The book contains a large number of useful and carefully designed tables interspersed throughout the text and in a sizeable statistical appendix.

Their basic argument is that Americans must choose between creating "new families" or be left with "no families" as more people reject the heavy responsibilities and limitations brought about by marriage and parenting. The main chapters of the book follow the cohort through their young adulthood, their transition to marriage, parenthood, divorce and remarriage, considering changes in husbands' and childrens' share of household tasks, and showing how such factors as their own parents' divorce or setting up an independent household prior to marriage, has affected, and been influenced by, their experience.

A few of the more interesting findings must suffice in a short review. Young women from family households which had been riven by divorce, and those who lived outside a family setting, responded by demonstrating better planning for lifelong employment than others, approval of working mothers, later marriage—and for those who did marry, delayed childbirth. The youngest of these women were much more likely to share domestic chores with husbands and children, and to actively seek to include them. The results for men were more dramatic. Teenage boys in mother-only families were more likely to share responsibility for household tasks, more than teenage girls from two-parent families, building up some skills and knowledge which can be used in the future—hopefully! Experience of family disruption was found to delay marriage for young men, but appeared to result in more egalitarian attitude to, and sharing in "women's work" in their married lives. Furthermore, independent living as young adults had a liberalising effect. The authors suggest that these young men will be more open than their predecessors to the kinds of cooperation and joint responsibility necessary for "new families." The final chapter may well find its way into readers, at least in revised form. Not only are the results ably summarised but they are interwoven with insights about the future of family life, and the likely direction of change.

There are two important variables which are not fully addressed or neglected. Firstly, there is no analysis on the basis of social class as such though educational levels and income have been used as explanatory variables from time to time. Secondly, the children of the "baby boom" grew up during a period of unprecedented affluence in the Western world but have had to cope in their adult lives with the stringencies of economic recession, including widespread redundancy, unemployment, and the anxieties associated with getting a job in the first place, not to mention the problems involved in setting up a household. Surely these factors further constrain the range of choice of young people who may well poignantly recognise the problems they face as partners and parents, and to whom "no family" may be a much more attractive alternative—at least in the shorter term.

The book is nevertheless a most worthwhile contribution to the literature on family life and should be of interest to a wide range of scholars and their students.
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The population that has come to be known as kikokushijo and the "problem" (kikokushijo mondai) it has generated in Japan reveal much about the history, concerns,
and aspirations of its people and nation as they face the 21st century. In scarcely less than twenty years, the term kikokushijo (children returning to Japan from sojourn abroad) has become a term freighted with an ambivalence reflecting the national insularity that foreigners have perennially attributed to Japanese society. That such children should be considered “a problem” was, in fact, a stimulus to my own interest as I cast about for a research problem in the late 70’s. At that time, kikokushijo was not a popularly recognized term, a condition quickly remedied by frequent and focused media treatment of the trials and tribulations of this population of school children. In Japan’s “International Youth”, Roger Goodman admirably documents the emergence of the kikokushijo in the social, cultural, and economic dynamics of post-war Japan, and examines the rhetoric in which it is characterized as a national issue.

It is a fascinating story and it is apparent that Goodman has reviewed an impressive body of literature in researching the complexities of the institutional responses to the kikokushijo. At the center of these complexities is the intense and almost paradoxial concern that the Japanese have for individual educational achievement together with the high value placed upon schooling as the major instrument for the reproduction of a people disciplined by the demands of “groupism.” The educational system developed by the Meiji government was for use as an instrument for the identification, selection, training, and placement of “talent” in the institutional structures of society, not for individual rewards but rather mobilized for the benefit of the larger society. The dynamics of what has been called the “educational mania” in Japan are rooted in this historical effort which has had among its consequences the legitimation of a channel of social mobility for all without regard to family position in the prior feudal order. But as Goodman shows in rich detail, competitive behavior in the classroom is constrained by deference to explicit instruction, by teachers and peers, to maintain the “harmony of the group” (wa). The situation of the kikokushijo is that they are conceived to be burdened by disadvantage in the universal competition for educational achievement as a consequence of the deficits they have acquired in their education and socialization outside the Japanese school system.

Drawing upon his extensive experience as participant and observer in Fujiyama Gakuen, a school conceived and organized to facilitate interaction and exchange between kikokushijo and students who have never been abroad (ippanset), Goodman analyzes the ambivalence with which kikokushijo are viewed. Although the official educational ideology affirms “internationalization” as an educational goal, in this school that enrolled kikokushijo and ippanset students in approximately equal numbers, many teachers considered the former to constitute a definable group, and felt that they had “more demerits than merits” as students, and they were critical of the undesirable effects of the kikokushijo’s attitudes and behavior on the latter. Further, in his review of the research conducted by Japanese educationist and social scientists on the kikokushijo mondai, Goodman finds that researchers uncritically assume that kikokushijo have returned to Japan with negative values, attitudes, and behaviors necessitating programs of educational remediation. Thus, the kikokushijo mondai has generated rhetoric that sponsors a special system of “reception schools” (ukereko) in which kikokushijo would be exposed to a treatment of “adaptation education” (tekio kyoiku) in order to strip them of their foreign experience (gaikoku hagashi) and to “re-dye” (somenaoshì) them in Japanese colors.

A non-Japanese reader presented with this story might reasonably find it a bit bizarre. How is it that this relatively small population of students (which increased from 8,662 in 1971 to 41,155 in 1987) could activate such intensity of response to their homecoming, and how is it that they should command the institutional concern and