japanese Greeting added]
This spring I hope that you are healthy and happy.

You have been invited to participate in a research project, "Supporting Divorcing Parents in Japan." This research is intended to study the attitudes of court officers, counselors, attorneys, and professors in Japan about education for divorcing parents. This project is Akemi Kishimoto’s thesis project.

You are invited to read and respond to the attached questionnaire. It has 39 questions and will take between 20-45 minutes to complete. If you would like to participate in this research study, please answer the questions you wish to, put the questionnaire in the envelope provided, and mail the questionnaire. Please do not put your name on the questionnaire or envelope.

One way in which you may benefit from this research study is having the chance to convey your opinions about how to best help families that are experiencing divorce. Families experiencing divorce may benefit from the knowledge that is gained from this research.

While we know to whom we mailed this invitation or to which office we mailed this invitation, we will not know which individuals responded. Your name will not appear on any papers on which this information is recorded. We will report group data only by profession, age, and sex and not by region or prefectures. Questionnaires will be retained for at least three years in a locked file in the principal investigator’s office.

You may refuse to participate without prejudice or penalty. If you have any questions or concerns about this study, you may contact either Dr. Karen Blaisure at (269) 387-3663 or karen.blaisure@wmich.edu or Ms. Akemi Kishimoto at (269) 387-3663 or akemi.kishimoto@wmich.edu. You may also contact the chair of Human Subjects Institutional Review Board at 269-387-8293 or research-compliance@wmich.edu or the vice president for research at 269-387-8298 or leonard.ginsberg@wmich.edu with any concerns that you have.

This consent document has been approved for use for one year by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board as indicated by the stamped date and signature of the board chair in the upper right corner. Do not participate in this study if the stamped date is more than one year old.

By mailing the questionnaire back to the researchers, you are indicating that you have read the purpose and requirements of the study and that you agree to participate.
家庭と消費者科学

この度、「離婚しようとする親への支援について」（"Supporting Divorcing Parents in Japan"）というテーマの調査にご協力いただきたく、ご案内を申し上げています。この調査は、離婚しようとする親への教育について、家庭裁判所調査官、カウンセラー、弁護士、大学教員の皆さんにご意見を伺うことを意図しております。このプロジェクトは、岸本朱美の修士論文です。

調査の方法は、お読みいただいて答えていただくアンケート方式です。39の質問があり、ご回答には20分から45分程度かかると思われます。この調査に参加いただけた場合は、あなたが答えたい質問のみ、お答えいただいて結構です。そして、記入が終わりましたら、同封した返信用封筒にてご返送くださいますようお願いいたします。あなたのお名前を返信用封筒やアンケート用紙に、書いていただく必要はありません。

このアンケートに回答する利点として、離婚を経験する家族に対するよい支援のある方を境上で、皆様のご意見を反映させる可能性があるといえることが考えられます。この調査で得た情報は、離婚を経験する家族の支援にとって、貴重な資料となることでしょう。

私どもは、ご協力いただいて、これを成果として使うことを控えておりますが、ご協力いただけたかということについては把握できませんし、またいたしません。それゆえ、この調査のデータを使用した論文に、回答者の個人名が使われるときは一切ありません。地域別、年齢別のグループでデータを報告することもありません。このデータは、職業別、年齢別、性別のグループでのみ報告されます。調査票は、その後、主任調査員のファイルで厳密3年間、施錠した上で保管されます。

この調査にご回答いただけないとしても、あなたへの侵害やペナルティーはありません。何か質問や不安な点がございましたら、Dr. Karen Blaisure Tel: アメリカ国内 (269)-387-3663, e-mail: karen.blaisure@wmich.edu か、岸本朱美 Tel: (269)-387-3663, e-mail: akemi.kishimoto@wmich.edu のどちらにも連絡が取ることができます。また、不安な点は、
Human Subject Institutional Review Board Tel: 269-387-8293, e-mail: research-compliance@wmich.edu, Chair Tel: 269-387-8298, e-mail: leonard.ginsberg@wmich.edu

この文書はHuman Subject Institutional Review Boardによって、その目的と目的に沿って、1年間有効と承認されています。

調査員に配布したアンケートを返送したことによって、調査の目的と目的に必要な同意をお願いいたしました。
Date: February 18, 2008

To: Karen Blaisure, Principal Investigator
   Akemi Kishimoto, Student Investigator for thesis

From: Amy Naugle, Ph.D., Chair

Re: HSIRB Project Number: 08-02-17

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research project entitled "Supporting Divorcing Parents in Japan" has been approved under the exempt category of review by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board. The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the application.

Please note that you may only conduct this research exactly in the form it was approved. You must seek specific board approval for any changes in this project. You must also seek reapproval if the project extends beyond the termination date noted below. In addition, if there are any unanticipated adverse reactions or unanticipated events associated with the conduct of this research, you should immediately suspend the project and contact the Chair of the HSIRB for consultation.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

Approval Termination: February 18, 2009
Date: February 28, 2008

To: Karen Blaisure, Principal Investigator
   Akemi Ishimoto, Student Investigator for thesis

From: Amy Naugle, Ph.D., Chair

Re: HSIRB Project Number: 08-02-17

This letter will serve as confirmation that the changes to your research project "Supporting Divorcing Parents in Japan" requested in your memo dated 2/27/2008 (edits to improve phrasing of the Japanese) have been approved by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board.

The conditions and the duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University.

Please note that you may only conduct this research exactly in the form it was approved. You must seek specific board approval for any changes in this project. You must also seek reapproval if the project extends beyond the termination date noted below. In addition, if there are any unanticipated adverse reactions or unanticipated events associated with the conduct of this research, you should immediately suspend the project and contact the Chair of the HSIRB for consultation.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

Approval Termination: February 18, 2009
Date: March 18, 2008

To: Karen Blaisure, Principal Investigator
    Akemi Kishimoto, Student Investigator for thesis

From: Amy Naugle, Ph.D., Chair

Re: HSIRB Project Number: 08-02-17

This letter will serve as confirmation that the changes to your research project "Supporting Divorcing Parents in Japan" requested in your memo dated 3/17/2008 (minor wording changes to survey) have been approved by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board.

The conditions and the duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University.

Please note that you may only conduct this research exactly in the form it was approved. You must seek specific board approval for any changes in this project. You must also seek reapproval if the project extends beyond the termination date noted below. In addition if there are any unanticipated adverse reactions or unanticipated events associated with the conduct of this research, you should immediately suspend the project and contact the Chair of the HSIRB for consultation.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

Approval Termination: February 18, 2009
Date: April 14, 2008

To: Karen Blaisure, Principal Investigator
    Akemi Kishimoto, Student Investigator for thesis

From: Amy Naugle, Ph.D., Chair

Re: HSRIRB Project Number: 08-02-17

This letter will serve as confirmation that the changes to your research project "Supporting Divorcing Parents in Japan" requested in your memo dated April 14, 2008 (add reminder postcard; omit English version of cover letters and consent documents) have been approved by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board.

The conditions and the duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University.

Please note that you may only conduct this research exactly in the form it was approved. You must seek specific board approval for any changes in this project. You must also seek reapproval if the project extends beyond the termination date noted below. In addition if there are any unanticipated adverse reactions or unanticipated events associated with the conduct of this research, you should immediately suspend the project and contact the Chair of the HSRIRB for consultation.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

Approval Termination: February 18, 2009
Appendix C

Questionnaire in English and Japanese
Divorcing Parents and Their Children Questionnaire

Please circle the response that best represents your opinion.

Q1. Please let us know about you, first.
   1) Family Court Officer
   2) Counselor in Family Problem Information Center
   3) Attorney
   4) Professor who concentrates on studying families
   5) Other: __________________________

Q2. Sex: Male or Female

Q3. Age: _____ years old

Laws and Rules about Divorce in Japan

Questions 4 - 8 are about current laws and rules of divorce when there are children. Please circle the response that best represents your opinion.

Q4. The Current Parental Authority Law (Civil Law Article 819)
   1) I approve of the current law that gives parental authority to one of the parents.
   2) I prefer that the law be changed so that one or both parents could have parental authority.
   3) I prefer that the law be changed in this way (please describe below):

Q5. The Law on Visitation
   1) I do not believe there should be a law that requires parents to develop a visitation contract
   2) I believe there should be a law that requires parents to develop a visitation contract
   3) Other:

Q6. The Use of the Term “Visitation”
   1) The term “visitation” is proper and should to be used
   2) The term “visitation” should be changed to ________________.
   3) The term “visitation” should be changed to parenting plan.
Q7. About Child Rearing Expenses
   1) I agree with current laws that state parents have the option to develop an agreement on child rearing expenses.

   2) I believe that the law should change and require parents to develop an agreement about current and future child rearing expenses as a condition to divorce

   3) Other:

Q8. About “Divorce by Consent” When the Couple Has Children
   1) I agree with the current system, and it should be continued.

   2) I believe that the current system should be changed this way (Please describe below)

Q9. About Children Whose Parents Divorce. Please use a circle to indicate the response for each item that best represents your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Slightly Important</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Not Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How important is it for children’s well-being that parental authority is determined by the Court or by the parents?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How important is it for children’s well-being that custody be determined by the court or by the parents?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How important is it for children’s well-being that a contract for visitation be determined by the court or by the parents?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How important is it for children’s well-being that a contract for child-rearing expenses be determined by the court or by the parents?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q10. What details should be included in an agreement about visitation? Please circle one or more of the responses that best represent your opinion.

1) Frequency of visitation
2) Length of visitation
3) The day of visitation (e.g., second Saturday of the month)
4) Visiting schedule in weekly basis
5) Visiting schedule for holidays
6) Participating in activities in children’s school
7) Other:

Post-Divorce Relationships Between Parents and Children

Please let us know your opinion about post-divorce relationships between the parents and the children. Please circle one that you think apply.

Q11. What long-term effects are there for children who see both parents after divorce?

1) More negative than positive effects
2) An equal number of negative and positive effects
3) More positive than negative effects

Q12. It is best for children if they are raised by one custodial parent because it is a more stable environment than if children see both parents.

1) I agree with this statement.
2) I disagree with this statement

If you wish, please comment on your answer to this question.

Q13. It is in the child’s best interest if both parents have ongoing post-divorce relationships with the child.

1) I agree with this statement.
2) I disagree with this statement

If you wish, please comment on your answer to this question.

Q14. After divorce, it is in the child’s best interest if there is limited contact with the non-custodial parent so that the child can become comfortable in the new family structure.

1) I agree with this statement.
2) I disagree with this statement.

If you wish, please comment on your answer to this question.
Q15. Seeing both parents after separation decreases children’s stress and sense of loss.
   1) I agree with this statement
   2) I disagree with this statement
   If you wish, please comment on your answer to this question.

Q16. In case of divorce because of domestic violence, it is proper to have visitation between the non-custodial parent and the children as long as the children’s security and welfare are protected.
   1) I agree with this statement
   2) I disagree with this statement
   If you wish, please comment on your answer to this question.

Q17. Do you agree or disagree that both the father and the mother should have a relationship with their children after divorce? (In this case, exclude those divorces that include domestic violence or drug/alcohol/sexual abuse.)
   1) Agree  2) Slightly Agree  3) Neutral  4) Slightly Disagree  5) Disagree

Q18. What should the non-custodial parent do after the divorce to have a close of a relationship with children? (In this case, exclude those divorces that include domestic violence or drug/alcohol/sexual abuse.) Please circle all that you think apply.

   1) Play with the children
   2) Supervise homework
   3) Take care of children
   4) Listen to children’s talking
   5) Give advice
   6) Drop off and pick up children from their activity
   7) Help with the children’s activities (for example, practicing soccer together)
   8) Have dinner with the children
   9) Children stay over the night in non-custodial parent’s house
   10) Participate in school events
   11) Ask the school to send school report
   12) Participate in the school’s parent/teacher association
   13) Participate as a parent volunteer in the children’s class
   14) Other:
Please let us know your opinion about the possibility of divorcing couples in Japan developing parenting plans. Please circle the response that you think apply.

Q19. Would a parenting plan differ from the current visitation contract?
   1) It might be less detailed.
   2) It might not be different.
   3) It might be more detailed.
   If you wish, please comment on your answer to this question.

Q20. Would a parenting plan have a different impact on parent/child relationships than the current visitation contract?
   1) The relationships might be less fulfilling.
   2) The relationships might not be different.
   3) The relationships might be more fulfilling.
   If you wish, please comment on your answer to this question.

Q21. How would divorcing parents react to having to develop a parenting plan?
   1) Most parents might disagree with it.
   2) Most parents might be neutral.
   3) Most parents might agree with it.
   If you wish, please comment on your answer to this question.

Q22. How much education would divorcing parents need to develop a parenting plan?
   1) No education
   2) Some education
   3) A lot of education
   If you wish, please comment on your answer to this question.

Q23. What would be the most effective ways to education Japanese parents about the need for children to have a relationship with both parents after the divorce? Please circle all that you think apply.
   1) Education for divorcing parents
   2) Education in Home Economics for high school students
   3) Education for newly marriage couples
   4) Education for the children who experienced parental divorce
   5) Education for the public
   6) Other:
Q24. The following statements refer to divorcing couples who have high conflict. High conflict is defined in this case as distrusting one another, having strong anger toward one another, and being competitive during the court process. Please use a circle to indicate your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It is appropriate for the Family Court to reject a claim of visitation when the child exhibits insecurity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It is appropriate for the Family Court to order indirect visitations, such as pictures and videos, to help children who feel insecure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sending couples to an education program, either together or separately during the Family Court process or after the divorce was granted, would reduce parental conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Requiring parents to attend counseling, either together or separately during the Family Court process or after the divorce was granted, would reduce parental conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. It would be helpful to parents if the Family Court required them to develop a parenting plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Divorce in Japanese Society

Q25. What is your response to each statement? Please use a circle to indicate a response for each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Children whose parents divorce tend not to see their non-custodial parent enough after divorce.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. One of the reasons that visitation is not enforced is the tendency of non-custodial parents to think of their children as someone else’s children after divorce.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Parents allow their anger to keep them from visiting their children or allowing visitations to occur.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Given the socio-historical expectation of uniformity, divorcing parents find it difficult to imagine how they themselves could be cooperative as co-parents post-divorce.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q26. Japan is one of the countries that ratified the Convention of the Rights of the Child, ratifying it in 1994. Article 9-3 of the Convention states the following:

Stated Parties shall respect the right of the child who is separated from one or both parents to maintain personal relations and direct contact with both parents on a regular basis, except if it is contrary to the child’s best interest.

Do you think the Japanese Government guarantees Article 9-3 for divorcing children?

1) Agree  2) Slightly Agree  3) Neutral  4) Slightly Disagree  5) Disagree

Q27. Please comment on your answer to question 26 here:


Parent Education

Q28. If education for divorcing parents is offered in Japan, the goal of the program should be to _________. Please circle the answer you think is best for each situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. reduce children’s exposure to parental conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. increase parental communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. facilitate divorce adjustment for children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. prevent or reduce behavioral problems in children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. facilitate divorce adjustment for parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. improve parenting and co-parenting skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. increase knowledge of the effect of divorce on children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. decrease complaints to the court and relegation rates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. increase understanding of court procedures and legal standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q29. If the education for divorcing parents is offered in Japan, the content should include

| 1. Emotional Stages of Divorce for Adults | Important | Neutral | Not Important |
| 2. Parents’ Reactions and Adjustment to Divorce | | |
| 3. Children’s Reactions and Adjustment to Divorce | | |
| 4. Responding to Children’s Reactions to Divorce | | |
| 5. Cooperative and Parallel Parenting |
| *Parallel parenting is when there is no contact between the parents, but both parents have relationships with the children and raise them. | | |
| 6. Co-parenting Communication Skills | | |
| 7. Referrals to Services and Materials | | |
| 8. Custody and Visitation | | |
| 9. Parenting Plans |
| *Parenting plan can include a range of details depending upon the parents’ wishes, but it is a detailed contract indicating how both parents will participate in raising the children everyday after divorce. | | |
| 10. Other | | |

Conducting Education for Divorcing Parents

Q30. In Japan, should education for divorcing parents be required by law? Please choose one that you think should apply.

1) Education should be required by law for all divorcing parents.
2) The law should allow education to be offered but parents’ attendance would be optional.
3) Education should not be required by law.
4) Other (Please describe):

Q31. Who should receive education?
Please choose all of them that you think apply.

1) Divorcing parents
2) Parents post-divorce
3) Never-married parents who are going to separate
4) Other (Please describe):
Q32. How should parents attend education programs for divorcing parents?
1) Separately
2) Together
3) Does not matter

Q33. The following questions ask about the timing of education. Please choose one that you think apply.

For couples who divorce by consent, education should be offered within _________ after the couple submits the divorce notice to the family register.

1) two weeks
2) a month
3) three months
4) six months
5) Other:

For couples who divorce through the Family Court process education should be offered within _________ after the couple first seeks a divorce through family court mediation.

1) two weeks
2) a month
3) three months
4) six months
5) Other:

Q34. Where should education for divorcing parents be held? Please choose your top three places.
1) Family Courts
2) Health Centers
3) Schools
4) Hospitals
5) Community Centers
6) Counseling Offices
7) Churches, temples, shrines
8) Other:
Q35. Which teaching strategies are better for Japanese? Please choose three.

1) Lecture
2) Video or DVD
3) Handouts
4) Large group discussion
5) Small group discussion
6) Workbooks
7) Self-Assessment Tools
8) Role-plays
9) Skill Practice
10) Self-awareness Activities
11) Online material or website
12) Other:

Q36. Who should offer education for divorcing parents? Please choose four.

1) Attorneys
2) Family Court Officers
3) Family Court judges
4) Family Court mediators
5) Counselors
6) School Counselors
7) Teachers in elementary, middle, and high school
8) Professors
9) Child-care specialists
10) Nurses
11) Social workers
12) Volunteers who experienced divorce
13) Clinical psychologists
14) Psychiatrists
15) Other:
Through Your Experiences as a Specialist

Q37. How common are the following issues for divorcing parents?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Common</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Not Common</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Money problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Children carrying messages between parents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Long distance parenting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Quizzing children about other parent and his or her activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Putting down the other parent in front of the child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q38. In addition to the situations in Question 37, what other problems are commonly seen or assumed for divorcing couples in Japan. Please describe it down.

Q39. What are appropriate future roles or functions of the Family Courts? Please choose all that reflect your opinion.

1) Mediation and judgment for domestic matters
2) Family background investigations
3) Offer the education program for divorcing parents
4) Offer the education program for the children who experience divorce
5) Offer the counseling for divorcing parents
6) Offer the counseling for the children who experience divorce
7) Set up the visitation center for the safety visitation
8) Other:

Thank you for participating in this survey by April 9th. Please place the survey in the envelope and mail.
離婚しようとする親および子どもについての調査

はじめに、あなたのことについて教えてください。
問１ あなたは次のどれにあたりますか。
1. 家庭裁判所調査官          2. 家庭問題情報センターのカウンセラー
3. 弁護士                   4. 大学教員
5. その他 ________________

問２ 性別： 男性 ・ 女性

問３ 年齢：__________________歳

日本での離婚における法律わかりりについて

問４～８は、未成年の子どもがいる場合の離婚に関する現行の法律わかりりについて質問しています。それぞれの箇所で、あなたの考えに近いもの１つに○をつけてください。

問４ 現在の親権に関する法律(民法第819条)について
1. 親権者を一方の親に定める現在の法律に賛成である
2. 親権者を一方の親にするか、両方の親にするか、選択できるように法律を改正したほうがよい
3. 親権者について定めている法律を改正したほうがよい

（改正の案について下の欄にお書きください）

問５ 離婚にあたっての面接交渉に関する法律について
1. 面接交渉の取り決めをしなければならないことを法律で規定する必要はない
2. 面接交渉の取り決めをしなければならないことを法律で規定する必要がある
3. その他（具体的にお書き下さい）：______________________________

________________________________________
問6 面接交渉という表現について
1. 面接交渉という表現は適当であり、このまま使われたほうがよい
2. 面接交渉という表現は、別の表現に変えられたほうがよい（具体的に下の欄に書き下さい）
3. 面接交渉という表現は、養育計画(ペアレンティングプラン)に変えられたほうがよい

問7 現在や将来の養育費に関する法律について
1. 現行のように、養育費の取り決めは任意であることに賛成である
2. 養育費についての取り決めを離婚の条件とするように法律は改正されたほうがよい
3. その他（養育費のことについて具体的に書き下さい）

問8 子どもがいる場合の協議離婚の制度についてあなたはどのようにお考えですか。
1. 協議離婚の制度はこのままでよい
2. 協議離婚の制度は変えられたほうがよい（具体的に下の欄に書き下さい）
問9 離婚を経験する子どもについて
1）～4）のそれぞれについて、あなたの考えに近いものを1つの欄に○をつけしてください。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>重要である</th>
<th>どちらかといえば重要</th>
<th>どちらでもない</th>
<th>どちらかといえば重要でない</th>
<th>重要でない</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1）裁判所、又は親によって親権者が決定されることは、子どもの福祉にとってどの程度重要だと思いますか。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2）裁判所、又は親によって監護親が決定されることは、子どもの福祉にとってどの程度重要だと思いますか。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3）裁判所、又は親によって面接交渉の取り決めがされることは、子どもの福祉にとってどの程度重要だと思いますか。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4）裁判所、又は親によって養育費の取り決めがされることは、子どもの福祉にとってどの程度重要だと思いますか。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
問１０ 面接交渉の取り決めにはどのようなことが含まれるとよいでしょうか。
あなたの考えに近いものを全てに〇をつけてください。

1. 面接交渉の回数 2. 面接交渉の長さ
3. 面接交渉の日（例：第二土曜日など） 4. 週を単位とした面接交渉のスケジュール
5. 祝日の面接交渉のスケジュール 6. 子どもの学校行事への参加スケジュール
7. その他（具体的にお書き下さい）

離婚後の親と子どもの関係について

離婚後の親と子どもの関係についてあなたの考えをお聞かせ下さい。
問11〜17では、あなたの考えに近いものを1つに〇をつけてください。
問１１ 離婚後、両方の親に会っている子どもには、長期的にみてどのような影響があると思いますか。
1. ネガティブな影響が、より大きい
2. ポジティブな影響もネガティブな影響も同じくらい
3. ポジティブな影響が、より大きい

問１２「子どもが一つの安定した家族で、一人の親から監護されるということは、両方の親に会うことよりも安定した環境をつくり上げるため、子どもにとって最もよく。」という考えについてどう思いますか。
1. この考え方に賛成である
2. この考え方に反対である
この考え方について、何かお考えがありましたら自由にお書き下さい。

問１３「離婚後、両方の親が子どもに継続的にかかわることは子どもの最善の利益にかなう。」という考えについてどう思いますか。
1. この考え方に賛成である
2. この考え方に反対である
この考え方について、何かお考えがありましたら自由にお書き下さい。
問14「離婚後の新しい家族の中で、子どもに不安を与えないために、非監護親の面接交渉が制限されるのは子どもの最善の利益にかなう。」という考えについてどう思いますか。
1. この考え方贅成である
2. この考え方反対である
この考え方について、何かお考えがありましたら自由にお書き下さい。

問15「親が別居した後に、子どもが両方の親に会うことは、子どものストレスと喪失感を減少させる。」という考えについてどう思いますか。
1. この考え方贅成である
2. この考え方反対である
この考え方について、何かお考えがありましたら自由にお書き下さい。

問16「離婚の原因がDVであっても、子どもの安全と福祉が守られていれば、非監護親も面接交渉権を持つことは当然である。」という考えについてどう思いますか。
1. この考え方贅成である
2. この考え方反対である
この考え方について、何かお考えがありましたら自由にお書き下さい。

問17離婚後も両方の親が子どもにかかわることに、あなたは贅成ですか、反対ですか。
（ただし、離婚の原因が、DV、薬物や飲酒による中毒、性的等の虐待の場合を除きます。）あなたの考えに近いものを1つに○をつけて下さい。
1. 贅成である 2. どちらかといえば 3. どちらでもない 4. どちらかといえば 5. 反対である

贅成である
反対である
問18 あなたは、非監護親が、離婚後も子どもとよい関係を築くために、どのようなかかわりをもったら良いと思われますか（ただし、離婚の原因がDV、薬物や飲酒による中毒、性的な虐待の場合を除きます）。かなわったほうがよいと思うもの全てに〇をつけて下さい。

1．遊ぶ 2．宿題をみる 3．世話をする 4．話を聞く 5．悩みの相談にのる 6．習い事などの送迎迎える 7．習い事などの手助けをする 8．食事をする
例：サッカーの練習を一緒にする
9．子どもが泊まりにくい 10．学校等の行事に参加する 11．成績や日常の記録を学校から送ってもらう 12．学校等のPTAに参加する 13．クラスのボランティアに参加する 14．その他（具体的にお書き下さい）

問19~22 では、離婚するカップルが子どもの養育計画（ペアレントイングプラン）を立てることがについて質問しています。あなたの考えに近いものを1つに〇をつけてください。

問19 養育計画は、現在の面接交渉の取り決めと違いがあると思いますか。
1．面接交渉の方が詳しい内容なのでないか 2．違いがないのでないか 3．養育計画の方が詳しい内容なのでないか
cこの質問の答えについて、何かお考えがありましたら自由にお書き下さい。

問20 養育計画をたてることは、面接交渉の取り決めよりも、両方の親の子どもへのかかわり方に何か違いがあると思いますか。
1．養育計画をたて方が、子どもとのかかわり方が、より希薄になると思う 2．違いはないと思う 3．養育計画をたて方が、子どもとのかかわり方が、より深くなると思う
cこの質問の答えについて、何かお考えがありましたら自由にお書き下さい。
問２１ 離婚する親は養育計画を立てることに対して、どのような反応をすると思いませんか。
1．反対し、受け入れないと思う
2．どちらでもないと思う
3．賛成して、養育計画をたてると思う
この質問の答えについて、何かお考えがありましたら自由にお書き下さい。

問２２ 養育計画を立てるとしたら、離婚する親にはどの程度の教育が必要であると思いますか。
1．全く必要ないと思う
2．多少必要であると思う
3．かなり必要であると思う
この質問の答えについて、何かお考えがありましたら自由にお書き下さい。

問２３ 離婚後、子どもは両方の親にかかわることが必要である、ということを周知するにはどのような教育の場が効果的だと思いますか。あなたの考えに基づいものの全てに〇をつけてください。

1．離婚する親に対する教育
2．家庭科における高校生への教育
3．新婚のカップルに対する教育
4．離婚を経験した子ども達への教育
5．一般の人たちへの教育（例：政府による広告など）
6．その他（具体的にお書き下さい）：_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _
問24 離婚するカップルが高葛藤の状況の場合、次の表の1)～5)の記述についてどのようにお考えですか（高葛藤のカップルの特徴として相互不诚信、相手への強い怒りの気持ち、相手に勝ちたい気持ちなどが上げられます）。
1)～5)のそれぞれについて、あなたの考えに近いもの1つのか枠に○をつけて下さい。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>賛成</th>
<th>どちらかというと賛成</th>
<th>どちらもないと考えない</th>
<th>どちらかというと反対</th>
<th>反対</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1）家庭裁判所が、子どもの情緒不安定を理由として、子どもと非監護親の面接交渉を却下することとは適切である</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2）子どもの情緒不安定を理由とされた場合でも、写真やビデオなどで、子どもの現状を情報提供するという間接的な面接交渉の方法を、家庭裁判所が命じることとは、適切である</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3）家庭裁判所の求めにより、カップルが教育的なプログラムを一緒に行う、または、それぞれに受け取ることは、調停中や離婚後の葛藤を減らすのに有益である</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4）家庭裁判所の求めにより、カップルがカウンセリングを一緒に行う、または、それぞれに受けることは、調停中や離婚後の葛藤を減らすのに有益である</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5）家庭裁判所の求めにより、養育計画を立てることは、カップルにとって葛藤を減らすのに有益である</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
日本社会における離婚について

日本社会における離婚に関する傾向についてご意見をお聞かせ下さい。

問２５ １）～４）の記述についてどのようにお考えですか。

１）～４）のそれぞれについて、あなたの考えに近いもの１つの欄に〇をつけて下さい。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>賛成</th>
<th>どちらかといえば賛成</th>
<th>どちらでもない</th>
<th>どちらかといえば反対</th>
<th>反対</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1）離婚を経験した子ども達は、離婚後、非監護親に充分に会っていない傾向にある</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2）非監護親は、子どもを、離婚によって外に出たよそ者ととらえる傾向があり、面接交渉が行われにくい一因となっている</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3）親の感情によって、面接交渉が行われなかったり、妨げられたりする傾向がある</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4）歴史的・社会的に画一性が求められてきたことによって、独自に離婚後の親としてのイメージを描くことを困難にしている傾向がある</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
問26 日本は子どもの権利条約を批准している国の一つであり、1994年に批准しています。

第9条3項は下記のようになっています。
「締約国は、児童の最善の利益に反する場合を除くほか、父母の一方又は双方から分離されている児童が定期的に父母のいずれとも人間的関係及び直接の接触を維持する権利を尊重する。」

日本政府は、親が離婚をした子どもに対して、子どもの権利条約の第9条3項を保証しているとお考えですか。あなたの考えに近いものを1つに○をつけて下さい。

1.そう思う 2.どちらかといえば 3.どちらでもない 4.どちらかといえば 5.そう思わない

そう思う

そう思わない

問27 問26において、そのように思われる理由をお書きください。
離婚する親への教育について

問28 もし、離婚する親への教育が日本で行われるとしたなら、プログラムの目標は、それぞれどの程度重要であるとお考えですか。
1)〜9)のそれぞれについて、あなたの考えに近いものを1つの欄に○をつけて下さい。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>重要 である</th>
<th>どちらでもない</th>
<th>重要 でない</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) 子どもが親の争いに陥されることを減らす</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)両親のコミュニケーションが増加する</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)子どもの離婚への適応を援助する</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)子どもの問題行動を防止、または、減少させる</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)親の離婚への適応を援助する</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6)自分の子育て、および、離婚した親との共同の子育てのスキルを向上する</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7)子どもへの離婚の影響についての知識を深める</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8)裁判所への申し立てや訴えの数を減らす</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9)裁判所の手続き・過程・法基準の理解を増加する</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10)その他 (具体的にお書き下さい)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
問２９ 離婚する親への教育が日本で行われるとしたら、プログラムの内容はそれぞれどの程度重要であるとお考えですか。

1）～9）のそれぞれについて、あなたの考えに近いものを1つの欄に○をつけて下さい。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>重要である</th>
<th>どちらでもない</th>
<th>重要でない</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1）</td>
<td>離婚に対する大人の心理的過程・段階</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2）</td>
<td>離婚に対する親の反応と適応</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3）</td>
<td>離婚に対する子どもの反応と適応</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4）</td>
<td>子どもの離婚への反応に対する親からの返答・応答</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5）</td>
<td>共同またはパラレルの子育てについての知識</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*パラレル子育てとは、親同士の接触がないが、両親のそれぞれが子どもに関わる子育て</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6）</td>
<td>共同子育てにおけるコミュニケーションスキル</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7）</td>
<td>サービスや教材の紹介・薦め</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8）</td>
<td>監護および面接交渉についての知識</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9）</td>
<td>養育計画・ペアレンティングプランについての知識</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*ペアレンティングプランとは、離婚後両親が子育てにどうかかわるか、子どもがどのように日々すごすかのか、細かい取り決め</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10）</td>
<td>その他（具体的にお書き下さい）：</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
日本における離婚する親の教育の実施について

問30 日本では、法律によって離婚する親の教育を定める必要があると思いますか。
あなたの考えに近いものを1つに○をつけて下さい。
1．離婚する全ての親が教育を受けるように、規定するのがよい
2．教育が提供されるよう規定することはよいが、参加は親の選択にする
3．法律で定める必要はない
4．その他（具体的にお書き下さい）：

問31 離婚する親の教育は、どういう人を対象にしたらよいと思いますか。
あなたの考えに近いものを全てに○をつけて下さい。
1．離婚しようとしている親
2．すでに離婚している親
3．事実婚を解消する親
4．その他（具体的にお書き下さい）：

問32 離婚する親の教育プログラムに参加する親は、どのように参加したらよいと思いますか。
あなたの考えに近いものを1つに○をつけて下さい。
1．両方の親が別々に
2．両方の親が一緒
3．どちらでもよい

問33 離婚する親の教育のタイミングについてお考えがいしします。
（1）協議離婚するカップルの場合、離婚する親の教育は、離婚届を出してからどれくらいの間に、教育を提供されるのがよいと思いますか。あてはまるものの1つに○をつけて下さい。
1．2週間以内
2．1ヶ月以内
3．3ヶ月以内
4．6ヶ月以内
5．その他（具体的にお書き下さい）：
(2) 家庭裁判所のプロセスを通るカップルの場合、離婚する親の教育は、カップルのどちらかが申し立ててから、どれくらいの間に教育を提供されるのがよいと思いますか。あてはまるもの1つに○をつけて下さい。

1. 2週間以内
2. 1ヶ月以内
3. 3ヶ月以内
4. 6ヶ月以内
5. その他（具体的にお書き下さい）：

問34 離婚する親の教育はどこで行われるのがよいでしょうか。

あてはまるものの3つ以内に○をつけて下さい。

1. 家庭裁判所
2. 保健所
3. 学校
4. 病院
5. 公民館やコミュニティーセンター
6. カウンセリングのオフィス
7. 教会・寺院・神社
8. その他（具体的にお書き下さい）：

問35 離婚する親の教育は、日本においてどの指導方法が効果的だと思いますか。

あてはまるものの3つ以内に○をつけて下さい。

1. 講義
2. ビデオやDVD
3. 資料冊子
4. 大グループでのディスカッション
5. 小グループでのディスカッション
6. ワークブック
7. 自己評価票
8. ロールプレイ
9. コミュニケーション等のスキルの練習
10. 自己理解の活動
11. オンライン教材やウェブサイト
12. その他（具体的にお書き下さい）：
問36 離婚する親の教育は誰が行うのがよいですか。あてはまるもの4つ以内に○をつけてください。

1．弁護士  2．家庭裁判所調査官
3．家庭裁判所裁判官  4．家庭裁判所調停員
5．カウンセラー  6．スクールカウンセラー
7．小・中・高の教員  8．大学の教員
9．保健師  10．看護師
11．社会福祉士  12．離婚を経験した親のボランティア
13．臨床心理士  14．精神科医
15．その他（具体的にお書き下さい）：

専門家としての経験を通して
問37 離婚する親には、1）～5）のような問題やもめごとは、どの程度みられますか。または、どの程度あると思いますか。1）～5）のそれぞれについて、あなたの考えに近いものを1つの欄に○をつけて下さい。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>項目</th>
<th>よくある</th>
<th>どちらでもない</th>
<th>あまりない</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1）お金に関するもめごと</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2）両方の親が直接話したくないために、子どもが両方の親から伝言をさせられる</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3）家を出た親が子どもから遠く離れて暮らしているために、子どもとの関係を築いていくことが難しい</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4）一方の親の様子や、子どもの行動を探るために、子どもに質問をくりかえす</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5）子どもの前で、一方の親を非難したり罵ったりする</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
問38 問37でとり上げられた内容以外で、どのような問題やもめごとがよくみられますか、またはよくあると思いますか。自由にお書き下さい。

問39 離婚にかかわる家庭裁判所の役割や機能について、将来的にふさわしいと思うもの全てに○をつけて下さい。
1．家事事件についての調停や審判
2．紛争の背後にある原因の調査
3．離婚する親への教育プログラムの提供
4．離婚を経験する子どもへの教育プログラムの提供
5．離婚する親へのカウンセリングの提供
6．離婚を経験する子どもへのカウンセリングの提供
7．安全な面接交渉のためのビジテーションセンターの設置
8．その他（具体にお書き下さい）：__________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

ご協力ありがとうございます。回答していただいた調査票を、同封した返信用封筒に入れ、4月9日(水)までにポストに投函してください。
Appendix D

Letters to Family Court and to FPIC Counselors in English and Japanese
March, ____ 2008.

[Each group will receive its own letter]

Dear Family Court Officer

Dear Counselors in Family Problem Information Center:

Student researcher, Akemi Kishimoto, MS is a graduate student at Western Michigan University, and is focusing on studying support for divorcing parents. She developed a survey under the guidance of Dr. Karen Blaisure, a professor at the same university. They would like to know Family Court Officers’ opinions about how to support divorcing families.

We would like you to please hand out the enclosed envelopes to the Family Court Officers in your office. We are obligated to you for considering doing so, especially when you are very busy.

Dr. Karen Blaisure
Professor

Akemi Kishimoto, MS
Graduate Student
2008年 3月_日

家庭裁判所調査官様

主任調査員: Karen R. Blasure, PhD
学生調査員: Akemi Kishimoto, MS

調査用紙配布のお願い

時下ますますご清祥のこととお慶び申し上げます。
さて現在、アメリカ、ミシガン州のウエスタンミシガン大学の大学院で
学んでいる岸本朱美は、学生調査員として、離婚する親への支援について
研究を進めています。今回、同大学の Dr. Blasure の指導の下に、調査を
作成しました。この調査の研究者達は、離婚を経験する家族の支援に関し
て、家庭裁判所調査官の皆様に、ご意見を伺いたいと考えています。

同封されている調査用紙の入った封筒を、家庭裁判所調査官の皆様に、
手渡していただけますようお願いいたします。お忙しい折にこのような
依頼を申し上げることは、まことに恐縮ではございますが、なにとぞよろ
しくお願い申し上げます。

Dr. Karen Blasure
Akemi Kishimoto, MS
March, ____ 2008.

Dear Counselors in Family Problem Information Center:

Student researcher, Akemi Kishimoto, MS is a graduate student at Western Michigan University, and is focusing on studying support for divorcing parents. She developed a survey under the guidance of Dr. Karen Blaisure, a professor at the same university. They would like to know Family Court Officers’ opinions about how to support divorcing families.

We would like you to please hand out the enclosed envelopes to the counselors in your Family Problem Information Center. We are obligated to you for considering doing so, especially when you are very busy.

Dr. Karen Blaisure

Akemi Kishimoto, MS
家族問題情報センターのカウンセラー様

主任調査員: Karen R. Blaisure, PhD
学生調査員: Akemi Kishimoto, MS

調査用紙配布のお願い

時下ますますご清祥のこととお慶び申し上げます。
さて現在、アメリカ、ミシガン州のウエスタンミシガン大学の大学院で学んでいる岸本朱美は、学生調査員として、離婚する親への支援について研究を進めております。今回、同大学の Dr.Blaisure の指導の下に、調査を作成しました。この調査の研究者達は、離婚を経験する家族の支援に関して、家族問題情報センターのカウンセラーの皆様に、ご意見を伺いたいと考えています。

同封されている調査用紙の入った封筒を、家族問題情報センターのカウンセラー様の皆様に、手渡していただけますようお願いいたします。お忙しい折にこのような依頼を申し上げることは、まことに恐縮ではございますが、なにとぞよろしくお願い申し上げます。

Dr. Karen Blaisure
Akemi Kishimoto, MS
Appendix E

Letter of Introduction to Faculty in English and Japanese
Dear Colleague:

It is my wish that this letter finds you in fine health and in good fortune.

I am Professor Suzuki at Yokohama National University, Department of Education Human Sciences. I send you this letter with the hope that you might participate in a survey that Mrs. Akemi Kishimoto is conducting.

Mrs. Kishimoto, formerly Akemi Masubuchi, is a graduate with the undergraduate Class of 1992 from the Yokohama National University Department of Education. She continued here as a graduate student and completed a Master of Education degree in 1994. The city of Osaka currently employs her as an elementary school teacher. Since September in 2005, she has been studying at Western Michigan University, Department of Family and Consumer Sciences. Her concentration is Family Life Education; she is interested in education for divorcing parents in the U.S. She is currently drafting her master thesis; the theme is “Supporting Divorcing Parents in Japan” under the guidance of Dr. Karen Blasure.

To aid in the development of her master thesis, she would like to hear opinions about education to support divorcing parents from the Japanese specialists who study families. Therefore, fellow members of the Japan Society of Family Sociology and the Council on Family Relations of the Japan Society of Home Economics, I introduce you to Mrs. Akemi Kishimoto. Besides, I am also the member of Mrs. Kishimoto’s master thesis committee.

Please accept my apology because I know you have a busy schedule. I hope you understand the reasons that I introduced you to her. I hope you also understand the purpose and importance of Mrs. Kishimoto’s survey. I respectfully request your participation in this survey.
2008年 3月 3日

各 位

横浜国立大学教育人間科学部
鈴木 敏子

挨拶

先生方におかれましては、ますますご清祥のこととお喜び申し上げます。
横浜国立大学教育人間科学部の鈴木と申します。この度、岸本朱美が実施する調査にご協力いただき、このようなご依頼のお手紙を差し上げた次第です。

岸本（旧姓増渕）は、1992年に横浜国立大学教育学部を卒業、1994年に同大学教育学研究科（修士課程）を修了した後、大阪市で小学校教員をしております。そして2005年9月から、U.S.A.のシミシガン大学Department of Family and Consumer Sciencesに留学して研究を進めているところです。彼女は、Family Life Educationを専攻して、米国の離婚教育プログラムに関心をもって、Dr. Karen Blaisureの指導のもと、Supporting Divorcing Parents in Japanというテーマで修士論文を作成しております。

その際、離婚する親への支援に関して、日本の家族研究者のご意見をお聞きしたいと考えました。そこで、私も会員であります日本家族社会学会、あるいは（社）日本家政学会家族関係学部会の会員の先生方を紹介させていただいた次第です。なお、私も、彼女のThesis Committeeのメンバーの一人になっています。

ご多忙のところ誠に恐縮ですが、先生をご紹介致しましたことをご了解いただきますとともに、岸本の調査のご依頼の趣旨をご理解いただき、ご協力くださいますよう、よろしくお願い申し上げます。
Appendix F

Reminder Postcard in English and Japanese
Dear Family Court Officer or Counselor in Family Problem Information Center:

Principal Investigator: Karen R. Blaisure, PhD

Student Investigator: Akemi Kishimoto

Student researcher, Akemi Kishimoto, MS is a graduate student at Western Michigan University, and is focusing on studying support for divorcing parents. She developed a survey under the guidance of Dr. Karen Blaisure, a professor at the same university. A few weeks ago the survey was sent to your office.

We would like to know Family Court Officers’ opinion about how to support divorcing families as much as possible, and your opinion is very important and valuable. If you would like another copy of the survey and return envelope, please email or mail me your address and I will send you one. The survey asked you to post it by April 9th, however, we still welcome your participate in this survey after this date. I hope you can take a few moments to your respond to this survey.

Thank you.

e-mail: akemi.kishimoto@wmich.edu
2008年4月14日

家庭裁判所調査官様

家庭問題情報センターのカウンセラー様

主任調査員：Karen R. Blasure, PhD

学生調査員：Akemi Kishimoto MS

時下ますますご清祥のこととお慶び申し上げます。

さて現在、アメリカの西ミシガン大学の大学院生である岸本朱美は、学生調査員として、離婚する親への支援について研究を進めています。同大学のDr.Blasureの指導の下に、岸本朱美が作成した調査を、先日、皆様に郵送しました。

この調査の研究者たちは、離婚を経験する家族の支援に関して、専門家である家庭裁判所調査官の皆様の貴重なご意見を、できるだけ多く伺いたいと考えております。

調査用紙や返信用封筒が必要な場合は、メールや手紙でご連絡いただければ、すぐに送ります。なお、調査用紙には4月9日までに郵送いただけますようお願いしておりますが、9日以降でも、どうぞ皆様の貴重なご意見をお聞かせ下さい。

よろしくお願いいたします。

e-mail: akemi.kishimoto@wmich.edu