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Abstract

This dissertation explores how Japanese youth experience their senses of self through looking into drama/theatre classes in secondary school. To consider the issue of “multicultural coexistence” in Japan with the idea of multiple belongings and the liberation of youth, I explore the ways, if any, in which young people are involved in a radical repositioning or internal qualitative transformation in a productive and affirmative manner, as well as what factors prevent those transformations from occurring. Applying Deleuze and Guattari’s concepts such as “becoming” and “affects,” I especially examine the experiences of acting or performance, in particular the practices of “mimesis,” which refers to embodying the image of “the other” through imagination.

The analysis is based on one year and five months of ethnographic research with high school students at a school in a cosmopolitan but relatively economically deprived area of Tokyo. The narratives emerged from observation in drama classes and in-depth interviews with journal writing and assignments, utilizing a methodology of postqualitative research. As seen through repeated patterns of being stuck, the analysis reveals how the identity category of ethnicity/nationality as well as the notions of “Japaneseness,” “kyara,” and “school caste” rigidly function to territorialize youth, blocking possibilities for them to become otherwise. Reconstructing the gender hierarchy, silencing of the girls’ desire for masculinity, and normalization of the boys’ rejections of femininities formed other patterns. Affects fluctuate with different constellations of possibilities and constraints. The assemblages of femininities and masculinities, and particularly the respective positions within those, form a significant
component of the affective experiences of youth at school. Considering pedagogical aspects, which might have restricted those experiences, I also sketch several points for drama pedagogy to deepen role-playing or acting as a testing ground where new relationality with other bodies is tried out. This study contributes to the educational research that sheds light on the complexities of the affective experiences of youth at school.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

In the middle of the class on the first day of my field work, Mr. Okamoto\(^1\) called the students to gather in front of the blackboard, where the desks were all moved, to decide the main title and the subtitle of the final performance. Taking a glance at me, he said, “let’s go American style” in a big voice with a smile, suggesting that the students sat as they like, such as sitting on the desks\(^2\). I was surprised by his suggestion, due to the rarity of this kind of casual behaviour at a school in Japan. There, in the classrooms, desks and chairs are usually organized neatly in rows. I wondered if he chose the word “American” because of my presence, just arrived from “the West.”\(^3\) Half of the students found spots scattered among the desks.

In front of the blackboard, Mr. Okamoto asked the students to share their thoughts and the images they perceived after reading all of the other students’ drama scripts, collectively titled *Sketches of Daily Life* and written about various aspects of their daily lives. Students answered one by one, with such comments as: “There is a big difference in ‘temperature’ [passion];” and “The tension is different. There is individuality in each;” and “It’s individualistic;” and “I think that everyone brought something different things.” The students’ voices sounded full of surprise and excitement. Urged to elaborate, Maiko mentioned, “I thought that it’s interesting that even the same things are treated differently,” and Nijiho said, “I thought that it’s free. Even if there was a theme of summer break, there are a variety of topics.” I detected excitement among the students regarding the fact that they feel that their individuality is respected, and their opportunity to learn the differences among them in class. Listening to the words of the students and seeing them speak with passion, this drama class seemed to be

---

\(^1\) Pseudonyms are used to maintain confidentiality of participants and their respective schools.

\(^2\) In this study, I wish to present translations of the subjects’ comments in a tone of English that is as close to the original Japanese as possible and therefore will apply non-academic language in such quotes.

\(^3\) I was back from Canada. However, it is often the case in Japan that “the West” almost automatically refers to the United States, while different nationalities such as Canadians or Australians are not seriously considered.
somehow a different space from other classes at school in Japan, where rigidity, uniformity, and a focus on passing entrance examinations are often central.

To continue the discussion, Mr. Okamoto asked the students how they perceived themselves, and Maiko said, “We are small. These small selves together make up the earth.” To which Mr. Okamoto replied, “Oh, the conversation has suddenly become big. It’s about globalism.” Students laughed. After several exchanges among students, they decided the main title of the class performance would be “Puzzle Pieces,” which they said represents when “small things gather and connect” and “individuality.”

Moving into the discussion for creating the subtitle of *Sketches of Daily Life*, students started talking about affect in their daily lives. As for the subtitle, Inoue-kun⁴ suggested, “fatigue to and fro,” and Mr. Okamoto asked him, “What part of you does the word represent? It’s different from being young, energetic, and glittery, right?” said Mr. Okamoto. Inoue-kun replied, “It’s different now. Everything is languid. An athletic meet is languid. There is a feeling of fatigue.” As if other students agreed with him, they joined in to explain the feeling, saying, “the same things continue for too long” and “fatigue in our daily lives.” Inoue-kun explained further, saying, “the example is my current self. For example, I get up late in the morning, look for friends to and fro, and go to Ikebukuro even if there is no place that we [his friends and Inoue-kun] want to go to.” Mika shouted in a big voice, “I know what you mean!” indicating that she too was also often feeling such fatigue. Inoue-kun continued by saying, “We don’t have money for karaoke and even if we go to a game center [video game arcade], we are not able to do anything.” Mika added, “No plans!” and Inoue-kun continued, “We do things without any plan, just to do them. Then most of the time we fail, but sometimes we succeed.” Then, he

⁴ Kun is a suffix often added to a boy’s name.
ended his statement by mentioning, “That’s like, it’s a better level than NEETs⁵ but on a lower level than normal high school students.” Listening to Inoue-kun talking, other students nodded in agreement. Soon after, however, responding to the word “normal,” Mr. Okamoto suggested students not think that they are either normal or not normal. Students stopped chatting and laughing in an instant.

Taking his turn, Tomo explained the meaning of “to and fro,” connecting with the image of the salaryman⁶. Tomo suddenly stood up and said, “It’s like this,” moving his body and speaking in a depressed voice. He opened his mouth widely, moving his chin left and right and up and down, working his facial muscles expansively, letting his arms hang at both sides slackly and moving his legs like he had lost all energy, then falling on the floor a moment later. He said, “It’s like bye bye, just like that,” indicating the merciless life of the salaryman. Adding the interpretation of “to and fro,” other students also said such ideas as: “It’s like chaos;” “indecision;” “tedious;” and “It’s like emotion. Unstable.”

Throughout the discussion over “to and fro,” which became part of the subtitle of their final performance, Sketches of Daily Life, students repeatedly mentioned their turmoil by remarking on the feeling of dullness and a lack of any clear goals or directions in their lives. What I was intrigued about through those conversations was primarily the fact that students actually expressed and shared their thoughts on their lives in class, especially about what they were feeling in their daily lives. Although it was the feeling of fatigue or dullness rather than happiness or enjoyment that they expressed, it showed that their experiences, and their affective experiences in particular, were a significant part of learning in class. This scene looked very

---

⁵ The term NEETs refers to a sociological term that has become well known in Japan, an abbreviation of “Not in Education, Employment or Training.”

⁶ The term salaryman, rendered as sarariiman in Japanese, refers to the figure of “the besuited urban, white-collar office worker/business executive” (Dasgupta, 2013, p. 1).
different from other classes at school in Japan where the passive acquisition of knowledge was the central focus.

Another point that struck me was how repeatedly feelings of dullness or fatigue were mentioned. Nakanishi (2004), a scholar of youth studies, points out that the youth today are currently suffering from fatigue in that they cannot hold hope for the future in Japan. It was as if these students were providing proof of this argument. Mr. Okamoto added another layer of interpretation with regard to the feelings of those students after the class. In a teacher room, Mr. Okamoto told me that he believes students think that “people who perspire hard while heading straight for their own goal” are the “normal people,” and that they are different from them, implying that the students in drama class at Akane feel that they are less than “normal.” The assumption behind those ideas is that those who are energetic and have passion in their lives with a clear plan were regarded as better and more centred, while those who are not so energetic and lack any plan are positioned lower in the hierarchy and marginalized. In an interview, measuring strictness in daily lives as a criterion, Inoue-kun stated that their position is in the middle between the “normal people” (whose day-to-day rhythm is precise) and the NEETs who do nothing.

In addition, describing the overall tendency of Japanese youth as he saw it, Mr. Okamoto stated, “While when the [so-called] entrance examination war was severe, students had things for them to be absorbed by, but now, almost everyone can go to university and everything is loose so that I think that growing up and going into the adult world makes them feel empty.”

Listening to these ideas, I was intrigued by how highly affectis regarded as an indicator for the condition of the lives of youth. This point was also deliberately outlined in a later interview with Inoue-kun. Reflecting on his words in class at that time, he elaborated on what he had tried to say. Inoue-kun explained that failure or success can be judged by his own emotion,
that is, “the feeling of dullness” or “the feeling of fun.” He said that feeling dull is different from both “the feeling of dislike” and “the feeling of not wanting to do something,” but “it’s more like being bored about daily life.” He stated that a feeling of fun could often emerge after something different happened to interrupt the repetition of their daily lives. Affects such as being bored or having fun are important factors by which students measure up the value of their lives.

As such, the drama class was the place where many students agreed that “individuality” is respected and that their affects were expressed and taken seriously. This was the context in which I conducted my research, looking at how these affects flow or do not in the process of “self-making” by youths at school in a cosmopolitan but relatively economically deficient area of Tokyo.

**Research Context**

**Liberation through engaging with difference.** Through increased human mobility, as well as the spread of the Internet and other diverse media, the current phenomena of transculturality and cultural inter-relatedness create pluri-ethnic, polylingual, and multicultural social spaces. Exposed to new cultural images, ideas, and values, and encountering “the other” more commonly in daily life, young people now live in a more diverse, complicated, and uncertain world than ever before (Best & Kellner, 2003). Recent critical youth studies illustrate the process of youth self-formation in relation with diverse “others” locally and globally (Maira & Soep, 2004). Wandering within and between multiple borders marked by “otherness” and “difference,” now young people can construct themselves in more diverse interactive relationships. These processes might increase the opportunity to become conscious of, and to
critically reflect on, the relations not just with the other beyond the nation but with the other within the nation, which has been historically constructed.

In spite of a qualitative proliferation of differences, however, what occurs instead in the capitalist society is called “a commodified form of pluralism” (Braidotti, 2011). While the commodity object enables subjects to have a close encounter with a distant “other,” “global multiculturalism promotes a fashionable market for diversity, which commodifies different ethnicities and races” (p. 6). Referring to the contemporary “mediascape” (Featherstone, 1990), that is, the global cultural flows of images and objects, Ahmed mentions imaginative boundaries as follows:

The flow of cultural images and objects which play with “otherness” and “difference” may serve to reproduce as well as threaten the imaginary boundaries between social or racial groups. The flow of images and objects across border lines incites us to consider how identity is reconstituted in an intimate relationship to “the strange” and the exotic. (2000, p. 116, italics in original)

Then, the important question is how the materiality of bodies experiences the boundaries in advanced capitalism, which claims to be “immaterial” and “flowing.”

The possibility of engaging with transgressive dialogue declines when nationalism is reinforced. Media culture and cultural products have been increasingly produced to gain national interests (Iwabuchi, 2007). Stating that a nation is a social construct produced as a result of modernity, Benedict Anderson (1983) described a nation as an “imagined community,” in which the members hold the perception of mutual affinity. Responding to the perceived threat of globalization to the national identity of Japan, Japanese nationalism has been especially

---

7 When put in italics, in the tradition of postcolonial thinker, Edward Said, the other refers to an attribute, which is given to those who are marginalized and not representable in the dominant culture within the system of knowledge and power (Kang, 1996).
reinforced by the current right-wing Prime Minister Shinzō Abe and his Liberal Democratic Party, which promotes the economic policies collectively known as Abenomics.

Various scholars have demonstrated an understanding of Japanese nationalism in relationship to its colonial past and present through the construction of “Japanese culture” (Park, 2007; Sakai, 1996; Suzuki, 2005). In the modernization process, Japan as an “imagined community” was constructed with the sets of intertwined, binary positions between a “modernized,” “superior” West and a “lagging behind” Asia. In addition, feminist scholars articulate that the “desire for a national identity” and nationalism are gendered; that is, that all nations depend on constructions of gender (McClintock, 1995; Ueno, 2004). In other words, Japanese nationalism has been constructed through the Japanese patriarchy (Jung, 2003; Park, 2007; Ueno, 2004), positioning men as centre and women as the internal other.

While re/producing cultural hierarchies domestically and internationally, nationalism is most disruptive for the people who do not fit “properly” with the label of being “Japanese” and have been marginalized in the nation, assimilated, and/or excluded under the myth of Japanese homogeneity. Japan’s current population is actually diverse. In addition to the Ainu, Okinawan, and Buraku people, who are racialized as “foreign,” there are residents from Japan’s former colonial efforts in Korea, Taiwan, and China. These *zainichi* are the largest group of foreign residents in Japan. Immigration reform driven by labour shortages also induced *Nikkeijin*, or people of Japanese decent whose ancestors had migrated away, to migrate to Japan since the 1980s. While multiculturalism is not currently part of policy in Japan, the number of people in the population who are residents with foreign nationality or heritage could be higher in the

---

*Zainichi* literally means “resident in Japan” but is usually used to refer to Korean residents. Japan’s colonization of Korea in the early 20th century caused Koreans to move to Japan. *Zainichi* Koreans have chosen not to accept Japanese nationality and, as dual citizenship is not possible in Japan, these people are regarded as “resident aliens” with permanent residency. They still often experience discrimination based on ethnicity and nationality in Japanese society.
future. While the claim to cultural homogeneity of the Japanese ethnic conglomerate has been challenged, Japan as a nation is struggling with multiculturalism or “multicultural coexistence” (Mabuchi, 2011; Graburn, Ertl & Tierney, 2008; Lie, 2001).

Transgressive, interactive relation beyond the framework of the nation state is important in order to work on pressing issues such as the environment, increasing economic and social polarization, and exclusions of “the other” (Iwabuchi, 2007). Questioning the exclusiveness and closedness of the national border also possibly promotes the social space of the nation that is more interactive and inclusive, and where diversity is respected. What new interactive relations emerge or what prevents them from emerging in the context of Japan? These were the questions and assumptions that first guided my research.

I started my work with assumptions, such as that “mainstream subject positions have to be challenged in relations to and interaction with the marginal subjects” (Braidotti, 2011, p. 5). Therefore, in contrast with studies for which the purpose is to depict the resistance of marginalized youth, I instead looked at transformation of the centre of Japanese youth, that is, of what constitutes the notions regarded as “normative” among Japanese youth. By doing this, I was interested in asking the question of how the empowerment of youth can be possible through playful movements of affect during the process of growing up, liberating them from those ideas that were taken as granted. To address the questions of “multicultural coexistence” in Japan, I regard the issue of differences within Japan as of equal importance with the issue of differences beyond the nation.

Employing the notion of Braidotti’s “nomadic subjectivities” based on transmobile materialist understanding of nomadism, I considers subjectivity as a process of becoming nomad. Becoming a nomad involves the process of positive transformation into the active production of multiple forms of cultural belonging and complex allegiances (Braidotti, 2006). Relying on the
notion of “flexible forms of citizenship” (Braidotti, 2006, p.79) along with the idea of multiple belongings, I explored the ways, if any, in which young people were involved in a radical repositioning or internal transformation in a productive and affirmative manner in the geographical context of Japan in the early 21st century. I especially looked at how affects move and get stuck through the practice of mimesis, that is, mimicking “the other.” To address this question, I looked at the experiences of mimesis, regarding school as an important site to explore cultural practices of youth.

**Japanese youth and studies of self-formation.** Research on Japanese youth has been conducted along several avenues, which are not often with integrated with each other. One avenue evolved around the topic of self-formation. Asano (2009) identified the topic of and argument about youth’s self-formation in Japan since the 1990s. According to Asano, the focus of studies first shifted from analysis of the history of youth studies to the issue of communication. Applying communication theory, youth have been the subject of research on their styles of communication, with particular focus on the “failure” of communication. Through these studies the negative image of youth has been constructed, while some problems such as introverted identity are emphasized (Asano, 2009).

The focus of the research then shifted to the “change” of communication, exploring how youth alter the way they presented themselves depending on the situation, and this notion is labelled the pluralization of identity (Asano, 2009). Asano states that, in these studies, identity has been discussed in equal relation with others, standing side by side, implying that in those studies, the issue of power and inequity has not been adequately considered. Then, along with changes to the structure of employment throughout the 1990s, discussion on labour and class has increased in the field of youth studies since the end of the 1990s, and the issues of identity started to be problematized in relation with class differences (Asano, 2009).
Stating that this problem, with its focus on labour and class, should continue for a considerable time period, Asano (2009) calls for other kinds of youth studies that explore different political dimensions of identity. I have situated my study within this relatively new emerging problem area that looks at the cultural differences and inequalities, which is to say political dimensions, within the processes of youth self-formation.

Another avenue of work on youth studies in Japan has shed light on subcultural groups among the youth, such as zoku (族) and kei (系)⁹ (e.g. Shibuya-kei, Harajuku-kei, Akiba-kei, visual-kei or kogyaru). In addition to only appearing sporadically, these studies have merely focused on the contents of subculture, mainly applying semiotics (Namba, 2007). Calling for studies with a different perspective, Namba proposes changing the perspective of youth studies from “youth subcultures as groups” to “youth subcultures as categories,” and further toward “the studies on situations in which categories are operating” (2007, p. 14). Following Namba’s call for a change of perspective, in this study I have provided the contextualised analysis of youth experiences of self-formation by conducting ethnographic studies. Uncovering the complexity and ambiguity of those processes, I explored how Japanese youth experience the self affectively in specific social, material, and discursive contexts.

An important perspective of youth studies to consider is how youth have been framed in those studies and more largely in public discourse. In the 1980s, the positive image of youth called “new species of human” (shinjinrui; 新人類, also translated as new generation) was prevalent, referring to those who fit in with the advanced information society and advanced consumerist society of the 1980s. Then, since the 1990s, the youth of Japan have been viewed in a mainly negative light (Asano, 2006). A range of discourses decrying Japanese youth have emerged, criticizing the perceived “hedonistic, selfish and soft stance they indulge” (Anne, 2009,

---

⁹ Kei (系) usually refers to “the group” in which particular cultural practices are conducted.
The public conversation on Japanese youth includes discussion of *NEETs, freetā* (those who engage only in part-time jobs and float from job to job, free of a permanent obligation to a company), *hiki-komori* (those who stay in their own rooms and withdraw from society) and “parasite single” (those who stay at home and live off their parents’ income and resources).

What should be noted here is the perspective on youth, who are positioned as subordinated and seen as possessing a sort of psychological malaise. While they are positioned in a dichotomy with adults and often written by outsider academic “experts,” these studies have approached adolescence as a developmental stage based on theories of developmental psychology. In such cases, issues on youth are often narrated with the assumption that there is to be such a thing as a *proper, normal* Japanese youth. Taking Lesko’s (2001) critiques toward these approaches, which regard youth as biologically equivalent, I have instead built on critical youth studies, which refer to youth as a social category, the meaning of which is socially, culturally, and politically constructed, extending the discussion further by paying attention to affect.

**School as a place of youth’s affective experiences.** Educational scholars in Japan recently pointed out that the current characteristic of “school” is as being “the place where one fits in *(ibasho)*,” or “becoming the place where one fits in *(ibasho-ka)*” (Araya, 2008; Yamada, 2010). Instead of academic grades, which still have a strong impact on the lives of the youth, personal relationships such as friendship are increasingly significant in shaping the experiences of youth at school (Honda, 2005). Calling the current situation the “hyper-meritocracy (meritocratized)” age, Honda (2005) cautions us that youth are evaluated by competence, such as communication competence, the actual conditions of which are difficult to measure.
In this context especially, exploring student experiences at school is a pressing matter. However, it is only since the late 1990s that the experiences of students, who are seen as active agents, started to attract focus in Japan (Taga & Tendo, 2013), such as by Miyazaki (1993), who studies the gender subculture of female high school students. By reviewing the literature, which focuses on the topic of gender within the journal, *The Study of Educational Sociology* published by the Japan Society of Educational Sociology, Taga and Tendo (2013) articulate that empirical educational research at school in Japan in and around the 1990s (right after the time when the notion of gender was introduced into Japanese educational sociology) have often focused on the teachers’ practices while students have been regarded as passive objects. I suggest that this tendency can apply to the studies of students’ experiences at school in general.

In addition, although ethnographic studies about youth experiences at school within the poststructural framework have gradually received attention since the mid-2000s in Japan (Hatano, 2004; Uwatoko, 2011), the topic and perspectives on it are still very limited. An example of those studies includes the study by Hatano (2004), which describes how informal rules for not threatening gender separation of space and male privilege are constructed, through studying the practices at the judo club of a junior high school. Uwatoko (2011) also examines the formation and maintenance of separation and hierarchy of peer groups based on gender at high school. However, empirical studies on youth experiences of self-formation at school within these frameworks are in short supply and demand further exploration.

My research is largely situated within critical educational research that explores the relationship between youth subjectivity and schooling (Gaztambide-Fernández, 2009; Gonick, 2003; Pomerantz, 2008; Renold, 2005; Yon, 2000). More specifically, it is situated among those studies that explore the interplay between youth’s affects or “becoming” and schooling (Jackson, 2010; Kofoed & Ringrose, 2012; Renold & Ringrose, 2008, 2011; Ringrose, 2011; Ringrose &
Renold, 2012; Youdell & Armstrong, 2011). Building upon and challenging the critical educational research that employs Foucauldian notions of subject and discourse, and Butler’s notions of subjectification and performativity, I attempt to go beyond the analysis of textured bodies, that is, how subjects are discursively constructed through discourse.

Following the line of recent empirical educational research that employs the perspective of Deleuze and Guattari (1987), I pay attention to the aspects of affect, movement, and transformation of the body. Considering school as “affective assemblage,” I regard school as not only a social and political space that material bodies transect, but also a place where events of youth self-formation occur in specific time and space. In this dissertation, I explore how and where affects flow and get stuck, and how particular discourses related to ideas such as kyara and “school caste,” and discourses on categories such as ethnicity, nationality, and particularly gender are involved in those processes. By especially paying attention to the events of performances, and mimetic practices in particular, I explore the affective lives of young people at school in Japan. Through analyzing youth’s affective or stuck experiences, my hope was, ultimately, to pose the question of how educators and educational researchers could create the space of schooling to be more full of joy, excitement and fulfillment for youth, inviting them to step out from the limitation of their imagination with regard to whom they think they could become.

**Places of drama/theatre for self-formation.** In order to address the research questions, I investigate places of drama/theatre as potential sites for self-formation. Rather than regarding the experiences there only in consideration of the learning of drama/theatre education as a subject in its own right, I situate the drama classroom as a place that can act as a window to shed light on broader experiences at school and beyond (Gallagher, 2007). In this sense, I follow the line of arguments by the educational scholars who attempt to reconsider student experiences or
curriculum through the lens of the arts (e.g., John Dewey, Maxine Greene, and Madeline Grumet).

In addition, I consider the places of drama/theatre as potential sites to set students’ bodies as the central focus of classroom experiences. For instance, pointing out the inherent connection between drama education and bodily experience, Franks states, “dramatic texts and activities in classrooms are made up of and by the bodies of students who animate and populate the drama” (1996, p. 105, italics in original). I especially build upon the recent work that attempts to explore affective experiences of the bodies of young people in places of drama (Perry, 2011, 2013).

Furthermore, I regard places of drama as ideal sites to explore the cultural practices of mimesis, that is, mimicking “the other,” to which I pay special attention in this study. The main activities related to mimesis in drama/theatre are role-playing and acting, which are at the core of drama/theatre education. Dorothy Heathcote states:

A broad definition of educational drama is “role-taking,” either to understand a social situation more thoroughly or to experience imaginatively via identification in social situations. (…) Dramatic activity is the direct result of the ability to role-play – to want to know how it feels to be in someone else’s shoes. (Johnson & O’Neill, 1984, p. 49)

Indeed, role-playing or acting has been carried out at many different venues such as forum theatre (founded by Augusto Boal), psychodrama (founded by Jacob L. Moreno), moral education (Verducci, 2000), and vocational training (Holzman, 2009) in several environments such as at school, therapy, out-of-school youth programs, community programs, and the workplace. While the focus of role-playing or acting is often to teach and assess procedural knowledge toward a certain problem or social situation, which often accompany a predetermined correct procedure or ideal situation, I consider role-playing as an activity for self-
exploration where identities and relations are constructed and deconstructed (Bowman, 2010; Gallagher, 2002, 2007; Gallagher & Riviére, 2007; Neelands, 2004; Riviére, 2006). Referring to this aspect of acting, Neelands (2004) states as follows:

In acting “differently,” in acting “as-if” the world was otherwise, students may be encouraged to discover that at personal, local, national and international levels they are free to negotiate, translate and therefore transform the problem of identities and the problem of the representation of identities in what Bhabha calls a “discontinuous intertextual temporality of cultural difference.” (p. 54)

In this sense, role playing or acting is seen as a testing ground for actual social identities and relations where the youth transform the self and invent a new self by negotiating, adjusting and trying out the relationality with other bodies. The significance of these activities in places of drama/theatre is, firstly, concerning the range of the image with which youth are in relation. Through imaginative practices, youth engage with a wide range of images depicted in drama scripts beyond time and space without physical constrictions. Secondly, the fact that role-playing or acting in places of drama/theatre is often conducted in front of an audience or at least an imagined audience as a form of performance features the activities. The social processes and interactions in those spaces are therefore interactive, dynamic, and noisy with diverse points of crossing.

From a personal perspective, my past experiences with theatre also led me to conduct research in drama class. Having the dream to become an actor during my teens, I engaged in acting practices on several occasions while attending university. Absorbed in the acting process, I realized that the experiences of wonder through searching for a connection with a role, having dived into it, blurring the me and not-me, were all so powerful. What was originally seen as a predetermined dichotomic relation between myself and the role, such as the relation between
women/men, Japanese/non-Japanese, Eastern/Western, youth/adult and English speaker/non-English speaker, seemed to gradually shift. I often felt that the role was becoming a part of myself, I felt new senses of myself emerging, and ultimately acting led to transformative experiences for me. While experiencing the augmentation of myself was a liberating experience, I also learned how my own feelings distinguish myself from certain things as well. It was these experiences through which I started to see places of drama as a potential site to explore youth self-formation.

While writing a research proposal, I started to search for drama classes at high schools in Japan where I could possibly conduct my research. In addition to the recent introduction of the credit system high school, educational reforms since the 1980s, which encouraged individuality, creativity, and collaboration, have slightly advanced the situation of drama education at high school in Japan. However, according to the Japan Council of Performers’ Rights & Performing Arts Organizations (Geidankyo)\textsuperscript{10}, the number of high schools with a drama/theatre subject is a mere 50 schools. This is less than 1% of all 5,116 high schools in Japan, comprising 15 national schools, 3,780 public schools, and 1,321 private schools (as of 2010, according to the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology [n.d.]). Browsing for information on the web and writing letters to acquaintances, I visited four possible high schools, and I was drawn to Akane as a research site. I already knew one of the teachers at Akane, Mr. Kobayashi, since we went to the same school and studied under the same advisor for our Master degrees.

Beside the teachers’ and principal’s keenness and interest in hosting my project (see Appendix A for the Consent Form for Administration and Appendix B for the Consent Form for Teachers), I thought that the classes for general education, such as communication education in

\textsuperscript{10}I received the document, “The list of high schools with drama education classes” at the seminar, “Theatre and education seminar: the reality and the issues of drama class in high school” held by the Japan Council of Performers Rights & Performing Arts Organizations. The seminar was held in August, 2010 in Tokyo.
which all students are targeted, were more suitable than the type of class which mainly aims at getting students to acquire the technical theatrical skills to train potential professional actors. Also, I was keen to research the classes that include in-depth acting experiences, where students encounter and carefully face the image of the particular role. In this sense, I did not mainly consider classes where drama pedagogy is simply applied to other subjects such as the class of English or social studies, nor the class in which the main activities are game-based or improvisation.

Gaztambide-Fernández (2013) argues that mainstream arts in education scholarship and advocacy regard “the arts” as a definable naturalistic phenomenon by employing what he calls the “rhetoric of effects.” Cautioning us that this positivistic rhetoric masks the complexity of the practices and processes associated with the arts, he proposes an alternative rhetoric, that is, a “rhetoric of cultural production,” which sheds light on practices and processes of symbolic creativity. I take his call, and as Gallagher and Neelands (2011) do, I regard drama/theatre as the place of cultural production. This rhetoric is especially important in the field of drama education in Japan, in which “the rhetoric of efficacy” has largely been applied, and theoretical arguments and empirical research itself are still underdeveloped. H. Nakajima (2008) reminds us the need to build “a bridge between theories and praxis” in theatre/drama education in Japan, and I hope to situate my work in this gap.

Outline of the Thesis

This dissertation consists of eight chapters. In Chapter 2, I outline the theoretical tools for my investigation of youth self-formation and schooling. Building from the Foucauldian concept of discourse, I attempt to critically engage with the notion of “the subject as produced in power/knowledge.” With the goal of putting the questions of alliances and liberation in focus and moving beyond a politics of self-completed identity, I look into Deleuze and Guattari’s
concepts such as “becoming,” “affect,” “territorialization” and “deterritorialization,” in which relationality is central. In Deleuze and Guattari’s “transcendental empiricism,” (1987) “becoming” refers to becoming different and movement as qualitative transformation. Then, I show how these concepts ask questions that are different from the “problem of identity” by looking at the way of moving across boundaries of identity categories, that is, relational transformative practices. Also, I pay attention to their notion of “assemblage” as a tool to conceptualize the place of the school. Further, I especially consider “performance” and, in particular, the practices of “mimesis,” which refers to incorporating “the other” and embodying the image through imagination. I consider “transitional space,” an in-between space of “me” and “not-me” as the most important aspect to be explored.

Chapter 3 turns to questions of methodology and the methods I employ. In order to frame my own sense in the field, I rely on the paradigm broadly called “post qualitative research.” Seeing research from the viewpoints of “assemblage” as defined by Deleuze and Guattari and of “intra-action” by Karen Barad, I demonstrate research processes and practices based on a methodological guideline of “post qualitative research.” I specifically consider the interwoven relationship between participants and the researcher, and reframe the researcher’s relationship with the data, rejecting its status as an objective observer. Then, I lay out four main data collecting methods: 1) participant observation in drama classes; 2) students’ journal writing; 3) assignments in the classes; and 4) interviews with youth participants. Finally, as an analytic strategy, I articulate coding and narrative, which offer us rich insights into how affects are intertwined in multifarious and complex ways.

In Chapter 4, I first describe how I encountered the field on the first day of my fieldwork. Then, as context for the students’ experiences, I summarize the historical, geographical, and social context of Akane High School and introduce the teachers of the classes. I also present the
thresholds of the students’ experiences to be shown over the analytic chapters. As the first
threshold, I describe historical, geographical, and social contexts as well as the curriculum
context of the school that I visited. Then, I show the content of four classes to contextualize the
students’ involvement in the classes. I also show the drama scripts with which the students
engaged and provide a short description of the students as a cast in this study. Finally, I describe
each of the theatre activities such as casting, character development, and performance to present
what specific activities students experience or engage with in drama class.

Analysis begins in Chapter 5. Drawing upon the data from all of the classes, I explore
the events of noticeable patterns of becoming (in actuality, mostly not becoming) throughout the
fieldwork, which will be the foundation of the analysis in the following chapters. As the
predominant factors with which territorializing emerged, I firstly address the identity category
of ethnicity/nationality related to Japanaeseness. Secondly, I address the girls’ desire for
masculinity and the boys’ rejections of femininities, which together pose the question of gender
hierarchy. Thirdly, the notion of *kyara* (Japanese interpretation of the English word “character”) is considered the factor that prevents students from imagining to become otherwise. Then, I pay
attention to the idea of school caste, which divides students into hierarchical groups.

Building on the framework laid out in Chapter 5, in Chapter 6 I explore the assemblages
of femininities, considering how young girls’ bodies are entangled within those assemblages at
school. Mainly based on the second term of the class of Foundations of Theatre Expression, this
chapter explores key assemblages of femininities, organized around the experiences of four girls.
Tracing the patterning of the momentary fluctuating affects, I describe the movement of affect
varied in each case such as being stuck and becoming. The categories of femininities casted vary
at each event (e.g., motherhood, “girlie” girl, “gyaru,” “sporty girls,” and “otaku”), and I show
the meanings imbued with each category and the ways girls experience each category. Finally, I also examine “girlie” femininities, in which all students engaged, yet in distinctly different ways.

In Chapter 7, I explore how boys’ bodies are entangled within several masculinity assemblages. Mainly based on the second term of the class of Foundations of Theatre Expression, I account for how boys construct their masculinities with a variety of different kinds of masculinities, organized around the experiences of four boys. The categories of masculinities casted include “salaryman” masculinities, normative cool masculinities, “otaku” masculinities, hegemonic heterosexual masculinities, and homosexual masculinities. Describing the directions and movements of the affects and the meanings imbued in each particular masculinity, I explore how their way of engaging with a certain masculinity is influenced by students’ different hierarchical status.

In Chapter 8, I pay attention to the pedagogical intentions of drama, which directly shaped the students’ affective experiences in the classes. I consider how students’ experiences might have been influenced by pedagogical aspects, especially how these aspects might have been restricted. Then, I sketch several points, which I suggest are important to consider in applying drama pedagogy to enhance students’ affective experiences.

In the concluding chapter, I first summarize the noticeable patterns of becoming and being stuck in the field as well as the factors, which generated those movements. Reflecting upon the insights produced throughout this dissertation, I articulate some topics that I think are important to pursue for further research. Then, I highlight some contributions of this research to youth studies at school and the field of drama/theatre education. At the end, I address some methodological considerations such as research methods for study of affective experiences, the applicability of drama, the uniqueness of the participants and the limitations of my “affective
capacities” as a researcher, hoping that the narratives outlined in this dissertation are read with an openness that inspires reflection, looking toward a new future.
Chapter 2
Theorizing Becoming Different in Performance

This chapter lays the foundation for exploring how young people become who they want to be by creating new connections with “the other” and negotiating competing discourse in the context of Japan in late modernity. I begin by situating my theoretical approach in relation to the concepts of discourse and subjectivity established by poststructural scholars, which recent critical studies of education heavily rely on. However, without meaning to disregard those studies, this study rather builds upon the Deleuzian approaches to body capacities and transformation (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987; Jackson, 2010; Kofoed & Ringrose, 2012; Renold & Ringrose, 2008, 2011; Ringrose, 2011; Ringrose & Renold, 2012; Youdell & Armstrong, 2011). By exploring how such transformations occur at the events of performances, and through mimetic practices in particular, this dissertation explores the affective experiences of young people at the specific space and time of schooling.

Becoming: Beyond Subjectivity

The concept of subjectivity has been taken up by scholars of youth studies, who critically examine students’ experiences at school, drawing upon Foucauldian theories of discourse and the subject. For Foucault, discourse is “systems of thoughts composed of ideas, attitudes, courses of action, beliefs and practices that systematically construct the subjects and the worlds of which they speak” (Lessa, 2006, p. 285). Discourse operates as “a space of differentiated subject-positions and subject-functions” (Foucault, 1991, p. 58). This concept is useful, for example, to analyze how certain related discourses such as gender, sexuality, ethnicity and nationality are produced in Japan as norms, how those normativities are maintained in the discourse, and how patriarchy, sexism, heteronormativity, and nationalism maintain hierarchical social relations such as patriarchal gender and sexual order in Japan. For Foucault, the subject is
seen to be an effect by discourse and positioned in relation to particular discourses and practices. Here, the subject is a textual position, “a produced form, the outcome of a complex constellation of textual, material, institutional, historical factors” (Blackman et al., 2008, p. 8).

Responding to this conception and trying to go beyond, recent works on subjectivity illustrate it as “more than a subsidiary effect” and “more than the sum total of combined discursive positions” (Blackman et al., 2008, p. 7). As such, distinguished from “the subject as-by-product” or “the subject as produced in power/knowledge,” subjectivity refers to “the experience of being subjected,” “the experience of the lived multiplicity of positioning,” (Blackman et al., 2008, p. 6) and “self-awareness—the condition of being a subject” (Henriques et al., 1998, p. 3).

Henriques et al. state that subjectivity is understood as “a process of finding yourself becoming a subject over the course of an infinite series of encounters, involving reflexivity and creativity in the imaginative transformation of desire and anxiety” (1998, p. xvii). In order to shed light on “the possibility of subjectivity as a viable resource of resistance,” Blackman et al. (2008) call for attempts at accounting for “the different level of effects that power has in relation to subjects who are differently produced,” (p. 8) and “analyzing the multiple and diverse facets of subjectivity itself” (p. 9).

Indeed, the “cultural turn” (Jameson, 1998), which placed emphasis on the role of language, discourse, and representation in the constitution of social reality, has fostered complex analyses of the intersections between power, knowledge, and subjectivity. I recognize the significant contribution to youth studies of these approaches; however, in this study, I pick up the critique that these approaches tend to overlook material forces and processes by exclusively focusing on the discursive and reducing matter to culture (Alaimo & Hekman, 2008; Barad, 2003; Clough, 2007; Coole & Frost, 2010).
Judith Butler is another important scholar whose concepts such as “performativity” have been taken up by scholars of youth studies. Through the concept of “performativity,” how identities such as gender are discursively constructed or ruptured have been critically examined. While accommodating “the material” in her works to some degree, Butler is still criticized for “loss” of the materiality of the body in her work such as *Gender Trouble* (1990) and *Bodies That Matter* (1993) (Alaimo & Hekman, 2008). Ahmed (2008) states that, although Butler (1993) does attend to the question of matter, for Butler, it is not about a theory of the material world, but about “an effect of a process of materialization,” that is, how sex materializes.

Massumi (2002) states that this conceptualization of the subject and subjectivity is based on the “positioning model” in which the “positioning” is on a grid and conceived as “an oppositional framework of cultural constructed significations” (p. 2). In this model, the body is regarded as a “‘site’ on the grid” and defined by “its pinning to the grid” (Massumi, 2002, p. 2) and the body is “boxed into its site on the cultural map” (p. 3).

Responding to this, several studies recently pay attention to “the body” in order to examine the qualities of subjectivity (Blackman et al., 2008, Henriques et al., 1998). For example, building on Foucauldian poststructural discourse analysis, combined with Lacanian psychoanalysis, “psychosocial” research explores how subjects emotionally “invest” in discourses and how the discourses are resisted (Walkerdine, Lucey, & Melody, 2001). Analyzing unconscious dynamics such as fantasy, desire, and anxieties, “psychosocial” research explores how subjects negotiate discourse, not just mere passively but by taking up certain discursive positions (Ringrose, 2013). Although these provide very important contributions to our understanding, I see that they are still inadequate to explore an incorporeal dimension of the body, which Massumi (2002) states the aspect of body’s “movement as qualitative
transformation” (p. 3). In order to consider the body in this way, I draw upon the concept of “becoming” proposed by Deleuze and Guattari (1987).

**Becoming and affect.** In Deleuze and Guattari’s (1987) philosophy, “transcendental empiricism,” becoming means “becoming different” and transformation. Here, transformations are “not of forms transforming into another or different form but of constantly processual, constantly transforming relations” (R. Coleman, 2008, p. 168) within which bodily capacities are combined. For Deleuze, “becoming” is “the continual production (or ‘return’) of difference immanent within the constitution of events, whether physical or otherwise” (Stagoll, 2010, p. 26). It is the very dynamism of change. Difference is, “first and foremost, an internal—rather than relational or external—process” (Hickey-Moody & Malins, 2007, p. 5). Seeing it as positive and productive, for Deleuze and Guattari, the concept of difference disturbs the idea of “a self which is constituted through its difference to an ‘other’ ” (p. 5).

For Deleuze and Guattari (1987), becomings take place when “a body connects to another body and in doing so, begins to perceive, move, think and feel in new ways” (Hickey-Moody & Malins, 2007, p. 6). Becoming here is a continual process, and a process of movement, variation, and multiplicity, referring to the ways in which bodies experience and live. Deleuze and Guattari (1987) describe “becoming” as follows:

A line of becoming is not defined by points that it connect, or by points that compose it; on the contrary, it passes between points, it comes up through the middle (…). A line of becoming has only a middle. The middle is not an average; it is fast motion, it is the absolute speed of movement. A becoming is always in the middle; one can only get it by the middle. A becoming is neither one nor two, nor the relation of the two; it is the in-between, the border or line of flight or descent running perpendicular to both. (p. 293, emphasis in original)
“Becomings” are also the “lines of flight,” an important concept by Deleuze and Guattari. Saying that they are “not magical escapes,” they note that it is important to see if lines of flight are destructive or productive (or both). Describing drug addiction, Deleuze and Guattari caution us that some lines of flight are totally destructive and turn into “a line of death and abolition” (1987, p. 314). Although potentially dangerous if they occur too fast, at other times they can be a liberating and revolutionary practice.

Becomings are also related to virtualities: relations, which bodies form, refer to “the virtual (potential) links between bodies” (Budgeon, 2003, p. 53). Grosz states, “Becomings are the open-ended elaboration of tendencies, virtualities, that are not fully or equally actualized, and the movement of these tendencies in directions that are to some extent delimited but are fundamentally unpredictable” (2011, p. 51). Here, the idea of potentiality, which is different from possibility, is important. Differentiating the two, Massumi states that potential is “conditions of emergence,” while possibility is “re-conditionings of the emerged,” that is, “normative or regulatory operations” (2002, p. 10). In other words, potential is not pre-scripted and “the immanence of a thing to its still indeterminate variation, under say,” while possibility is “a variation implicit in what a thing can be said to be when it is on target” (Massumi, 2002, p. 9, italics in original).

In addition, Deleuze and Guattari (1987) consider becoming with its companion concept, becoming-woman: “all becomings begin with and pass through becoming-woman” (p. 277). For Deleuze and Guattari (1987), becoming-woman means “a ‘becoming-minoritarian,’ that is an ‘in-between’ movement which disrupts and refuses conventional categorization and signification” (R. Coleman, 2009, p. 22). Therefore, while minorities refer to “multiplicities of escape and flux” (Deleuze & Guattari 1987, p. 470), “there is no becoming-man because man is the molar entity par excellence” (p. 292). Definition of minority and majority in this context
does not depend on physical numbers: “minorities are not necessarily defined by the smallness of their numbers but rather by becoming or a line of fluctuation, in other words, by the gap that separates them from this or that axiom constituting a redundant majority” (Deleuze & Guattari, p. 469).

The majoritarian standard is constituted through the operative statements of various regions of the social field. For Deleuze and Guattari (1987), the central point is “the average European,” such as the “male- ([in contrast with the] female), adult- (child), white- (black, yellow, or red); rational- (animal)” that “has the property of organizing binary distributions within the dualism machines, and of reproducing itself in the principal term of the opposition; the entire opposition at the same time resonates in the central point” (p. 292).

As a medium of becoming, Deleuze and Guattari (1987) elaborate on the concept of the Body without Organ (BwO). While a BwO is opposed to the organization of the organs into an organism, it is not opposed to the organs nor an organ-less body (R. Coleman, 2009). In other words, a body is not reduced to its functions and the BwO dismantles the organism. A BwO is not a closed, unified entity but a body that “is always part of something else, always something other than what it is” (R. Coleman, 2009, p. 33). Also, the BwO is never complete: “you never reach the Body without Organs, you can’t reach it, you are forever attaining it, it is a limit” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 150).

The BwO is also “machinic assemblages,” which are “on a plane of immanence of different organs, different moments, different elements and things” (R. Coleman, 2009, p. 33). Conceived from the perspective of territory, spatiality, and nomadology, an assemblage is a geographical concept, constituted by a horizontal and a vertical axis (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987). “The horizontal axis” deals with “machinic assemblages of bodies, actions and passions, an intermingling of bodies reacting to one another” and “a collective assemblage of enunciation, of
acts and statements, of incorporeal transformations of bodies” (Deleuze & Guattari 1987, p. 88, italics in original). “The vertical axis” has both “territorial sides, or reterritorialized sides, which stabilize it,” and “cutting edges of deterritorialization, which carry it away” (p. 88, italics in original).

To describe the processes of becoming, Deleuze and Guattari (1987) bring Baruch Spinoza and Friedrich Nietzsche’s philosophical conceptions of affect together: “an affect is a ‘becoming’ (affects are becomings)” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 256). The affect for Deleuze is “a transitory thought or thing that occurs prior to an idea or perception,” and “the change, or variation, that occurs when bodies collide, or come into contact,” and “the knowable product of an encounter, specific in its ethical and lived dimensions” (F. Coleman, 2010, p.11). Affect is not “a characteristic” but “the effectuation of a power” (Deleuze & Guattari cited in Ringrose, 2011, p. 601, italics in original), and it refers generally to “bodily capacities to affect and be affected” or “the augmentation or diminution of a body’s capacity to act, to engage, to connect” (Clough, 2007, p. 2). Linking to the self-feeling of being alive (or the presence of vitality), here the body is reconfigured as “a sum of its capacities,” which can be seen through its affect (Jordan, 1995, p. 133 cited in Buchanan 1997, p. 75). The body is here considered in terms of “the nature and limits of its capacity to be affected” (Deleuze, 1990, p. 218). The important question is “what can a body do?” rather than the traditional question, “what is a body?” leading to the discussion of the invention of a new self.

The capacity of a body is “never defined by a body alone but is always aided and abetted by, and dovetails with, the field or context of its force-relations” (Gregg & Seigworth, 2010, p. 3). The body is seen as events “within the context of multiplicity of practices and regimes” (Budgeon, 2003, p. 51). The events are continually in “a process of connections, extensions, reformations,” “the process of becoming,” and “a fluid process of transformation” (Budgeon,
This approach of seeing a body as an event sees the transformation of a body in a very contextualized way (Clough, 2007; Massumi, 2002).

In relation with becoming, the concept of agency is also reconceptualized as the one that lies in relationality among several bodies. It is “linked to the opening up of new ways of being” (p 56) and lies “in creative evolution” (Davies, 2010, p. 59). This is different from the conception of agency based on humanist notions of rational actors with free-will, social structuralist views of human intention and action against social structure, and poststructuralist views of the faculty of tactically negotiating against discourse.

Deleuze and Guattari (1987) describe three types of process in regard to movement of an assemblage: territorialization, deterritorialization and reterritorialization. The notion of territorialization refers to “when energy is captured and striated in specific space/time contexts” (Ringrose, 2011, p. 603), and “Usually (though not always) these social territorializations entail – somewhere in the process – some act of interpretation, of ascribing meaning to an act or action” (Fox, 2002, p. 353). As for deterritorialization, Deleuze and Guattari state that it is “the movement by which ‘one’ leaves the territory” and “the operation of the line of flight” (1987, p. 508). Deterritorialization is “a movement producing change” and refers to “free(ing) up the fixed relations that contain a body all the while exposing it to new organisations” (Parr, 2010, p. 69). While the deterritorialization is often momentary and perhaps inconsequential, at other times, it may be substantial and life-changing, carrying the BwO into unimagined realms of possibility and becoming-other (Fox, 2002; Fox & Ward, 2008). In spite of these different forms of deterritorialization, I do not explore the substantial and life-changing aspect of the deterritorialization in this work. Rather, I focus on my analysis to explore the more momentary aspects of deterritorialization.
Deterritorialization is always bound up with processes of reterritorialization, constantly moving between deterritorialization and reterritorialization. Reterritorialization describes “processes of recuperation of those ruptures” (Ringrose, 2011, p. 603). It is “a complex process” and does not mean “returning to the original territory but rather the ways in which deterritorialized elements recombine and enter into new relations” (Patton, 2010, p. 73).

This conceptualization of the body can be situated within a broadly increased interest in the body in the social sciences for at least half a century and particularly in the past two decades (Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992; Bray & Colebrook 1998; Butler, 1990, 1993; Foucault, 1977; Grosz 1994; Merleau-Ponty, 1962, 1968; Shilling, 2003, 2008; St. Pierre & Pillow, 2000). As a legacy of the ideas Descartes summarized in the famous line, “I think, therefore I am,” the body had been either ignored or made marginal, seen as “nature,” “a passive vessel,” or “a container for personal and private feelings” for a significant period of time (Grosz, 1994).

However, feminist scholars problematize the idea of the mind/body dualism where the mind is privileged and the body is subordinated. In this dualism, while the mind is regarded as masculine and associated with will, reason, and logic, the body is considered as feminine and associated with disorder, excess, and unappreciation (Bordo, 1986; Braidotti 1994, 2011; Bray & Colebrook, 1998; Bultre, 1993; Flax, 1990; Grosz, 1994). Feminist scholars have criticized this humanistic view in that they continue sexist arguments regarding differences between the sexes or gender as inherent opposites. Although the context of the research is in Japan, I consider this argument relevant in the context of Japan as well, especially due to the influence of Western philosophy to Japan since the Meiji era (which began in 1868).

While the paradigm that draws upon the lines of thought of Benedictus de Spinoza and later Deleuze and Guattari is the central focus for my analysis, I also incorporate analysis through the lens of discourses. Although there are fundamental ontological differences between
Butler and Deleuze’s respective viewpoints, for example, this research follows recent attempts that try to productively combine them (Hickey-Moody & Rasmussen, 2009; Kofoed & Ringrose, 2012; Renold & Ringrose, 2008; Ringrose, 2011).

**Becoming Otherwise: Exploring Relational Transformative Practices**

The concept of becoming is proposed, by Deleuze and Guattari, with the purpose of strategically moving beyond the politics of identity (Hickey-Moody & Malins, 2007). While the concept of identity has been widely used in the social sciences and humanities since roughly the 1950s, the most prominent view on identity proposed by Erick Erickson (1968) regards identity as a sense of personal coherence, developing across the life-cycle and stage. Having a certain ideal identity as a reference point, it is regarded as a developmental achievement, which one should search for. Although it experiences changes along with anxiety and crisis, in this view, the human subject is conceived as a stable, rational individual, remaining principally the same person.

Alongside this humanistic study of identity as personal project, another dominant view is the one in which identity is studied based on social groups and social categories. As we see in traditional anthropology and social identity theory, the premise of such study is that members of the same group share similar and essential characteristics and traits, which distinguish them from the other, those outside of the group (Brubaker & Cooper, 2000; Wetherell, 2010). Stabilizing culture and social groups, categories are assumed to be stable, to have clear boundaries, and to possess coherent essences. As an alternative view, symbolic interactionists (Jenkins, 2004) emphasize a dialectical perspective of identity practice, and regard identity as a never-ending synthesis through the interaction between the internal and the external based on the social interactionist tradition of George Herbert Mead (1934).
Paying attention to communicative and semiotic practices, Ervin Goffman (1959), for example, also offers the view of social role and social identity that is signalled and maintained through dramaturgy, performance, and interaction. Evolving around what they call “molar categories” which are unified and binary categories, Deleuze and Guattari explain that an identity is an object or “form that we know from the outside and recognize from experience, through science, or by habit” (1987, p. 275).

With the advance of postmodernism and poststructuralism, the view of a unitary, rational subject has been problematized, and identity has been replaced with the concept of subject and subjectivity while being fragmented and discursively constructed (Foucault, 1977). While modernist work asks the question of what identity is, attempting to capture the similarity and shared traits as the essence of identity, discursive work on identities place the notion of difference as central, addressing how identity is discursively constructed (Wetherell, 2010). For example, Butler conceptualizes gender in a way in which there is no “essence” or “real” in identity categories such as “woman,” “man,” “lesbian,” and so on. For her, gender is “performative in the sense that it constitutes as an effect the very subject it appears to express” (1993, p. 314). In other words, what seems “natural” about an identity category is the effect or effects produced through imitation of “a phantasmatic ideal” (p. 313).

In the context of gender, masculinity is defined as “the processes and relationships through which men and women conduct gendered lives” (Connell, 2005, p. 71). Masculinity is “simultaneously a place in gender relations, the practices through which men and women engage that place in gender, and the effects of these practices in bodily experience, personality and culture” (p. 71). There are various kinds of masculinities, positioned in hierarchical relationships. The hegemonic masculinity may be conceived of “as a cultural ‘ideal’ or ‘blueprint’ which, by and large, cannot be perfectly attained by most men” (Daugupta, 2013, p.
It refers to “not necessarily the most common type on view [but] generally exerts its influence by being able to define ‘the norm’ ” (Swain, 2005, p. 220). In direct contrast to hegemonic masculinity and positioned outside the legitimate forms, “subordinated masculinity” is regarded as “controlled, oppressed, and subjugated” (Swain, 2005, p. 221). In the context of Japan, “salaryman” masculinities have been considered to be the hegemonic masculinity (Daugupta, 2013) and *otaku* masculinity is regarded as a “subordinated masculinity” (Tanaka, 2009).

Masculinities are generally constructed through feminine disassociations (Connell, 2005; Renold, 2005) with an unequal relationship between masculinities and femininities. Emphasized femininity is “a form of femininity that is practiced in a complementary, compliant, and accommodating subordinate relationship with hegemonic masculinity” (Messerschmidt, 2011, p. 206 cited in Charlebois, 2014a, p. 22), while an “oppositional” form of femininity “refuses to complement hegemonic masculinity in a relation of subordination” (Messerschmidt, 2011, p. 206 cited in Charlebois, 2014a, p. 23).

Bauman states, “if the *modern* ‘problem of identity’ was how to construct an identity and keep it solid and stable, the *postmodern* ‘problem of identity’ is primarily how to avoid fixation and keep the options open” (1996, p. 18, italics in original). Looking at social divisions, discursive work puts the concepts such as exclusion, inclusion, marginalization, and resistances in the centre. Critiquing systemic structurings and ideology, these are the works of what Grossberg calls “the ‘colonial model’ of the oppressor and oppressed” and the “‘transgression model’ of oppression and resistance” (1996, p. 88). Moving beyond both models of oppression, Grossberg (1996) instead calls for cultural studies to move towards “a model of articulation as ‘transformative practice,’ ” which creates alliances and social solidarities.
To address issues of making alliances and solidarity, which are conceptualized to be created through transformative practice (Grossberg, 1996), the concept of “becoming” provides an important perspective by exploring relationality. As the traditional field of study that looks at relationality, such as British object relations advanced by scholars including Melanie Klein and Donald Woods Winnicott, and American relational psychoanalysis promoted by Jessica Benjamin and others, psychoanalysis applies the concept of identification to explore the issues of identity formation. Jacques Lacan and Judith Butler are also dominant scholars who address questions about identification and subjectivity. The concept of identification is “a processual, active term, derived from a verb” (Brubaker & Cooper, 2000, p. 14), and the importance of focusing on processes of identification for studies of identity has been articulated (Hall, 1996).

However, traditional psychoanalysis often personalizes identification by referring to the “images” of persons as we see in Oedipal identification (Rajchman, 2000). In Anti-Oedipus (1983), Deleuze and Guattari critique the traditional psychoanalysis (Freudian, Lacanian) and reconceptualize desire from an individual and insatiable lack regulated by Oedipal law, to flows in the processes of experimentation on a plane of immanence. In these views, the relation for becoming or affect is “real, material, but incorporeal,” “inseparable, coincident, but disjunct,” and “real but abstract.” It is “never present in position, only ever in passing,” relating with “its own indeterminacy (its openness to an elsewhere and otherwise than it is, in any here and now)” (Massumi, 2002, p. 5, italics in original). In this case, change is not about “displacement” (to leap from one position to the next) but the space of the continued crossing and movement. Massumi (2002) urges us to regard the positions as non-static rather than predetermined, and this research considers that “the points or positions really appear retrospectively, working backward from the movement’s end” (Massumi, 2002, p. 6).
Deleuze and Guattari mostly consider the concept of subjectivity in a negative way as it is a molar event. This research regards subjectivity as decentred, a part of an assemblage, and an emergent conjunction that is always in a process of becoming. This is based on Braidotti’s transmobile materialist understanding of nomadism, inspired by Deleuze’s philosophical nomadology. As “a new figuration of subjectivity in a multidifferentiated, nonhierarchical way” (Braidotti, 2011, p. 137), the nomad “expresses the desire for an identity made of transitions, successive shifts, and coordinated changes, without and against an essential unity” (Braidotti, 1994, p. 22). Defined by “the subversion of set conventions” (p. 5), the nomad is “a postmetaphysical, intensive, multiple entity, functioning in a net of interconnections” (Braidotti, 2011, p. 66).

While the nomad’s identity is “a map of where s/he has already been,” known retrospectively (Braidotti, 1994, p. 14), nomadism allows us to “think through and move across established categories and levels of experience: blurring boundaries without burning bridges” (Braidotti, 1994, p. 4). Braidotti mentions that nomadism is “not fluidity without borders, but rather an acute awareness of the nonfixity of boundaries. It is the intense desire to go on trespassing, transgressing” (2011, p. 66). This concept of decentred subjectivity or nomadity offered me a theoretical lens to analyze the continued crossing and movement, of how youth move across boundaries of identity categories such as nationality, gender and sexuality, as well as the normative ideas contained with those categories at school.

I regard this change or transformation as a political action for creating solidarity. In some points, I follow the approach of third-world multicultural feminists toward solidarity, which places difference rather than commonality at the center (Lugoness, 2003; Mohanty, 2003; Morgan, 1984). By expanding what the body can do, becoming traverses the boundaries that work for closure and exclusion in order to build relations and enable “togetherness.”
Schooling as a Place of Assemblage: Youth’s Affects at School

Studies have been conducted on the function of schools in reproducing the social order (Althusser, 1971; Bowles & Gintis, 1976) and a cultural system (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990). In those works, retaining social structures and systems for their analytical focus, the school is regarded as a place that manifests and perpetuates the inequities of the broader society, and where youth passively receive ideology and correspond to social norms. In opposition to this conceptualization, in this study I rely on the idea that the school is a place for cultural practice in which attention is paid to the multidimensional, contextual micropolitics of the experiences of youth. Here the school is a site of contestation and change where youth actively engage in the process of their own self-making. In Yon’s words, the school is “a discursive field wherein identities are made, unmade, and contested” (2000, p. 31). As a place for youth’s resistance to and creative engagement within the social system and normativity, it is also the place of possibility for change, lauding youth’s oppositional and transformative practices (Currie, Kelly & Pomerantz, 2009; Pomerantz, 2008).

Furthermore, I attempt to conceptualize schooling with Deleuze and Guattari’s concept of the “assemblage” (1987). Applying the concept of “assemblage” formed by “the specific relationships and connections between bodies” (Kofoed & Ringrose, 2012, p. 10), Ringrose conceptualizes schools as “affective assemblages,” that is, “‘multiplicitous’ ‘social entities’ constituted through interactions among the various parts, with various affective capacities” (2011, p. 601-602). Conceptualizing the classroom, the school community, and the broader social community as assemblages, “the education assemblage” is formed by “economy and politics, policy, organizational arrangements, knowledge, subjectivity, pedagogy, everyday practices, and feelings” (Youdell & Armstrong, 2011, p. 145). Assemblage as a concept consists of both “molecular assemblages” that are formed by “the flows of affect through space and
time” (Kofoed & Ringrose, 2012, p. 10), and “molar assemblages” that are stable forms, including “systems of social or economic organization, discourses, orthodoxies, evaluative categorizations, codifications, cultural norms and so forth” (Potts in Fox & Alldred, 2013, p. 773). The conceptualizing of schooling as “affective assemblage” offered me a theoretical lens to analyze the affective aspect of youth’s resistance to and creative engagement within the social system and “normativity” at school. In other words, the concept of “affective assemblage” is useful to analyze how youth’s bodies are transformed as a singular event at school where educational practices and interaction among peers and with teachers often occur with stabilizing effects.

In addition, as a place where events occur in specific time and space, the school contains the spatial and temporal trajectories of people located within a “power geometry” inside and beyond the school (Gulson & Symes, 2007; Massey, 1993; McGregor, 2004). As a social and political space that materially affects bodies, school space is neither static nor neutral, but a place where both “striated space” and “smooth space” coexist (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987). “Striated space[s]” are “those which are rigidly structured and organized, and which produce particular, limited movements and relations between bodies” (Hickey-Moody & Malins, 2007, p. 11). They are also “hierarchical, rule-intensive, strictly bounded and confining” (Tamboukou, 2008, p. 360).

By contrast, “smooth space[s]” are “those in which movement is less regulated or controlled, and where bodies can interact—and transform themselves—in endlessly different ways” (Hickey-Moody & Malins, 2007, p. 11). They are “moments and sites of possibility when and where the assemblage and its striations might be disrupted or deterritorialized” (Youdell & Armstrong, 2011, p. 145). In smooth space, the body is “open to new movements, performances and connections” (Hickey-Moody & Malins, 2007, p. 11). This attention to space could be
situated within “spatial turn” in social theory (Bright, Manchester & Allendyke, 2013; McGregor, 2004).

In this research, I build upon works of educational research about broad cultural practices among youth or the lived experiences of students at school (Gaztambide-Fernández, 2009; Levinson & Holland 1996; Luttrell, 1997, 2003; Pomerantz, 2008; Thiessen, 2007; Yon, 2000; Willis, 1977), and more specifically educational research that explores the interplay between youth affects of becoming and schooling (Kofoed & Ringrose, 2012; Jackson, 2010; Renold & Ringrose, 2008, 2011; Ringrose, 2011; Ringrose & Renold, 2012; Youdell & Armstrong, 2011). These studies regard the school as an institution with great socializing power beyond the formal goals outlined in its respective institutional mandate and as an important site for young people to be involved in self-formation.

Bearing social justice in mind, I draw upon the critical educational scholars who explore youth’s subjectivity based on Foucauldian discursive study and Butler’s theories of subjectification. With a wide range of analytical focal points, these studies examine the practices related to different subject positions such as an enterprising young subject (Kelly, 2001; Nayak & Kehily, 2013), gender (Aapola, Gonick & Harris, 2005; Currie, Kelly & Pomerantz, 2006, 2009; Davies, 2003a, 2003b; Davies et al, 2001; Gonick, 2003; Harris, 2004a, 2004b; Kelly, Pomerantz, & Currie, 2005; Paechter, 2007; Pomerantz, 2008; Walkerdine, Lucey, & Melody, 2001), class (Walkerdine, Lucey, & Melody, 2001), race (Nayak, 2003; Reay & Lucey, 2000), and sexuality (Rasmussen, Rofes & Talburt, 2004; Rasmussen, 2006; Renold, 2005). Going beyond the analysis of how subjects are constructed through discourse, I explore the aspects of affect and transformation of the body, for which there is a need for further exploration in the context of the school.
Although empirical works that employ Deleuze’s philosophy are relatively new, a body of distinct research has been steadily growing, especially in the 21st century (R. Coleman & Ringrose, 2013). I attempt to contribute to this growing body of empirical research (Hickey-Moody & Malins, 2007; Potts, 2004), and especially to educational research in which the Deleuzian perspective is applied. While still few, several studies stand out as critical contributions to an emerging body of such educational empirical research. For example, Renold and Ringrose (2011) explore how young teen girls in urban and rural working-class communities are “regulated by, yet rework and resist expectations to perform as agentic sexual subjects” within contemporary debates on the moral panic around “sexualization” (p. 389). Through their ethnographic and narrative interviews with girls, Renold and Ringrose (2008) illustrate cracks and ruptures of heteronormative femininity in the context of a politics of “postfeminist masquerade.”

Investigating a case study of a teenage girl, who engages with social networking sites, Ringrose (2011) explores the relation between cyber-bulling and femininity, applying “a Deleuzoguattarian analysis,” which “offers new theoretical tools for thinking about discursive subjectification” but also “mapping complex desire-flows and micro movements through and against discursive/symbolic norms” (p. 598). She explores “the relationships between school and online spaces and subjective interfacing with these spaces” (p. 598).

In their empirical study about cyberbullying, Kofoed and Ringrose (2012) examine situated processes of subjectification and complex maneuverings of positionings, drawing on Butler’s theories of subjectification and Deleuze and Guattari’s theories of affect. Developing the terminology of “traveling and sticky affects,” they state that the term “sticky” refers to “force relations which (temporarily) glue certain affects to certain bodies” and the term
“traveling,” in contrast, refers to “the relational lives between subjects and the promiscuity and flowing nature of affects” (p. 9).

Drawing on the concept of becoming, Jackson also explores an adolescent girl’s struggle “against the over-coded, essentialized category of cheerleader and the discursive and material expectations of that category at her high school” and represents “how Jesse [her participant] unfolds herself through micro-particular movements with her other” (2010, p. 579). Mapping “how girls negotiate contradictory neo-liberal discourses of girlhood that dominate in popular culture,” and especially “post-feminist masquerade” (McRobbie, 2009), Ringrose and Renold explore “how specific ‘working-class’ girls struggle to negotiate this contradictory terrain of girlhood through imaginary ‘lines of flight’ in their narratives” (2012, p. 461). What is notable of these works is their focus on “teen femininity” in and around the spaces of schooling (Jackson, 2010; Renold & Ringrose, 2008, 2011; Ringrose, 2011; 2013), while other aspects such as masculinity and nationality have been given little notice.

In addition, while most of this research has focused on schools in Western countries such as the UK (Renold & Ringrose, 2008, 2011; Ringrose, 2011) and the USA (Jackson, 2010), the context of Japan has rarely been examined. Some recent discursive studies to explore how discourses such as gender, sexuality, ethnicity and nationality operate among young people at school in the context of Japan have examined certain subject positions and meanings such as gender in preschools (Davies & Kasama, 2004), Japanese femininities (Charlebois, 2011, chap. 3), sexuality (Castro-Vazquez, 2007) and “kikokushijo [returnees]” (Shibuya, 2001). However, these are still limited in the context of school in Japan and this area needs further consideration. Furthermore, the question remains: How do young people in Japan engage in affective transformative experiences at school? This is the main question that I explore in this study.
Becoming in Performance: Mimetic Practices

Erving Goffman, a social theorist, originally explored the notion of social performance extensively in his work, *Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (1959). “Performance” has recently received attention as a concept to shed light on new aspects of cultural praxis within contemporary cultural theory (Alexander, Anderson & Gallegos, 2005; Conquergood, 1986; Denzin, 2003). Arguing for “a more dynamic utilization of culture,” Conquergood sees the culture in performance paradigm as the one which “is never a given, but rather is alive with all the unpredictability associated with social actors making decisions such as deciding to perform a familiar narrative or disrupt it” (Conquergood, 1986, cited in Alexander, Anderson & Gallegos, 2005, p. 2).

Viewed as “struggle and intervention,” Denzin (2003) also considers the possibilities of performance for “transgressive achievements, political accomplishments that break through ‘sedimented meanings and normative traditions’ ” (p. 188), borrowing the words of Conquergood. While there are many kinds of performance and various functions of it, in this case it refers to “the strategic and the (...) aestheticized engagement of bodily activity with the intent of knowing through doing and showing” (p. 1) as well as “a displayed enactment of ideology and enfleshed knowledge” (Alexander, Anderson & Gallegos, 2005, p. 2). In other words, performance is an aesthetic, social, political process in which “relationships are negotiated, power struggles fought out, and communities emerge and vanish” (Fischer-Lichte, 2014, p. 42).

As for further conceptualization of performance, Fischer-Lichte’s definition is useful. She defines a performance as “any event in which all the participants find themselves in the same place at the same time, partaking in a circumscribed set of activities” (2014, p. 18). She articulates four central characteristics of performance, the first of which is its “mediality.”
Fischer-Lichte states that “a performance is inseparable from the bodily co-presence of various groups of people who come together as actors and spectators,” linking to “the medial conditions of performance, or its mediality” (p. 18, italics in original).

The second characteristic of performance is its “materiality.” Fischer-Lichte defines the materiality of performance as emerging through “spatiality,” “corporeality,” and “tonality” (2014). The materiality of performance is “not simply a given” but “emerges and disappears in the process of performance” (p. 36). Defining performance by its transience, which “is integral to the materiality of performance,” Fischer-Lichte articulates that a performance creates itself rather than creating a product. It is “transitory and ephemeral, even if the performance involves spaces, bodies, and objects that outlast the performance” (p. 18).

The third characteristic of performance is its “semioticity.” Fischer-Lichte (2014) states that everything is brought forth and shown as a sign—whether it is a movement, a sound, or a thing.

Finally, the fourth characteristic is its “aestheticity,” which is a sort of experience a performance enables for its participants by taking bodily co-presence, transience, materiality, and semioticity together (Fischer-Lichte, 2014)

Fischer-Lichte also pays attention to rhythm that “creates a relationship between spatiality, physicality, and tonality” (2014, p. 37). Fischer-Lichte states that rhythm “plays a large role in organizing the chronology of the scenes, speech, movement through the space, and spatial constellation” (p. 37). Rhythm also can be “an organizing principle that presupposes and spurs permanent transformations” (p. 37). Rhythm is fundamentally connected to the human body: the human body is “a rhythmical instrument, particularly suited to perceive and be moved by rhythm” (p. 38). In this way, performance refers to how “different ‘rhythmic systems’ come into contact” (p. 38), and this study especially looks at the contact where the rhythms of the
performer and those of the character come into contact within the rhythms of production that in turn come in contact with those of the spectator.

**Performance as event and liminality.** Performance is “an event,” which is created through the interaction of actors and spectators (Fischer-Lichte, 2014). As a singular event, Fischer-Lichte sees performance in which “participants experience themselves as subjects who partially control, and are partially controlled by, the conditions – neither fully autonomous nor fully determined” (2014, p. 42).

Another characteristic of performance bound up with its “event-ness” is liminality, which is originally Victor Turner’s conception. Turner defines a “liminal state” as an unstable existence “betwixt and between the positions assigned and arrayed by law, custom, convention, and ceremonial” (Turner, cited in Fischer-Lichte, 2014, p. 43). While liminality opens up cultural space for experiments and innovations, Fischer-Lichte states that “the experience of a liminal situation destabilizes one’s sense of self and other, and of the world at large,” implying “strong feelings and changes in a person’s physiological, energetic, and affective state” (2014, p. 43).

Fischer-Lichte states, “Any performance has the potential to create a liminal experience” (2014, p. 44). For artistic performances, threshold experiences are ends in themselves (Fischer-Lichte, 2014). Whether aesthetic threshold experiences will occur in a given performative event depends on “the perceptions of each individual whether the participants concentrate on the liminality of their perception or see the performance as a means to an end” (Fischer-Lichte, 2014, p. 44).

The notion of liminality resembles the notion of “transitional space” advanced by Winnicott, a child psychoanalyst. As “a time and space of play, creativity, and cultural production” (1971, p. 61), the transitional space is “a process that moves inner realities into a
special relation to outer realities” and “a simultaneous convergence of multiple events, sensations, actions, and experiences” (Ellsworth, 2005, p. 62). Transitional space is the in-between space of “me” and “not-me,” connecting inside to outside, in a constant flow of self into other, which disrupts dichotomous distinctions. As for the boundaries between self and other in transitional space, Ellsworth states:

We are traversing the boundaries between self and other and reconfiguring those boundaries and the meanings we give them. We are entertaining strangeness and playing in difference. We are crossing that important internal boundary that is the line between the person we have been but no longer are and the person we will become. (2005, p. 62)

The transitional space can be created and supported by what Winnicott called “a good-enough holding environment.” “A good-enough holding environment” means “the space and time of an attentive, responsive holding of demands and invitations that carry the potential for transitional experience” (Ellsworth, 2005, p. 60). It is an environment that does not “collapse the space of intermingling between self and other,” nor does it “allow either self or other, inside or outside, to do all the taking” (p. 60). Transitional spaces are only “potential” because “nothing makes them inherently or inevitably transitional” (p. 60) which always “comes as a surprise” for both the designers and for the audiences.

As a notion that is allied with “transitional space,” Winnicott describes “transitional objects” as the things we use to “imaginatively put ourselves in a transformative relation with the outside” (Ellsworth, 2005, p. 60). In this study, I consider “an image” of the other or the role as a “transitional object,” with which youth are in a transformative relationship.

“Deep mimesis” and affect. In this study, I explore the liminal experiences of performers, and especially of those during their mimetic practices. Having an origin in Greek thinking, mimesis is conventionally understood as “imitation” of reality, referring to the
physical act of mimicking, or regarding artistic images as representation of reality. For example, for Plato, mimesis is a form of copying the original, which produces the fake (Gebauer & Wulf, 1995). Opposing this conceptualization of mimesis, I cast mimesis as a social and cultural process, which makes and breaks social bonds. This view has an origin in the work of Benjamin, who sees “mimetic faculty” in all of our higher functions and regards mimesis as the compulsion “to become and behave like something else” (1978, p. 333). Although mimesis is often seen as a physical action where it is called mimicry, I see it as the mixture of the practices of body, mind, and brain.

Specifically, I regard mimesis as a distinct way of intervening in the self by stepping out of ourselves and drawing the outer world into our inner world; mimesis creates an otherwise unattainable proximity to the other (Gebauer & Wulf, 1995). In addition, mimesis is considered as “a *rendering*—a relation between things” (Gibbs, 2010, p. 193), seeing affect, relationality, and mediation as central in the process. That is, mimesis means “the corporeally based forms of imitation,” in which “the visceral level of affect contagion” is central (p. 186). Mimesis is also “a trajectory in which (subject and object) are swept up” (p. 194) rather than a clear-cut split between subject and object. Mimesis is the continuity of discontinuities, including “two parallel lines of abstractive suspense” that resonate together (Massumi, 2002, p. 41).

In order to explore mimesis from the perspective of “performance,” the work by Anna Deavere Smith is of great inspiration. Interviewing people with diverse backgrounds of race, ethnicity, gender, and class, and performing an edited interview on-stage, her performance is enacted by “taking onto her own body the words, intonations, affects, gestures, rhythms, and accents of those she listened to” (Ellsworth, 2005, p. 63). Smith’s acting is the search for

---

11 Anna Deavere Smith is an African American performance artist and playwright, well known for her acting technique and theatre performances, which have been developed in her influential books: *Fires in the Mirror: Crown Heights, Brooklyn, and Other Identities* (Smith, 1993) and *Twilight: Los Angeles, 1992* (Smith, 1994).
character, which “is constantly in motion” and is “a quest that moves back and forth between
the self and the other” (Smith, 1993, p. xxvii). In other words, acting for her is an activity that
attempts to break down and cross across the rigid boundaries between an actor/self and a
character/other.

Differentiating with “pretend,” Schechner describes Smith’s performance as “deep
mimesis,” which occurs by incorporating another, that is, by “be[ing] possessed by… open[ing]
one[self] up thoroughly and deeply to another being” (1993, p. 63). Schechner sees “uncanny
empathy” in her approaches of looking and listening, which is to “allow the other in, to feel
what the other is feeling, … absorb[ing] the gesture, the tone of voice, the look, the intensity,
the moment-by-moment details of a conversation without destroying the others nor losing
herself” (p. 64).

While the sensuous surface of her figure, voice, and gestures are deliberately focused,
hers performance is regarded as an attempt which “seek(s) to bring antagonistic selves and others
into intimate proximity without closing or presuming to know the spaces of difference between
them” (Ellsworth, 2005, p. 58). It is “cooperative dance,” in the words of Thompson (2003),
which is “a sketch of something that is inside a person and not fully revealed by the words
alone” (p. 7). Made up not only of “their own experiences but also of their fantasies and
misconceptions of others” (p. 64), Anna Deavere Smith’s performance is “emotional,
intellectual, bodily, and spiritual labor,” requiring “negotiat[ing] identity in relation to others
and to keep similarity and difference in relation, to keep self in relation” (Ellsworth, 2005, p. 65).

**Mimesis, image, and imagination.** Mimesis embodies the image and imagination.
Conceptualizing the relations between mimesis and image, Lury (1998) differentiates “blind
imitation” from “perfection-seeking homeostasis.” Based on Benjamin’s concept of “dialectical
image,” “blind imitation” is “a technique of the experimental individual,” “metamorphosis,”
“transformation,” or “binding into the environment” in which mimesis is “a relation of ‘being like’” (R. Coleman, 2009, p. 18). Here, while there are no clear lines of division between bodies and images, bodies and images are regarded as “constituted through their relationality” (R. Coleman, 2008, p. 163). In this view, bodies “become through their relations with images” (p. 174), while the relations produce particular affects.

This is different from what R. Coleman (2008) calls “an oppositional model of subject/object”¹² and “perfection-seeking homeostasis,” in which mimesis is reduced to “the imitation of versions of itself” and “a stylistic reduction” (Lury, 1998, p. 5). Here, bodies and images are regarded as a pre-existing distinction and reducing body image as the issue of “representation.”

The relation of the image with imagination is intertwined. While the image constitutes an important aspect of imagination, the image “encompasses an imaginary realm” (R. Coleman, 2013, p. 13). Imagination has been regarded as one of the key aspects of social and cultural practices (Anderson, 1983; Appadurai, 1996; Greene, 1995; Mills, 1959). For example, Anderson (1983) considers the imagination as the thing, which operates within a broader set of neoliberal imperatives that both produce and govern normativity. Also, Appadurai (1996) sees that the imagination is not only the faculty through which dominant imagined ideologies become prevalent, but also the faculty through which one may resist or subvert the hegemonic discourse or practice by imaging otherwise. Although some see the imagination as “utopian” or tied to the present “in an oppositional mode of negation” (p. 13), this research sees it as an

---

¹² R. Coleman (2013) argues that much of existing feminist empirical and theoretical work takes an oppositional model of body/image, subject/object, even if it is often only implicitly. In those well-established sociological views, bodies are seen as those which are “being effected by images” (R. Coleman, 2008, p. 174), and attention is especially paid to the negative effects of image on bodies. Much feminist empirical research explores the increasing homogenization of Western cultural images of female bodies and the pressure women feel from images (Bordo, 2003; Weiss, 1999). R. Coleman (2008) articulates that feminist theorist, Bordo (2003), who explores the problem of the “over-presence” of the image, linking contemporary Western visual culture, blurs the boundaries between bodies and images but her argument still rests upon a model of subject/object.
affirmative force which “actively strives to create collectively empowering alternatives” and sees it as “transformative and inspirational” with material effects (Braidotti, 2011, p. 14).

Braidotti states that, as one aspect of imagination, the practice of “as if” is “a technique of strategic re-location” and “the affirmation of fluid boundaries, a practice of the intervals, of the interfaces, and of the interstices” which leads to political subversion rather than “language games,” “self-referential obsessions” or “fetishistic disavowal” (1994, p. 6). The practice is empowering because of its potential for positive renaming and for opening up “in-between spaces where new forms of political subjectivity can be explored” (p. 7). In addition, in this research, I see imagination or the imaginary as that which is intimately tied to affective corporeal existence without a subject, referring to that which is not-yet and virtual. The value of the concept of the virtual has been explored in contemporary sociology (R. Coleman, 2013).

Although the virtual is often considered the opposite to reality, denouncing the opposition between the real and the virtual, Deleuze sees that the virtual refers to be fully real (Daignault, 2008).

**Performance and education.** The notable work which brings the lens of performance studies to education is _Performance Theories in Education: Power, Pedagogy, and the Politics of Identity_, edited by Alexander, Anderson, and Gallegos (2005). In parts of this collection (Aleman, 2005; Baszile, 2005; Gallegos, 2005; Urrieta, 2005), the question of “how performance is linked to the productions of identity and conversely how they function in maintenance, resistance, and subversion of power” is especially explored (Alexander, Anderson & Gallegos, 2005, p. 5).

Another collective work, which links performance and youth subjectivities in the field of education has been completed by a Canadian educational researcher, Kathleen Gallagher. Through research that explores youth subjectivity formation using the lens of performance,
Gallagher (2000) discusses gender and equity by looking at the lives of girls in an urban, single-sex school. Later, in her study of youth in public, urban, North American high schools, Gallagher (2007) explores youth subjectivity formation at school, especially in the place of the “urban,” by looking at theatrical performances. Examining “the particular strength of theatre to raise questions about relations of gender and race,” Gallagher and Rivière address “the implications of challenging normative constructions of racial and gendered subjectivity in urban schools within the context of youth performances of both the social and artistic kind” (2007, p. 319).

As another notable work about performance and youth self-making, Perry and Rogers (2011) explore “how the urban is imagined and troubled through performances of youth engaged in a devised theatre project” (p. 197). Looking at comic performances by adolescent girls who attend an after-school drama club, Ramsay (2014) also examines femininity in relation to “the opposition between comedy and what is coded as appropriate feminine behaviour” and “those current regimes of gender that encourage girls to discipline and control the body in pursuit of a feminine ideal” (p. 373). I situate my study within these avenues of research that look at youth experiences of performance to explore the questions of youth self-making in relation with such discourses as gender and race.

Conclusion

To summarize, this chapter first engages critically with the concept of discourse, as I attempt to both build from and challenge the critical educational work about youth subjectivity formation at school. With the purpose of putting the questions of alliances and social solidarities in central, I explore Deleuzian concepts such as “becoming,” “affect,” “territorialization,” “deterritorialization” and Braidotti’s “nomadic subjectivities,” and focus on Ahmed’s urge to locate the encounter in time and space. I consider school as “affective assemblage,” that is,
multiplicitous entities constituted through interactions among diverse parts with different affective capacities. I especially pay attention to “performance,” and mimesis in particular, as a cultural practice, and consider its “liminality” at “transitional space” as the most important aspect to be explored, while also regarding “imagination” as an important aspect of those cultural practices.

Drawing on these concepts, in this dissertation, I explore how affects flow and where they get stuck, or how territorialization and deterritorialization occur during events of mimetic performances at “affective assemblages” of schooling. Also, I examine how particular discourses related to ideas such as kyara and “school caste,” and discourses on categories such as gender, ethnicity and nationality are involved in such processes. To conduct ethnographic work means to engage with these concepts not metaphorically but contextually. Providing the contextualized analysis, I will explore dynamic social processes and young people’s capacities to create new connections with “the other” towards becoming who they want to become through negotiating competing discourse of what it means to be “normal” and “appropriate” young citizens in the context of Japan in late modernity.
Chapter 3
The Ethnographic Assemblages: Researching Becoming at a School

In this chapter, I first describe research methodology, which I rely on the paradigm broadly called “post qualitative research” (Lather & St. Pierre, 2013; MacLure, 2013; St. Pierre, 2011), and demonstrate research processes and practices based on the methodological guideline. I lay out four main data collecting methods and, as an analytic strategy, I articulate narrative and coding. Throughout this process, I specifically consider the interwoven relationship between participants and the researcher, and reframe the researcher’s relationship with the data.

Research Methodology: Toward Post Qualitative Research

To conduct an ethnographic study to explore youth’s affects in schooling, the tools of feminist poststructural ethnography (Britzman, 2000; Lather, 2007; St. Pierre & Pillow, 2000; Walkerdine, Lucey, & Melody, 2001) and the paradigm that is broadly called “post qualitative research” (Lather & St. Pierre, 2013; MacLure, 2013; St. Pierre, 2011). More specifically, to frame my own sense-making (which focuses on affects in the field), the work (which draws its ideas from the studies of Deleuze and Guattari [Alvermann, 2000; R. Coleman & Ringrose, 2013; Lather, 2007; Mazzei & McCoy, 2010; St. Pierre, 2000], and Karen Barad [Jackson & Mazzei, 2012; Taguchi, 2012]) became a strong methodological guideline. As alternative research practices to either realist or constructionist ontologies, these are also called “new materialist research” (Fox & Alldred, 2014) and go well together with “(post)critical feminist methodology” (Lather, 2007). Although those that follow Deleuze methodologically are still relatively scattered (Mazzei & McCoy, 2010), they have been emerging in recent years.

Seeking ethical research practices, these approaches are both built upon the wider critique of the conventional humanist and positivist epistemology and premises of traditional ethnography: the notion of objectivity and universal truth, the idea of a value-neutral “scientific”
method, and the purpose of portraying the essence of a context and “the other.” Instead, these approaches are guided by the belief that “truth” is always tentative and provisional, and exists in multiple forms in the field, constantly changing and affected by the context.

Developing a post-qualitative research practice requires several reconceptualizations of research processes and practices. One important idea is to see research from the viewpoint of assemblage as defined by Deleuze and Guattari (R. Coleman & Ringrose, 2013; Fox & Alldred, 2014; Jackson & Mazzei, 2012), regarding methodology as “a way of relating to multiple assembled worlds” (R. Coleman & Ringrose, 2013, p. 6). The research assemblage comprises “the bodies, things and abstractions that get caught up in social inquiry, including the events that are studied, the tools, models and precepts of research, and the researchers” (Fox & Alldred, 2014, p. 2).

The notion of “intra-action” by Karen Barad, which sees research processes and practices as “folding and flattering,” is also important for “post qualitative research.” Jackson and Mazzei explain that the focus of “intra-action” means “re-considering the mutual constitution of meaning as happening in between researcher/researched; data/theory; and inside/outside” (2012, p. 11). For them, this is not an attention to “one of the various poles in a myriad of binaries,” but rather an attention to “a flattening and attentiveness to how each constitutes the other and how each, as supple, sprouts as something new in the threshold” (p. 10).

To employ these concepts of assemblage and intra-action in methodological practices means, first, to focus on “affect.” Attending to “affective flows and the capacities they produce,” Fox and Alldred encourage us to disclose “the relations within assemblages” and “the kinds of affective flows that occur between these relations” (2014, p. 4). This is what Deleuze and Guattari (1987) call “schozoanalysis;” that is, a method to map how desire flows and power operates.
Secondly, committing to “specificity” or “singularity” of a thing is also important: rather than looking at a determining social structure, singular affect should be explored (R. Coleman & Ringrose, 2013; Fox & Alldred, 2014). Deleuze’s empiricism is about “a commitment to beginning from singular, partial or ‘molecular’ experiences, which are then organized and extended into ‘molar’ formations” (Colebrook, 2002, p. 82, cited in R. Coleman & Ringrose, 2013, p. 10-11).

The third characteristic is a focus upon social production rather than social construction. R. Coleman and Ringrose articulate the shift of attention from “knowing” to “relating to” the world: that is, paying attention to not only “catching” the realities, but “making” them (2013, p. 6). Emerging as an assemblage, knowledge production is then seen as “a creation from chaos,” which is “not as a final arrival, but the result of plugging in” (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012, p. 2). In this sense, knowledge is considered the issue of how a researcher relates with and becomes participants and data within research assemblages.

Being “one point of the relations within an assemblage,” researchers are themselves “entangled within the assemblages they seek to study” (R. Coleman & Ringrose, 2013, p. 6). Critiquing methodology in the traditional social science research, feminist poststructural ethnography calls upon researchers’ reflexivity to examine their own subjectivity, which shapes research practices (Lather, 1991; St. Pierre & Pillow, 2000; Walkerdine, 1997; Walkerdine, Lucey, & Melody, 2001). For example, shedding light on the interwoven relationality between participants and a researcher, Walkerdine, Lucey, and Melody suggest to make explicit “which part of me is the subject speaking, which part of me is responding, who I represent for the subject, and who they represent for me” (2001, p. 19). Although seeking reflexivity reveals the research’s way of knowing, Jackson and Mazzei propose to “unsettle the ‘I’ of both the researcher and researched who is a static and singular subject” (2012, p. 10).
Addressing the problem of distinguishing between the subjects and objects of research, Deleuzian research methods attend to “affective capacities” and the ethics which could be explored through “an attention to how ‘relations with other bodies diminish or enhance those capacities’” (R. Coleman & Ringrose, 2013, p. 11). R. Coleman and Ringrose caution researchers to “be responsible for the ‘cuts’ that are made in the practice of boundary-making,” moving away from “seeing individuals as clearly bounded subject” and toward “a mapping of the relations in which researchers are always involved” (p. 6).

The process of research was, then, the process of mapping my own relations in the field and that helped me learn about school assemblages which students are part of. For example, soon after starting the fieldwork, I came to realize that I was in a part of the “theatre person” assemblage, which caused me to shift my attention to theatre as an identity category with certain meanings and systems. One day, in a class called Applied Theatre Expression where students were practicing a part of *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, Shuji, a male student, slowly approached me while I was sitting at the back to see the whole stage while writing field notes. He asked me, “Why don’t you participate in the performance?” Quite surprised by the question, I asked him what prompted him to ask me. He said, “Because you look very fond of theatre and I thought you want to join us.” “Do I look that way?” I asked. He said, “Yes, I can tell from outside,” with a smile. Never having directly addressed him about my history surrounding theatre, I wondered how he got that impression of me: Was it that obvious? His question unexpectedly made me confront my unconscious affects toward theatre, which had not been examined for a long time, bringing back some of my memories.

These opportunities to explore how I could relate with students and the field not only deepened my understanding of the field, but also became powerful, transformative experiences for me. My relation with theatre seemed to give me some degree of legitimacy to do the research
in the place of theatre, attracting certain students as well as keeping some students away, and affecting what topics were discussed and how openly they talked. As I previously discussed elsewhere (Gaztambide-Fernández, Cairns, Kawashima, Menna & VanderDussen, 2011), my body was entangled in the field, shaping what I, as a researcher, could do and, in return, letting me know more about the field.

**Encountering the Data as a Nomadic Ethnographer**

Although positivistic ethnographic work traditionally considers data collection in the way that a researcher chooses an existing method to get data, new materialist social inquiry sees a research methodology as “a specific arrangement of machines, designed to shape how affect flows between its constituent relations, and what capacities these flows produce” (Fox & Alldred, 2014, p. 6). In this sense, the research method could only be designed within the research assemblage, and only after encountering the participants and the field through the process of figuring out affective flows surrounding myself. For example, in a research proposal, I originally planned to invite students to make their own collages, which I thought could be a part of a method of visual analysis, and create portfolios to keep a record of their learning in class. However, while I had consulted my research plan with the teachers, I could not find a way to smoothly connect those activities with classroom activities that teachers already had in mind. More specifically, listening to Mr. Okamoto’s intention of what he planned to do, especially through *Sketches of Daily Lives* (an ongoing exercise of writing about their lives through reflecting on them, and working toward a final performance), I could not find a way to put forward the activity that I originally had in mind. I found out that this task would not fit with the classroom activities. As a result, journal writing and interviewing became the main methods of data collection.
In order to not uncritically impose a pre-determined planned method onto the field, the idea of “a nomadic ethnographer” (St. Pierre, 2000) was helpful. “A nomadic ethnographer” is one who “appear[s] in one local space and then another without defining transitions and paths to connect those points into a fiercely ordered grid of striation” (St. Pierre, 2000, p. 264). She travels around the problematics within connections and multiplicities and seeks “the surprising intensity of an event” rather than settling for the familiar “iteration of theorematics” (p. 264). My fieldwork was “nomadic inquiry,” in that I was always unsure of my destination, figuring out what the things I have been doing are called as a research method along the way.

For ethnographic work at school, teachers are a significant part of the research assemblage. When I first consulted about the journal exchange method with teachers before entering the field, I explained it as writing exchanges between students and me outside class. Explaining the ethical review policies of University of Toronto, I told them that these would not be revealed to keep the students’ privacy. Once approved by the teachers, I conducted those exchanges during the class entitled Foundations of Theatre Expression.

Although the teachers had opportunities to see the questionnaire for journal writing as I had distributed the papers to students in class, they never asked me about those questions during classes. However, one day after a final performance day had ended, Mr. Okamoto asked me in the teachers’ room how my exchanges with students had been going. I handed him the blank questionnaire sheets, and while seeing him reading them curiously I mentioned some examples of students writing without revealing individual names or statements. At that moment, I realized that I knew of some of the students’ experiences in class that their teachers did not. It was clear to me that my overgeneralized statements were too vague for him. Through the practice of journal writing, the only relationship expanded was the relationship between the students and myself and not the relationship of Mr. Okamoto with either students or myself. In addition,
expanding my relationship with the students seemed to indirectly have an influence on decreasing his relationship with the students, limiting what he as a teacher could do with students in class through the impression of the stronger bond between students and myself.

Here, my practice, in the name of “ethical correctness,” of keeping the results to myself turned me into the privileged researcher who is the only one who can access certain information, information which could have been useful to the teachers as feedback for conducting their classes. Should I have not told him anything about the content in the first place to prevent this situation? In the end, after discussing the research method again, we decided to instead use reflection papers as a part of assignments in class the following week so that both the teachers and I would be able to read the students’ comments. This marked a shift to my approach, decided while in the field.

This incident with a teacher illustrates that ethical practice should be considered effectively as a single event that occurs contextually beyond a simple statement of approval in a consent form. Problematizing the slippery notion of “informed consent,” which is framed in a regulatory manner in the institutionalized procedural ethics by professional guidelines and codes, Renold, Holland, Ross, and Hillman attend to “the intersubjective, situated and negotiated approach to research ethics as ongoing dialogue in everyday fieldwork relations” (2008, p. 427).

In addition, the ethics in educational research clearly need to be considered in relation with the dual relations with students and teachers in order to prevent a one-sided benefit for the researcher. I see this double relation with students and teachers as one of the challenges faced by educational scholars. For example, with my research focus on youth, I intended to build one-on-one relations with youth beyond the teacher-student relationship. At the same time, I needed to act with a certain kind of adult behaviour and be seen as a legitimate researcher in order for the teachers to feel comfortable to have me stay at their school. In the class space, especially, where
all of the students, teachers, and I were together, I often felt that the two different
assemblages with teachers and students that I was part of were each pulling me away from the
other. Now I think that the expectation of acting like “an adult” that I unconsciously felt
regulated in my capacity for how much I could engage with students, preventing construction of
any sort of deeper relations in class.

With similar concern it is important to gather participants, attending to the complex,
always-in-process terrain of consent. Renold et al. propose the concept of “becoming
participant,” which focuses on “the micro-ethical moments of complex and ambivalent
engagements and disengagements within the research process” (2008, p. 427) and “the dynamic,
complex and shifting nature of the ways in which ‘participants’ are positioned and position
themselves within the research process” (p. 429). While participation is voluntary, attending to
the contextual process of “becoming participant” is especially important when the research
practices are embedded in class practices. For example, teachers in some classes sometimes
suggested I created reflection papers that were relevant for both class practices and my research
interest (as in Foundations of Theatre Expression and the second term of Applied Theatre
Expression).

At another time, I facilitated group discussion (Foundations of Theatre Theory). On one
occasion, I taught one session of a class (Foundations of Theatre Expression), which made my
position literally shift from researcher to teacher, blurring the line between pedagogy and
methodology. Influencing what knowledge was being produced, these shifts especially urged me
to continuously consider the process of “becoming participant” in the blurring terrain of student
participation.

Rejecting the researcher’s status as objective observer and reframing the researcher’s
relationship with the data, this study took a view of considering the researcher as part of the data
(Sermijn, Devlieger, & Loots, 2008; Taguchi, 2012). Taguchi sees that “the bodymind of the researcher becomes a space of transit in the encounter with data” and regards data as “a co-constitutive force, working with and upon the researcher, as the researcher is working with data” (2012, p. 272). Given this emphasis on co-constitutivity, the notion of data in traditional qualitative research has been questioned. Articulating “emotional data,” “dream data,” and “sensual data,” or “response data” as “transgressive data,” St. Pierre argues for the inclusion of “transgressive data,” which is never “textualized into words on a page” and “escape(s) language,” that is, data that “(is) uncodable, excessive, out-of-control, out-of-category” (1997, p. 179).

Ringrose and Renold also see the data as that which “will always exceed itself and evolve and transform as it intra-acts with other data and research assemblages” (2014, p. 778). Taking this view of data, this research produced the data through five main data collecting machines: 1) participant observation in drama classes; 2) students’ journal writing; 3) assignments in the classes; 4) interviews with youth participants; and 5) the bodymind of the researcher.

**Observation in drama classes.** From October 2009 to February 2011, I visited Akane High School one or two days each week to observe drama classes. Along with “hanging out” with students before and after the classes, classroom observation provided an important starting point to explore students’ bodily experiences at school. By mainly observing class practices from outside, sometimes facilitating class discussion (Foundations of Theatre Expression, Foundations of Theatre Theory), and at one time teaching a class (in the third term of Foundations of Theatre Expression), I developed a sense of the daily practices in drama class.

During the first six months at school, I focused on observing the 12 students of one class, Foundations of Theatre Expression, from which I developed a research assemblage with other
classes and students (although 13 students took the Foundations of Theatre Expression, one third grade student only took the second term of class, while the other students were all in the second grade and took both terms). During the next school year (the Japanese school year starts at April and ends at March), I visited three classes (Applied Theatre Expression, Foundations of Theatre Theory, Applied Theatre Theory). Most of the 12 students in Foundations of Theatre Expression in the previous year took both applied classes, while new students also joined the classes. Also, I observed Foundations of Theatre Theory in which new second year students from the grade below attended (see Appendix C for the list of classes and Appendix D for the students in class).

Classroom observation, to which I devoted a large portion of my time at the school, was the place to explore identity experimentation and its social context, especially how students’ affects flowed and became stuck in relation with the certain image of the other within collectively participating school assemblages. During classroom observation, I watched the way that students chose or were chosen for a role to act and practiced their performance, all while listening as students discussed the related issues with the processes. While observing each class, I tried to glean a sense of what discourses students brought into or were directed into their practices (and how competing discourses of identity played out), how students positioned themselves and others as particular kinds of subjects, and when and how students deterritorialized those discourses, especially around the events of acting practices.

The objective of the class activity often influenced how individual affective experiences of students appeared in class. For example, in some of the classes, in which there was a particular focus on the final product of theatre or on students’ understanding of the play, there was a constraint on how these affective experiences would arise. However, even in those classes, students frequently expressed their thoughts and feelings towards their own acting or when
seeing others’ acting in sometimes very subtle, sometimes very obvious ways. In my field notes, I wrote how students reacted when they were cast, got feedback on their performance, and were directed to act in different ways: they entailed embodied expressions including positive reactions such as delight, happiness, and passion, and negative reactions such as reluctance, irritation, and confusion.

These fleeting affective dots in the collective events of the classroom helped me to map out individual discursive “affective spots,” which were parts of and gave a sense of school assemblage. These “affective spots” became follow-up points in interviews to delve deeper and explore how affects emerge, flow, and get stuck in the school assemblage. What I wrote down in my field notes also included several different components of assemblages such as classroom settings, body movement of students, and specific interactions, both verbal and nonverbal.

On other occasions, classroom observations served to reveal the image of the role or the world that students were trying to become. Indeed, each drama text, or even one character within it, was constituted by many layered images in which series of positions with certain meanings would emerge. These images with which students experimented were constructed discursively and collectively in class, while student authors of texts were sharing their intentions (for instance, the text of Sketches of Daily Life in Foundations of Theatre Expression, and the text with which students did filmmaking in Applied Theatre Theory), teachers were telling students their interpretations of the text (For example, with A Midsummer Night’s Dream in the second term of Applied Theatre Expression, and Antigone and Oedipus the King in Foundations of Theatre Theory—see Chapter 4 for the further details), and actors were sharing their thoughts and internalizing the stories while practicing performances. Although none of these were directly the focus of analysis on their own, the assemblage of these images became the social
map of the image and its related social position, indicating the relations with which students themselves experimented.

Drama classes were usually conducted in open spaces where desks and chairs were removed so that arrangements of students are often more flexible than with other classes. The Foundations of Theatre Expression class was an exception since it was mainly lecture-based. Students sometimes participated in physical exercises and movement, and at other times sat in a circle, in an ellipse or in a line. Although there was this mobility in class, I often watched the performances and listened to the class discussions from the back rather than participating in class activities and talking with students during classes, especially since the class activities mainly involved the class as a whole. However, this varied depending on the class and the teacher, and in some cases I involved myself more in the discussions and practices, especially if invited by the teacher to do so.

**Journal writing and reflection papers.** Journal writing consisted of the interaction between students and myself through written text. I originally became attracted to the method after being inspired by a Japanese educational scholar, Akemi Kurachi, whose “journal approach” is one in which a learner and a learning assistant exchange a journal to support learners’ learning (Kurachi, 2002). I chose the method to aid my attempt to approach the internal experiences of individual students in class. Another reason for using journal writing was to further my efforts to try to create a collaborative context in which participants reflect on their own experiences, while answering the researcher’s questions and receiving responses to their writing from the researcher. While the researcher invites participants into dialogue, I thought that this method held the potential of going beyond the binary researcher-participant relationship.

While observation attends more to the discursive interactions among participants, the one-on-one written form possibly facilitates in-depth personal reflections and individual
narratives about their experiences in class. Another objective of this approach was to record, as much as possible, the fleeting senses of the experiences that might be forgotten later at the time of conducting interviews. Therefore, journal writing along with reflection papers functioned as prompts for conversations in interviews.

I exchanged journals with the 13 students who took Foundations of Theatre Expression. One day in class, after inviting students (see Appendix E for Consent Form for Students and Appendix F for Consent Form for Parents) and telling them that this would be an exchange between students and myself, I heard several female students’ voices shouting out such expressions as “Sounds fun!” “Exciting!” “Seems like the ‘exchange diary’ that I used to do with friends” (Students and I gradually came to refer to the journal writing as the “exchange diary”). After having obtained formal consent from their parents or guardians, I asked students in class to choose their favourite colour for journal writing from several colour options for thick, high-quality notebooks with a hard cover, showing them the pamphlet.

The thinking behind this was the thought at first that students won’t lose the notebook, increasing their motivation, and it soon turned out that my choice of these notebooks revealed students’ economic perspectives. Looking at the pamphlet in-group during a break, several students told me that the notebooks looked very expensive, and one hundred yen (about $1) notebooks were enough for them. When I told them that I will buy these books, the students were surprised with big smiles. When Maiko, a female student, told me that it was still too good for her, I was prompted to tell her, “Don’t worry. I have got financial support for this,” although it was not actually true. Looking relieved, she said, “Then, I will take it.” Never expecting these reactions from the students, I started to worry that I might have given students extra pressure by providing these to them, and that this was ethically insensitive behaviour. However, seeing the students already selecting their favourite colours, I decided to keep that style this time.
In order to structure the journal writing to some degree, every time I asked students questions that were related to the content of the classroom activities. At first, I asked questions regarding the students’ background and self-descriptions, and then their perceptions of the role and the texts they were acting and writing, the understanding of the proximity between the role/other and themselves, acting strategy, reflection of performances, and other choices of the roles they wanted to act (for invitation letters and actual questions regarding journal writing, see Appendix G). With these questions, their writing began with reflections on the last drama class, after which point I invited students to write anything about class-related issues if they like.

The length of students’ writing at one time varied from one page to six pages depending on each student’s level of engagement. The mode of writing style varied as well. Decorating the notebook with stickers, female students tended to write longer free-style narrative, sometimes drawing colourful pictures. In contrast, male students often gave short answers one by one for each question.

I responded to the students’ writing and the students often replied to my responses again in the following writing. These responses from students were usually followed up in the interview. While the journal writing process was mainly aimed at reflecting on students’ experiences in class, students were also invited to critically ponder other possibilities of the experiences in class through answering the questions in their journals. As such, I sometimes detected that journal writing itself somehow appeared to serve as a site for self-experimentation in a way that might not be allowed in class.

Receiving the journal notebooks from the students outside of class, I gave the books back to them with my responses at next class. On the first day when I brought the notebooks with my responses to the class, a few female students approached me as soon as I entered to the classroom. Nijiho asked if I wrote responses to them. I said yes, and she said “Ya-hoo” with a
big smile. Flipping the pages, she said, “Wow, you wrote a lot!” and finished reading it before the class started. While many students stated that they enjoyed the exchanges, expressing their excitement, a few students were more reluctant to participate, saying sorry that they forgot to bring the notebook or that they were sick. Since I felt that peer pressure in class might have made students feel an obligation to participate, I kept telling them that their participation was totally voluntary and they did not need to feel any pressure.

While journal writing allowed me to develop relationships with students before conducting interviews, it was noteworthy that the level of students’ engagement with journal writing did not directly reflect that of the students’ involvement in interviews. That is, even the students who seemed reluctant about journal writing often surprisingly engaged in interviews willingly.

Although I started with the journal writing at the beginning of my fieldwork, I switched to reflection papers at the second year of my fieldwork for two reasons: the first being the relationship with teachers already described, and the second being the increased number of students, which made it difficult for me to maintain journal exchanges with all students. The teachers and myself created reflection papers in several ways, ranging from the style where a teacher created an assignment, or the style in which the teacher and I prepared the questions together as an assignment, or the style in which I prepared questions to match a research purpose (see Appendix H for the questions used in the reflection papers).

A reflection paper had a different function from that of journal writing in terms of the person to whom students wrote, indicating what students could and could not say. Compared with reflection papers, journal writing appeared to be more similar to the interviews in terms of openness and depth of reflection. Nevertheless, both journal writing and reflection papers had a
similar function based on the premise that writing would be a productive experience, which encouraged students to reflect and go deeper into their own experiences.

**Interviewing.** While observation provided a sense of what discourses students engaged in and the process of discursive formation of being positioned in class, interviews revealed the movements of affects in these processes of students’ engagement with the discourses. In the one-to-one space, which resembles journal writing, interviews produced open student engagement, which was often infused with emotion.

I interviewed 31 students in total (17 male students and 14 female students, aged 16 to 18) one to four times each depending on their willingness to participate (see Appendix I for the list of students who participated in interviews). Overall, I had more opportunities to have an interview with “theatre-related students,” which had implications as to what kinds of data were produced in this research project. In fact, for the class of Foundations of Theatre Theory, I only had the chance to interview students who were members of the drama club as I was hesitant to ask students directly in the lecture-based class. Therefore I relied on my connections with the other drama club students to gain access to the students in the class as I found it more comfortable.

Having three interview sessions in total, I set up the first interview session with 12 students at the end of the first school year when the class of Foundations of Theatre Expression finished in March, 2010. Before the summer holiday, I held the second interview session through July and August, 2010 [I interviewed Jennifer, an international student in June as an exception since she was about to go back to the United States] to reflect on the first term of the class with 28 students who took any of the classes of Applied Theatre Expression, Applied Theatre Theory, and Foundations of Theatre Theory. The students who attended more than one class started narrating the comparison of several classes’ activities, teachers, and students in
each class. The final interview session was held in December, 2010 and February, 2011 with 17 students who took Applied Theatre Expression and/or Applied Theatre Theory to reflect each class and all drama classes as a whole. February was chosen for the interview period since it was after the high-pressure National Center Test for University Admissions had finished.

I loosely structured the conversations around an interview protocol (see Appendix J for Interview Protocol) and a memo for each student, in which I wrote what points I was intrigued about with each student, picking up ideas from their journal writing, reflection papers and events in class. In the first interview, I started by asking questions regarding students’ backgrounds and self-descriptions, school experiences in other context, and future aspirations. Then, extracting and referring the specific moment of individual “affective spots” which I captured in their writings of journal writing and reflection papers or events in classroom, I encouraged students to reflect on those moments.

While students were recalling them, I asked their thoughts and feelings to elicit detailed stories of their experiences as follow up questions. As each interview flowed on, I asked other significant affective events for the participants to get new perspectives especially on their experiences of acting roles in the classroom, but also other kinds of experiences at school and beyond. Thomson et al (2002) explore "critical incidents" or "fateful moments" in individual lives in the qualitative research on identity formation and I attempted to take the similar approach. During an interview, I tried to capture the movement of affect, grasping its weight, direction and rhythm. Then, I asked the students if they felt my grasp of their affects, and the cuts and connections within them, resembled their own memories. I also saw the interview as a place for self-experiment through the interactions and imagining otherwise, similar in function as the journal writing.
Jackson and Mazzei (2012) point out that traditional interpretive qualitative research regards participants as being selective in “1) their telling, 2) their interpretation of experience, 3) the representation of themselves, and 4) the assumptions they make about who that self is (during the telling)” (p. viii). Disrupting the centering compulsion of traditional qualitative research, which “oblige(s) researchers to ‘center’ the subject,” Jackson and Mazzei (2012) encourage us to attempt at “cutting into the center, opening it up to see what newness might be incited” as for interview method (p. viii). Following their suggestion, I took the idea of “the self as a rhizomatic story” which regards narrative as “a dynamic map of narrations” that is “always open and always changing” with “multiple entryways” (Sermijn, Devlieger, & Loots, 2008, p. 644).

Therefore, the story I engaged with during an interview was one of some possible paths in the rhizomatic story. I therefore approached the interviews not as a search for a definitive self, but as an opportunity for generating flows of affect from the interactions between the students and myself: researchers are within “the rhizomatic story as a part of the dynamic construction process” (Sermijn, Devlieger, & Loots, 2008, p. 639). For example, while listening to them speaking, the vivid memories of times with each student occurred to me, and these memories also acted as guides for the interview process. Although an interview was at first guided by the notes that I prepared, I especially attended to the “heightened intensity” with high speed and high emotional pitch (Kofoed & Ringrose, 2012, p. 11) and “vivid stories” that “revealed feelings, desire and intense connections” (Ivinson & Renold, 2013, p. 709).

I attended to “the principle of connection” and “the principle of a signifying rupture” (Sermijn, Devlieger, & Loots, 2008, p. 638). Sermijn, Devlieger, and Loots (2008) state, “each point of a rhizome can be connected with any other point in the rhizome” and “at whatever point a rhizome is ruptured or destroyed, it will always grow further according to different lines or
connections” (p. 638). Following carefully these flows of affect of a participant and between us, I considered how to cut the flows of connections and connect them with other points by extending one question or moving on to the next question. In this sense, during data collection, analysis has already started, happening simultaneously and erasing the discrete distinction between data collection and analysis (Taguchi & Palmer, 2013).

Although I planned for the interviews to be roughly 30 minutes in length, in reality the time taken varied from 15 to 120 minutes depending on each student’s eagerness for engagement. This often reflected my pre-existing relationship with participants and students’ ways of engaging with theatre. For example, an interview with Rui, who belongs to the drama club, took almost 2 hours, while he extensively talked about an acting experience in the role of an okama or a gay. On the other hand, male students who belong to sports clubs often just answered each question briefly. What soon became clear was that the interviews were the place of social production where students and I related differently so that affects flew with different intensities and directions between us.

For some other students, the interview seemed a more meaningful experience by becoming a place where they could talk about themselves with a listener who values those stories. Saying “thank you very much” after listening to their stories at the end of interview, some students, especially those who took the Foundations of Theatre Expression course in the first year, often told me that interviews were fun experiences and they were willing to have an interview whenever it was needed, while some other students just seemed to respond to my request to have an interview.

My pre-existing relationships with participants through observation and journal writing often affected how the interview went, influencing my ways of interacting with students, the level of comfort, and the depth of data. Especially in the first interview with those whom I have
not had chances to engage with well beforehand, I always kept conscious about own behavior throughout the interviews, such as how to ask questions and present myself, gauging the students’ reactions.

In order to let students feel more comfortable and allow smooth and productive relations to be generated, my thought process started in the morning when I chose what clothing I would wear that day for the interview. Imaging the interaction with each student at home, for the interviews with some female students who I detected often engage in feminine discourse, I tended to choose clothes which can be considered as feminine such as pink coloured and with soft material, while for interviews with the female students who I detected do not engage in such discourse, I often chose not too showy but moderate clothes such as dark brown pants and gray sweater. For the interviews with male students, I also often tried not to wear clothes that were too “feminine” in order to be seen as a legitimate researcher and build productive relations. In retrospective, these choices were half consciously and half unconsciously taken. They illuminate how the students and myself would be seen in the broader social dynamics that each student is part of in other school contexts.

In addition to the content of the conversations, the interaction itself during the interviews also helped me to make a sense of students’ experiences at school. While I considered ways of getting close with students on some occasions, other concerns occurred in the case of the students whom I already knew to some degree. While I was able to focus more on the content of interviews with these students, who I had already knew, I, at the same time, wondered how much the interview process should be seen as “research” and not a “casual conversation” from the point of view of ethical engagements.

Laughing together, and sharing some emotions, the conversation often has gone over to more personal exchanges. However, it was indeed a conversation with a purpose, preceded by
their signing a consent form and with a tape recorder present, ultimately for my purpose of analyzing the content. Struggling with the mode of my engagement to be sincere during interviews, I often went back and forth changing my performance between being official and casual. Sometimes I switched my way of sitting to a more official manner such as stretching my back straight, while at other times I switched into more casual mode through changing my tone of voice etc.

The environment of the interview location also affected how the interviews went. The interviews were at first conducted in a teacher’s room for Japanese language teachers. At the corner of a corridor near the entrance, the room lacked any spare space, with eight desks arranged facing each other, the desk tops all full of objects such as books, textbooks, Japanese language dictionaries, files of theatre classes, homework and stationery piled up, and bookshelves on the walls either side. During the interviews, Japanese teachers sometimes dropped by and stayed in the room.

With a teacher present, the interviews soon changed to different modes as voices got quieter and the talks became more formal with less emotional exchange (for instance, we laughed less). Looking for a place without interruption from the conversations of others where we would not be overheard, the location was moved to a school broadcasting room, which is a tiny, quiet, private space with big windows on the second floor. On other occasions when this space was not available, interviews were held on the sofa at the corner of a corridor. In a spacious area where other students might sometimes come and go, the conversations tended to stay superficial.

Most of the interviews were conducted one-on-one. However, two out of the total of 52 interviews unexpectedly turned into a group interview because of time constraints and students’ convenience: on one occasion, an interview was conducted with two male students together, and
at the other time, with three female students together. In those cases, with my original intention to approach individual reflection, I at first tried to interview each student one by one in front of other students. However, the peer presence seemed to prevent them from talking freely, raising concerns about what the other student(s) would think about what they had to say. In the end, both group interviews ended up with not much in the way of deep conversation emerging from any of the students.

**Data Analysis: Narrative, “Plugging In,” and Mapping**

Narrative is an important analytical tool to address self (Bruner, 1986, 2002; Clandinin, & Connelly, 2000; Connelly & Clandinin, 1990; Denzin, 2000, Labov, 1981; Mishler, 1986, 1999; Polkinghorne, 1995; Riessman, 2002, 2004). For example, Mishler (1986, 1999) sees that the use of narratives provides a powerful form to shed light upon the ways in which participants see themselves and how they make sense of their experiences. Connelly and Clandinin (1990) also note that, “humans are storytelling organisms who, individually and collectively, lead storied lives” and “the study of narrative is the study of the ways humans experience the world” (p. 2).

Following Deleuzian empirical works that employ narrative methods combined with ethnographic work (Renold & Ringrose, 2008; Ringrose, 2011; Ringrose & Renold, 2012), I regarded narrative as offering rich insights into how affects are intertwined in multifarious and complex ways. Tamboukou states that narrative “open(s) up microsociological analyses that focus on processes, deterritorializations, becomings and lines of flight, rather than striated spaces and structures, institutional segmentarities and motionless or fixed identities” (2008, p. 369). Here, narrative is not regarded as “unified representations of lives and subjects” (Tamboukou, 2008, p. 360) nor as “a linear and complete whole which is characterized by a plot” (Sermijn, Devlieger, & Loots, 2008, p. 634). In this sense, this is an attempt to go beyond
not only the traditional notion of narrative but also the limitations of Foucauldian structural
discourse analysis, which sees the subject as the mere effects of discourse and the site of
discursive production (Foucault, 1977, 1978). In this study, while I looked at narrative to
analyze how affects are stuck within discursive practices, the main focus of my analysis
regarded how affects move in narrative, attempting to sense the intensities and directions.

Coding has been regarded as an important part of analytic process in qualitative research
(Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss, 1987). In the traditional concept of coding, themes and
patterns that emerge from the data are identified, and codes and categories to be applied to the
data are developed, while collected data are often assembled and managed using qualitative
software to preserve the systematic and discipline nature of the data sorting process. The
example is a grounded theory approach which views theory as emergent and being developed
grounded on collected data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). However, MacLure problematizes the
coding whose conventional, tree-like structure which searches for patterns or order in a body of
data, building on the scientific and rationalistic worldview. By identifying and naming recurring
themes, categories or concepts, she states that this kind of coding reduces complexity of
movement, change and emergence of data by cutting the data up into segments, and “handles
poorly that which exceeds and precedes ‘capture’ by language, such as the bodily, asignifying,
disrupting (and connecting) intensities of affect” (2013, p. 170).

Jackson and Mazzei (2012) also see the problem of coding concerning the macro level as
it is to some degrees predictable and does not produce new knowledge, missing “the texture, the
contradictions, the tensions, and entangled becomings produced in the mangle” (p. 12). This
type of coding positions a researcher as “merely always-already subject[s] ready to capture and
code the experiences of our participants and their material conditions as always-already object”
(p. 12).
Opposing this type of coding, MacLure (2013) proposes coding which is “always subject to change and metamorphosis, as new connections spark among words, bodies, objects and ideas” (p. 181). Not regarding it as “a static representation or translation of a world laid out before us on the operating table of analysis,” she describes it as “an open-ended and ongoing practice of making sense” (emphasis original, p. 181). This conceptualization of coding also aims at fulfilling part of ethical obligation. “The slow intensity of coding,” to which MacLure (2013) refers, is “an ethical refusal to take the easy exit to quick judgment, free-floating empathy, or illusions of data speaking for itself” (p. 164). She states that this kind of coding invites “wonder” which is singular, ineffable and relational into the space of analysis. “Wonder” is also “a liminal experience that confounds boundaries of inside and outside, active and passive, knowing and feeling, and even of animate and inanimate,” allowing “some temporary point of indecision on the threshold of knowing, from which something unexpected might issue” (p. 181).

In addition, considering coding as the work of flattening, Jackson and Mazzei (2012) propose an idea of “plugging in” as a process not as a concept to think about “data” and “analysis.” Reconsidering the relationship between the theory and the data, they challenge qualitative researchers to “use theory to think with their data (or use data to think with theory)” (p. vii, italics in original). As a way to situate “plugging in,” they offer the figuration of the threshold as site of transformation, saying that in the space, we became aware of “how theory and data constitute or make one another” and how “the divisions among and definitions of theory and data collapse” (p. 6). Refusing a closed system for fixed meaning and letting meaning to stay on the move in the threshold, Jackson and Mazzei describe the relationship between the data and the theory as follows:
The data were not centered or stabilized, but used as brief stopping points and continually transformed, and exceeded, as we used theory to turn the data into something different, and we used data to push theory to its limit. (2012, p. 6)

A researcher is also “plugging in” to the texts and to the theoretical threshold (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012). Going beyond “the idea of reflexivity and interpretation as inner mental activities in the separate mind of the researcher” (p. 267), Taguchi (2012) also addresses “a diffractive analysis” which is an engaged and creative process that erases distinctions between “researcher” and “researched.” It is “an embodied engagement with the materiality of research data: a becoming-with the data as researcher” (italics in original, p. 265). Then, drawing attention to “a diffractive reading,” this research took the analytic approach which Taguchi describes as follows:

When reading diffractively I want to read with the data, understanding it as a constitutive force, working with and upon me in the event of reading it. I open up my bodymind faculties to experience the entanglement of discourse and matter in the event of reading the data. (2012, p. 274, italics in original)

As an analytical step, I integrated the idea of materialist data analysis proposed by Fox and Alldred (2014). For that analysis, “the assemblage” is taken as the primary focus, shifting the unit of analysis from “human agents” to “the assemblage.” I explore “affect economies and the territorialising and de-territorialising capacities produced in bodies, collectivities and other relations in assemblage” (p. 11). Then, I examine “how flows of affect within assemblages link matter and meaning, and ‘micro’ and ‘macro’ levels,” acknowledging “the affective relations within the research-assemblage itself” (p. 11). I began to organize data within the kinds of research methods (e.g., observation, journal writing, reflection paper and interview), within the case boundaries of individuals and within those of the classroom event (e.g., practices of theatre
performance and classroom discussion). Then, I searched for the assemblages and “affective spots” of narrative stories in each case. After “plugging in” the affective spot in the assemblage, I explored affect economies and the territorialising and de-territorialising capacities.

In the processes of analysis, as Jackson and Mazzei demonstrate, I focused to examine “regulation and resistance,” looking as “what to avoid, what not to do, and what not to become” (2012, p. 102), “maintaining privilege,” the event of “keeping them in their place,” and the view of “who does it work for?” Guided by these points, I also especially considered the normalizing tendency in affect economies as well as “silences” (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012). Jackson and Mazzei ask “where might the productive relationships between desire and silence be occurring?” (2012, p. 86), and “what desires are producing the silences, and what do these silences in turn produce?” (p. 102)

I also applied “mapping” as an analytic and writing strategy. Mapping is not “merely a representation but something to be interpreted yet again” (Jackson, 2010, p. 584). Resisting the route that is known in the form of tracing, mapping results in a flattening, prompting previously unthought questions: “What is blocked? What attempts to take root? Which lines survive?” (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012, p. 12). An analytic method that pursues maps making, “rhizoanalysis” (Alvermann, 2000; Masny, 2013) involves experimenting with “how to move between things in ways that nullify beginnings and endings” (Alvermann, 2000, p. 116), examining “texts that allows us to see things in the middle” (p. 118). For example, the focus of Alvermann’s analysis is “discontinuities and ruptures” rather than linkages or networks. Different from the conventional modes of interpreting text, which regards it as signifier or signified, texts for rhizoanalysis connect with other texts through diverse fragments of data, reader and context (Alvermann, 2000).
For Deleuze and Guattari, writing is also mapping, which has nothing to do with signifying. Writing has to do with “surveying, mapping, even realms that are yet to come” (cited in Jackson & Mazzei, 2012, p. 12). Following these ideas, I considered each chapter and each section as a rhizomatous map. As Stewart (2007), who describes the scenes from everyday life in the United States, organizes her book as “an assemblage of disparate scenes” (p. 5), that is, a series of vignettes, I present vignettes made out of the stories in the field, capturing moments of movement and mapping micro shifts in affective relations.

Also, as for pronoun usage, materialist researchers attempt a different writing strategy. For instance, Stewart (2007) employs the third person to describe her affective encounters with the worlds. On the other hand, Jackson (2010) uses the second person for her participant for the purpose of “be[ing] closer to the reader and mov[ing] away from the molar objectivity/distance of third-person convention” (p. 538). By doing that, she attempts to disrupt the “confessional ‘I’ that haunts interpretive and critical qualitative research tradition” (pp. 538-539). With these perspectives in mind, I employed third person for participants and first person for myself, with the purpose of keeping clear the direction of affect flows.
Chapter 4

Mapping Thresholds: The Field, Classes, Scripts, Casts and Theatre Activities

In this chapter, I first describe how I encountered the field on the first day of my fieldwork. Then, I account the historical, geographical and social context of Akane High School as well as the teachers of the classes, which shaped the students’ experiences in class. Finally, I present class, drama scripts, casts [students] and theatre activities as thresholds of the students’ experiences to be shown over the following chapters.

The First Day of My Fieldwork: Encountering the Field

On my first day in the field, I wondered how I feel different about the city of Tokyo, sitting on a surprisingly empty train on my way to Akane at just about noon. Arriving back in Tokyo from Toronto after spending about four years for my PhD study only a few weeks earlier, the city, which used to be seen in my eyes as a longed-for but busy battlefield filled with exhausted people with impassive faces, had by then turned into a place which made me more comfortable to be in, using my “native” language and knowing how to fit in easily. I had left Okazaki, Aichi, a sort of so-called “bed-town” that is in the grey zone between the metropolis and the suburban in the Chubu (Central) Region of Japan, where I was born and grew up until graduation from high school, to live in Tokyo from ages 18-24 where I attended university and graduate school. Yet experiencing this change of feeling toward the city of Tokyo (unfamiliar familiarity), and heading to the new (for me) area of Kita-ku in the north had an effect on me and I could not stop feeling anxious about not knowing what would be waiting for me in the field.

Arriving at the station nearest to the school, I asked a station attendant for directions to Akane. Seeming not to have heard the name before in spite of being only ten minutes walking distance from the station, he looked at a map. Following directions that he pointed out on the
map, I came out onto a main street where cars were rushing to and fro, and felt the stuffiness from exhaust fumes. Turning around the corner of the main street and entering a lane, I found several public housing complexes in a row with open spaces in front that are almost deserted and quiet. Passing them timidly due to the silence, I arrived at the school that stood in the middle of the public housing just across a narrow lane. The modern, square school building with an inorganic white wall stood out, surrounded by fences, separating it from the rest of the community.

Signing in at the admissions office, I met Mr. Kobayashi, a school teacher who was in charge of drama classes, and went to the teachers’ room for Japanese language teachers where I would be able to drop by to leave my baggage during my fieldwork. I suddenly heard a few female students’ voices in the corridor outside, chatting in Chinese. Mr. Kobayashi suggested we then go to the principal’s office together to greet the principal. All of a sudden, I became worried that the choice of my appearance might be too casual and asked him if my look of T-shirt and a short skirt with seventh length leggings beneath it without any make up would be a problem. Mr. Kobayashi said that it would be fine with a smile.

We therefore proceeded to meet the principal: a gentle, male in his mid-50s, neatly dressed in a suit and sitting in a quiet, formal room with wooden tables and wide windows. I tried to be polite to him by smiling and bowing and at the same time gauged a sense of how much I should speak to him in order not to be seen as overly opinionated or aggressive but instead as a legitimate researcher. He said that the educational effect of the drama class that he believed would be proven through my research is good for the program of Akane High School as well, and he looked forward to the results of the research. I smiled, concerned whether the line of my research would match his expectations.
Back from the principal’s office, we met with Mr. Okamoto, an artist teacher, who I had met twice before: first, at my original visit to the school about half a year previously, and second, at a meeting away from the school about a few weeks before. As it was time for class, we went together to an audio-visual classroom on the fourth floor where the drama class would be conducted. In the room, while a few female students were chatting, two male students were moving desks and chairs in order to make an open space in the classroom. Noticing Mr. Okamoto and myself, the students gathered around us. Mr. Okamoto asked them if they remembered that he had told them that a researcher would be coming to the class for research, and with surprised faces, a few students said no with smiles. Saying, “You don’t really listen to me,” to the accompaniment of giggling, Mr. Okamoto urged them to move the desks and chairs. The other students had arrived and finished with his class preparation, Mr. Kobayashi rushed in to join us.

With the sound of the bell, class started. At the beginning, Mr. Okamoto introduced me in a more formal manner to the students again. Saying that I study in “Canada” and am doing my “PhD,” he stated that I had come there to do research, and followed by telling them that their experiences are going to be written about in a thesis. I heard students saying one after another: “Oooh,” “I need to take classes seriously,” and “wow, Canada, cool!” A student said, “Speaking of Canada, maple syrup, right? Was it good?” and I smiled back at her. The two words which Mr. Okamoto emphasized seemed to make my existence legitimate there, while being seen as the one who comes from “the West” gave me a slight jerk after my long experiences of being seen as “Asian” or “Japanese” and different from “Western” or “White” in Toronto.

Hearing the students’ expressions of excitement, Mr. Okamoto added, “Ms. Kawashima and I graduated from the same university, but look, how different we are now.” Coming to my turn to speak, I was stuck by the sound of the word “kenkyū (research)” when I tried to introduce
my work. The image of a researcher who heartlessly scrutinizes his/her subject in a lab came to my mind, and standing in front of the young people, I felt hesitant to say the word. Not knowing what other words I could say, I started explaining my research with as light a tone of voice as possible, going on to tell them the purpose of the research, what I hoped to do with them and the length of the study.

After inviting the students to participate in the study, I distributed the consent forms with written explanation of the research. It was clear to me that all at once some distance emerged between us, and hurried to add that participation is not mandatory. Several difficult words and the formal written consent form seemed to get the students cautious about what I would do with them. In the end, Mr. Kobayashi told the students, “Ms. Kawashima would like to engage with you as much as possible so please tell her many different things, but only as much as you like.” I said to students, “I would love to learn about your experiences here. So, please teach me anything you wish.”

On my way back to the train station after the first day ends, walking the quiet shopping street, I only heard the sound of cars running which made me feel flat and lonely, feeling the gap from the school space filled with the existence of energetic youth. Around six o’clock in the evening, I walked toward an automatic ticket gate in the station, passing through the wave of people, mostly male “salarymen,” aged thirty to fifty, and silently walking. I finally got to a seat on a train, feeling gloomy but unsure what exactly is causing the feeling.

When I looked up, an advertisement poster, hanging from the roof of the train, caught my eye. In the middle of the picture stood a female model whose makeup consisted of shiny eye shadow and black highlighted mascara on whitened skin, smiling lightly and wearing trendy clothing. Reading copy written around the model that was about romantic relationships and trends, a question came to my mind: I wonder if the students I just met today will want to or be
able to become like the image of this model in the future. While I said in my mind that this would be an expensive endeavor, the word “fatigue” came to mind in opposition to the image, as it had just been brought up in the class discussion when students were deciding the title of their theatre performance. The feeling triggered memories of my high school days: that is, the feelings of powerlessness of being youth or a student, having nowhere to go, being held back and unable to move even an inch.

**The Historical, Social and Geographical Context of Akane High School**

My ethnographic work was conducted at Akane, a public high school in Kita-ku, on the edge of the northern side of Tokyo. Flourishing through the paper industry from the Meiji (1868-1912) until the middle of Showa (1926-1989) eras (The Taisho [1912-1926] era comes between the Meiji and Showa era), and formerly an army district, Kita-ku has since become part of an area of relative economic hardship compared with other wards in Tokyo, after having undergone economic decline. With relatively limited work opportunities, and with a convenient transportation system and several main roads accessing central Tokyo, the population that commutes to the other wards for employment is higher than the population who come to Kita-ku for employment. In a country where public transport is paramount, twenty train stations are scattered throughout the 20.61 square kilometre area of the ward, and the whole area of Kita-ku is within walking distance of the respective nearest train station.

With a population of 340,000 people, which is about the median for the 23 wards of Tokyo, Kita-ku, like country towns in Japan rather than its urban counterparts, has also undergone a low-birthrate, an ageing population, and decrease in population. However, with four public and 12 private high schools, the population of high school students in Kita-ku are relatively high among 23 wards. Compared with other wards in Tokyo, public facilities are not affluent but include such places as a compound cultural facility (music, theatre, gallery etc.),
three museums, a movie theatre, and a small theatre. Describing it as “the place with
nothing,” students at the school are likely to spend more time during the weekend in different
areas, such as Ikebukuro, Harajuku and Shibuya, which are regarded as the places of
dissemination of youth culture such as fashion and music, and attract the younger population
more as a result

As a reorganization of a previous high school, Akane opened in the middle of the 1990s
as “a new type of high school.” As, by this time, close to 100% of appropriately-aged youths in
Japan were now attending high school, such new schools began determining distinctively
defined characteristics, both to attract students and to respond to the diverse interests and career
plans of those students. It is the first full-time high school with a general course based on a
credit system in Tokyo. “Credit system high school” means being able to teach subjects other
than those assigned by the “Course of Study for High Schools.” The Ministry of Education,
Culture, Sports, Science and Technology introduced the system to part-time high schools and
correspondence high schools in 1988 and to full-time high schools in 1993. In 2010, the number
of full-time “credit system high schools” is 533, and that of part-time and correspondence
“credit system high schools” is 928 according to “The Present Situation of High Schools” (The

With a variety of elective classes, students at Akane are able to choose classes and make
their own class schedules, which they think fits their own future plans. By the end of the first
year, the students choose their own major out of two groups: “International Liberal Arts Group”
and “Life/Arts Group.” The “Theatre group” in which drama classes situate is a subgroup of the
“Life/Arts Group,” lining up with the other subgroups of “Home economics/welfare/nursery
group,” “Visual arts group,” “Music group,” “Physical Education group,” “Agriculture group,”
and “Nursing/medical group.”
In an interview with the principal, he described the students at Akane as those who possessed more individuality than the students at college-bound schools, where students began to think during high school about what they want to do in the future. He said that this school, on the other hand, suits those who have something in themselves before coming to the school, and if not, the students will end up not knowing what they want to do in these credit system schools. In addition to the credit system, which demands students with independent and self-supported minds, Akane also emphasizes classroom activity. Not only is teamwork emphasized in the guidebook for applicants to Akane High School, Mr. Kobayashi also told me that students there might be used to teamwork because of the extracurricular activities, noting that one of the features of the school is the popularity of its school festival and that classrooms unite for one of the main events of the festival, “an interclass theatre contest.”

The rating of Akane’s student ability upon entrance, which in effect implies how much the school will expect its students to focus on the National Center Test for University Admissions or allow them to do other things, is at just about the average in Japan. According to the guidebook for applicants to Akane High School in 2009, about 52% of students go to college; 29% go to junior college or professional school; 2% get employed immediately; and 18% are in other categories.

As another feature of the school, Akane puts a great deal of effort into English education and international exchanges. Announcing that one of their educational aims is to “cultivate the foundation and basics to powerfully and soundly live in international worlds,” it has several programs such as school trips abroad, a foreign language training abroad program, homestay programs and acceptance of international students. Appointed as one of the “Tokyo Global 10” high schools in 2015, Akane is now taking the role of a leading school that aims to train students as “global human resources” with high English competency and active involvement in
international exchange. Not only does it have English classes with five English “native speaker” assistant teachers, French, Chinese and Spanish classes are also taught with “native speaker” assistant teachers as a second foreign language. Along with this, Akane took the initiative in introducing a separate entrance exam for “non-Japanese residents staying in Tokyo,” actively accepting the so-called “newcomers” (“Non-Japanese residents staying in Tokyo” usually refers to those who have stayed in Japan less than three years. The schools with this separate entrance exam system will number five in Tokyo in 2016).

Mr. Kobayashi told me that the foreign students accounted for about 10-15% of the total number of students, mainly coming from Asian countries such as China and Korea, and especially from the Philippines where an official language is English. Accepting one student for each grade, international students come from a range of areas including Europe, North America and South Asia. Although the school does not designate nationality or region of origin in classifying international student categories, no students from North America or Europe enter the school as non-Japanese residents staying in Tokyo. The principal told me that international students gave “us” different views from Japanese students. “Us” here sounded like he intended to include himself, the Japanese students and staff members and me, with the assumption that “we” share the same trait of being Japanese, differentiated from international students. Then, he hurriedly added that students with Chinese nationality or with Filipino parents were of course different as well.

In spite of the percentage of the student population of “Non-Japanese residents staying in Tokyo,” none of them took drama classes during my visit, while one international student from the USA took a drama class. Mr. Kobayashi once told me that he thought that the foreign students do not take the class because of the language barrier and because they are busy studying for the major subjects.
With just over seven hundred students in total, the school is comprised of three year levels with six homerooms in each year level (about 240 students per year level). Eighty per cent of students are female. The school does not designate the gender percentage in an entrance exam. The principal told me that one of the reasons would be the school’s focus on English education, along with a general tendency of female students to have better grades than male students. The students often told me that the presence of female students is strong at this school, centering the female students in a competitive soccer club.

The principal also mentioned that not only are male students at the school very shy, but also female teachers are more powerful and central in the school in spite of the slightly higher number of male teachers. Applying a small student number class system (one class has from 20 to 30 students), the number of the staff at the school is high, made up of 78 in total: the principal, two vice-principals, four chief teachers, 44 general teachers, a school nurse, a training assistant, a part-time teacher, six lecturers, 10 citizens’ lecturers, and eight foreign assistant teachers. In addition, he stated that people here do not stick to gender much, giving an example of a theatre contest at the school festival, where students often act different gender roles but people do not find it weird. While noting that, the principal said that the school is “free of gender roles” and I pondered how gender actually operated in the classroom at the school.

The school catchment area is mainly Kita-ku and its neighboring wards such as Adachi-ward, Itabashi-ward, Arakawa-ward and Katsushika-ward, which are equally or lower income areas, and some of which have densely populated areas of “Zainichi Kankoku/Chosen-jin (Koreans in Japan),” so-called “oldcomers.” In fact, there is an ethnic high school for students of Korean background in Kita-ku, which is the only such high school in Tokyo. With students mostly coming from within the 23 wards of Tokyo, but attracting few students from wealthy areas, yet at the same time, some students come from the edge of the western side of Tokyo,
spending more than one and a half hour commuting because of the unusual characteristics of the school. Compared with the parents at private schools with a six-year secondary school system, who are eager in regard to their children’s education, the principal said that the parents there are not much into the education, and the participation rate for meetings with guardians is not high.

Classes with Artist Teachers

Collaborating with school teachers of Japanese language subjects in the team-teaching style, artist teachers, who are mainly working as actors and/or directors outside the school teach the drama classes as part-time citizen lecturers at Akane High School (with the artist teachers mostly deciding the content and conducting educational practices). These educational practices by artists at educational sites called “outreach” are recently spreading in Japan, especially in metropolitan areas (Furukawa, 2013; Kisaragi, 1996; Japan Council of Performers’ Organizations, 2001, 2003a, 2003b; Tsutsumi, 2003). One of the major organizations that supports actors’ “outreach” activities, Geidankyo (Japan Council of Performers Rights & Performing Arts Organizations), has been supporting performers including actors with the purpose of enhancing children’s expression skills, communication competence, and creativity since 1996 when the Central Educational Council mentioned “Ikiruchikara (strength to live)” in its First Report.

In an article that he wrote about drama classes at Akane (not referenced in order to preserve anonymity), Mr. Kobayashi states that he is hoping that the classes take the role of nurturing the communication competence of students, that is, not only communicating the self but also welcoming the other, as well as polishing their expression skills, while maintaining the professionalism of theatre studies to support the students who want to work in the professional theatre world in the future. At a seminar held by Japan Council of Performers’ Organizations, he
stated that he has an impression that the drama classes at credit system high schools tended to have been started for the purpose of attracting students rather than based on firm educational philosophy and he suspected that these classes might fold without a philosophy or educational results supported by fact.

Along with the expectations from the school side, each artist teacher is left to decide by him/herself the class content and pedagogy based on their background, exploring how educational their practices might or might not be as they go along. Although he had been teaching at a training school for actors, Mr. Okamoto told me at one time that he could not apply the same teaching style at Akane and so he has been exploring what drama/theatre education is for him by trial and error, while getting advice from the school teachers he works with.

The school has four drama classes as elective classes of the “Theatre group” including: “Foundations of Theatre Expression,” “Applied Theatre Expression,” “Foundations of Theatre Theory,” and “Applied Theatre Theory,” with each class held once a week and lasting two periods in a row (50 minutes per period, with a 10-minute break in-between), and I visited each of these four classes. The following descriptions of each class and variations in teaching styles contextualize the students’ involvement in the classes.

The Foundations of Theatre Expression class was taught by Mr. Okamoto, a voice actor, actor, playwright, and director. In the syllabus, he states the aims of the class as: “Exploring ‘what each of us feels and thinks ourselves, here and now, and how we communicate it to others’, this class aims to deepen the understandings of the self and the other. Also, experiencing the difficulty of communicating and the enjoyment to overcome it, students will acquire the technique to jump into unknown spaces.” In the second term of the Foundations of Theatre Expression class (Oct., 2009 – Dec., 2009), Sketches of Daily Life was one of the main activities, aiming at getting students to reflect on their own lives by writing events down as a drama script.
Throughout the term, students revised their scripts, decided the casting, and read through and practiced the parts as they worked toward the final performance. During the classes after the final performance, students watched their own performances on DVD.

In the Foundations of Theatre Expression class in the third term (Jan. 2010 – Mar. 2010), I joined other teachers to assist in teaching the class. During the fieldwork, teachers, especially Mr. Okamoto, often asked me about what drama education in Canada is like and about my research interests in general. One day, around the middle of the second term of Foundations of Theatre Expression, Mr. Okamoto suggested I teach during the third term of the class, saying that he was interested in seeing new classroom lessons and that this might benefit my research. I detected that his suggestion partially came from his interest in different kinds of educational practices especially as a relatively newly-appointed teacher (Mr. Okamoto was in his second year of teaching at Akane at the time). I felt that I was seen as a representative of “the West” who had recently come back from there and should know the newest and better educational practices. Although I barely had any teaching experience related to drama activities at the time, I ended up mainly teaching the class with consultation with and feedback from the two teachers.

In the class, based on a drama text that focuses on multiculturalism, *Twilight: Los Angeles, 1992*, which is written by Anna Deavere Smith and translated into Japanese by myself, students first watched a few related videos and discussed the relevant issues. They then engaged in character development by writing character sketches, conducting walking activities, reading through parts in pairs and in-group, and some of the students presented their final solo performances. Students were able to choose the text written either in English or in Japanese.

The Applied Theatre Expression class in the first term (Apr. 2010 – Jul. 2010) was taught by Ms. Sayaka, an actor and vocalist. In the syllabus, the aims of the class are set as follows: “This class is for practicing several kinds of expression. Applying several kinds of
physical expression (singing/dance/performance), this class aims to nurture the ability to communicate.” In the class, while trying out vocal exercises, stretching, and dance for parts of the class, students mainly worked on exploring the song, *Seasons of Love*, from the Tony Award-winning musical, *Rent*, by singing and watching the video. Students also each wrote their own favourite poem and presented it to the audience, through which the students explored the meaning of the words in their own poem for themselves.

Ms. Furuta, an actor, taught the second term of Applied Theatre Expression (Sep., 2010 – Dec., 2010). Students read through Shakespeare’s *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* and practiced performing it, working toward the final performance. At the end of the class, the final performance was presented with costume and sound in front of other teachers and students at the Judo-jo, where the judo club usually practices, an open space with tatami mats.

Matsuda-sensei (先生) was a director and taught Foundations of Theatre Theory (Apr., 2010 – Jul., 2010). Sensei (先生) literally refers to “one who was born before” but in a Japanese context it means “teacher.” This is a typical way to call a teacher by name in Japan. However, he was the only one of the teachers at Akane whose name I called in this manner. In the syllabus, he states that “while having a clear image of the roles in fiction of a story and nurturing the imagination to be able to create changes in relations by themselves, this class aims for students to become more aware of the ‘language’ that acts as a bridge from person to a person.” By watching several videos of a modern playhouse and plays titled *Etsuko’s Youth* and *Oedipus the King* as well as a *No* (classical Japanese dance-drama) play and reading through the parts of the texts of *Antigone* and *Oedipus the King*, the students studied the direction, performance and interpretation of the various works.

Applied Theatre Theory (Apr., 2010 – Dec., 2010) was taught by Ms. Takako, an actor. In the class, students mainly did filmmaking on the theme of love, in which students decided
what they wanted to do in the class and the particular theme of the film through group discussion. Students wrote a script, and selected the director and casts. At the beginning of each class, students also participated in several theatre games to warm-up.

To compare the class style of those classes, although the Foundations of Theatre Theory class was mostly lecture-based, the other class lessons were mainly performance-based. While often intertwined, the balance between being ‘product’-oriented and ‘process’-oriented depended on each class. For example, while the second term of Applied Theatre Expression was more oriented toward creating a product, a Shakespeare play, the class lessons of Foundations of Theatre Expression and Applied Theatre Theory were more process oriented. The first term of Applied Theatre Expression might be classified as in-between. In addition, the balance of them often changes fluidly in even one lesson or within one activity. For example, even in a class that mainly aims for experience of the process such as Foundations of Theatre Expression, Mr. Okamoto sometimes mentioned the aspects of product-making in class.

Drama Scripts

The main scripts with which students were engaged for acting in the classes are as follows. The first and fourth scripts were written by students as homework. Therefore, the context of these two scripts is largely in present-day Japan, while the context of the script, *Twilight: Los Angeles, 1992* is in the United States in the early 1990s and that of *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* is in Athens in the era before Christ.

- *Sketches of Daily Life* series (second term of Foundations of Theatre Expression)
- *Twilight: Los Angeles, 1992* (third term of Foundations of Theatre Expression)
- *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* (Applied Theatre Expression)
- Student scripts on the theme of love (Applied Theatre Theory)
In this study, I regarded the drama text as containing several images, which emerge through narratives in text and are related to several subjects’ positions. How the images were constructed depended on what kind of drama text students engaged with (e.g. an existing text, a text written by students, a text about students in class). Whatever the case, several factors such as the actors, the teachers and the people who are the role model for a character in a scripted played synthetically to construct the images with which an actor engaged.

In this study, I did not conduct a content analysis, which approaches the drama text semantically. Rather, I interrogated the students’ narratives regarding the role or drama text as a place of becoming in relation with the image of the role. I especially explored the nodes at which the student in question and the role/text are entangled. As a site of exploration through which becoming is experienced, these nodes, which could be ideas, concepts or circumstances, are always singularities.

**Sketches of Daily Life series.** The Sketches of Daily Life series, which are about the students’ own daily lives, provided the main scripts for analysis in this study. The scenes of the scripts varied with such examples as students’ lives at school, family lives and events over a weekend. In a reflection paper about the classroom practices of Sketches of Daily Life, one student, Risa, mentioned that each script showed each student’s characteristics and she could learn new perspectives and ideas through the activity. However, how students engaged in writing own script varied. Wondering why she could expose herself so openly in the script, Mika said that she wrote about herself openly in the script. She said, “Although I thought that my script was dark as usual, I was writing my honest feelings so I really enjoyed it,” regarding it as an opportunity to reflect on herself. In contrast, another student, Yuka, was surprised at how openly other students wrote about themselves in their scripts. She said that she did not write
about her inner self much but instead focused on the social issues related with her life since she had hesitation to open herself much.

Each student’s penname was written on each text. The names of the role were expressed sometimes as a proper noun and at other times, as a pronoun/disguiser such as “male” or “guy.”

The following shows the title, the outline, the role and the main casting of each text (I omitted one script whose author did not participate in this study due to time constraints). As for the actual scripts written in Japanese, see Appendix K.

The overall title of the final performance was *Puzzle Pieces: To and fro again today*. The list of scripts and authors is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Morning War</td>
<td>Inoue-kun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fortune Telling</td>
<td>Toshi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The Best Memories and Spring</td>
<td>Nijiho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Me in the Dark</td>
<td>Mika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Aruaru (That’s the Way It Is)</td>
<td>Shuji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My Taste</td>
<td>Maiko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Beauty Salon</td>
<td>Chika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Somehow, Anxious</td>
<td>Makoto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. A Commonplace Summer</td>
<td>Rui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Come, Spring</td>
<td>Risa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Curry, G and Sea Man</td>
<td>Tomo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Green Summer</td>
<td>Yuka</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following is the main theme of the script and my interpretation of the underlying message in the script.

1. **Morning War**

   In the morning, we are at the house of a family. A mother is cooking breakfast in the kitchen. An older brother, a younger sister, father and an older sister show up to the living room one by one and begin to talk with each other. Through animated conversation, one can detect the bright atmosphere of a family who get along well with each other. Mr. Okamoto told me that
Inoue-kun is an only child so he may have written this due to a longing for the kind of big family he met visiting friends.

Mother  
Father  
Older brother  
Older sister  
Younger sister

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Member</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Maiko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Toshi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older brother</td>
<td>Makoto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older sister</td>
<td>Risa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger sister</td>
<td>Mika</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Fortune Telling  

Toshi

As a part of students' lives, two male students are chatting with sleepy faces in the morning, holding onto the handrail on a train for school. A student tells his friend that he watched some fortune-telling on TV and then also tells the friend what his fortune and lucky item are. The TV inside the train carriage was explaining blood type fortune telling and they ended up not being sure which they should believe. Toshi told me that he wrote this since he was wondering whether such fortune telling actually tells the future. In this script, young people who depend on fortune telling for direction in life seem to represent the young people who lack any drive for living their lives.

Male 1  
Male 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male 1</td>
<td>Inoue-kun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male 2</td>
<td>Makoto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The Best Memories and Spring  

Nijiho

At a comic market, Ichigo is lining up to buy a CD. After buying it, she handed a letter in an envelope and a ready-made Jell-O to Beat Mario, who she is a fan of, as a present. Receiving them, Beat Mario said, “Thank you,” and Ichigo left, looking back at him. Nijiho stated that she tried to write about “my pinkness [my feelings] at the comic market, a real
interaction at the comic market and happiness found in that,” saying that “pinkness” is the colour of “romantic love.”

Mario       Tomo
Ichigo (Strawberry)  Chika
Beat Mario  Toshi

4. Me in the Dark   Mika

At the break, Kanzaki is reading a book alone as usual in the classroom. Momoki and Makino ask who and what type of boy Kanzaki likes. Kanzaki answers that she does not need the one she likes and that her favourite type of guy is a rich person. These days, you can buy friends and lovers just get in the way. She states to the other two girls, “My happiness is your despair,” and Momoki and Makino are surprised but try to understand it because that is Kanzaki’s kyara (Japanese interpretation of the English word “character”). However, after Momoki and Makino have left, Kanzaki speaks to herself, saying that she actually wants to have a romantic relationship but is fed up with getting hurt. Mika mentioned that this text depicts her rejection of heteronormative relationship based on her past experiences.

Kanzaki      Miku
Momoki      Risa
Makino      Nijiho

5. Aruaru (That’s the Way It Is)   Shuji

During lunch break, two male students are chatting, having collapsed at their desks after eating their bento box lunch. They talk about a program that was on TV the night before and a plan to watch a rental video after school. They realize that they are late for PE class and they rush to go there but the play ends as one of the students realizes that he forgot to bring his track gear. Shuji stated that he wanted to write something that people feel to be a likely story.
Teachers pointed out that Shuji often forgets to bring things to school, and the forgetful student seems to match Shuji. By the tone of the lines, I detected the characters’ fatigue and that they are letting things go by passively.

Katsumi Inoue-kun/Rui
Ko Makoto

6. My Taste Maiko

This is about the taste for food and whether to accept difference. After school, two female students, Akiko and Chiharu, arguing if soy sauce should be put on a fried egg or not, come to a classroom, where two male students, Tōji and Natsuhiko, join the conversation. After a long interplay, Natsuhiko states that it is wrong to decide what is right but, in the end, it turns out that Natsuhiko doesn’t have a good sense of taste. Akiko, who likes Natsuhiko, tells herself that her feelings toward Natsuhiko won’t change because of this. Natsuhiko is described as a “cool” role by a number of students. Maiko stated that her sense of taste is always rejected by others so that she wanted to write about her frustration, saying that the reality and fiction of the text is balanced fifty-fifty. Throughout the script, I detected the characters’ discussion about among different tastes for food.

Toji Mika
Natsuhiko Toshi
Chiharu Yuka
Akiko Risa

7. Beauty Salon Chika

At a beauty salon, a customer is chatting with a hairdresser about the length to cut her hair. Her hair is long and she has kept it that way for a long time. She states that she wants to change her image. The hairdresser says that it would be a pity to cut that length of hair, and the
customer’s mind is shaken. She decides to get only a few centimetres cut. The hairdresser
tells the customer that long hair suits her better. However, looking at her hair in a show window
outside the salon, she soon regrets that she did not cut her hair more drastically. Mr. Okamoto
suggested that Chika is depicting “the girls’ mind” with this text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hairdresser</th>
<th>Rui</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Customer</td>
<td>Risa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Somehow, Anxious  
Makoto

In the morning on a weekday, two guys are playing video games in a really small room. The game encounters a bug while they are playing. One guy says that freeters (casual workers) have more physical strength than NEETs and the other says that he is not a NEET but a college student. With interplays such as this, their “conversation” lacks intent and substance. The text is full of slang. Makoto said about the text that “the scenery… projected straight into my mind. It is like floating in a space of languor.” Mr. Okamoto stated that the text is interesting since it expresses well “emptiness” and “trying to do something but finding that it is not going well.”

Their lives and the bugged game in the script seemed to be akin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guy 1 Inoue-kun/Rui</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guy 2 Tomo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. A Commonplace Summer  
Rui

On his summer holiday, a son is chatting with his mother who is reading a book, while the TV is on in the living room. The mother is smoking. The son starts to read a manga, which is always sitting in the same place, and also watches a TV program, Mito Komon. After the TV program ends, he goes out. Rui stated that he did not do anything special during summer holiday, and that this was the reality of his daily life.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother Maiko</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Son  Toshi

10. Come, Spring  Risa

This is about a crack in the relationships of a family. In a quiet living room, an older sister is watching TV and a younger brother comes home from a juku (a private-tutoring school). The younger brother changes the TV channel and asks his sister to bring a cup of tea. He says that if she does that, he will let her watch the TV program that she wants to watch. Looking at the paper written about a tripartite meeting of teacher, parents and student, the older sister feels sad about that her mother often did not attend the meeting by saying that she is not her mother. The younger brother says that it is a usual thing. The father comes home. He changes the TV channel without permission and starts to watch a baseball game. The mother comes into the living room and her way of talking is kind to the younger brother but severe to the older sister. The older sister, father, and younger brother leave the living room. Risa stated that her mother is a housewife and is at the top of the hierarchy in her family.

Older sister  Maiko
Younger brother  Makoto
Father  Inoue-kun/Rui
Mother  Nijiho

11. Curry and G and Sea man  Tomo

An older brother, Tomo, and a younger brother, Naoki, are talking while eating dinner, curry rice, which the older brother made. When Tomo is about to clear dishes up, a cockroach appears. He tries to beat the cockroach but misses and it escapes him. Tomo starts to play a video game to cheer himself up. Naoki asked Tomo if he is really enjoying the game, and Tomo says not really. Tomo later stated that he slightly changed the story but mainly it is based on actual stories with his younger brother during a summer break. This text seems to depict the
unsatisfied and hazy feelings harboured by young people, and video games seem to be a means for an escape or to compensate for those feelings.

Tomo Inoue-kun
Naoki Makoto

12. Green Summer Yuka

A mother and a daughter are anxiously talking about the fact that the seafood restaurant of a childhood friend’s house has closed down. Natsuki gets shocked since it is the place where she and her friends always gather. She sends an email to ask how her friend’s father is. She gets a reply and finds out that her friend’s father is fine but the store has not been well recently. She sends an email to her friend again, saying, “Let’s gather together again.” Yuka mentioned that this is based on a real story during a summer break. She said that she did not want to make the story too dark but instead to have hope. She told me that her childhood friends go to different schools and she wanted to write something about the people with whom she feels special deep connections, which are different from those with her friends at the current high school. She also said that she was interested in writing about depression since it is a current social issue as well. I detected Natsuki’s effort to positively overcome the difficult situation facing her best friend.

Mother Miku
Natsuki Nijiho

Twilight: Los Angeles, 1992. Twilight is written by an American actress and playwright, Anna Deavere Smith. The story of the text is based on the 1992 Los Angeles riots. The play is composed of monologues by real people connected directly and indirectly to the riots. A pioneer of the genre known as verbatim theatre, the text of the monologues is taken verbatim from actual interviews, which Anna Deavere Smith conducted. Since the entire text was too long for class activity, I chose several characters and scenes, trying to represent the diverse positions
towards the riots. The fourteen monologues of eleven people that I presented in class were
the following. Descriptions and categorizations of characters were quoted from Smith (2003):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Six in total: four male, two female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean American</td>
<td>Three male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Three in total: one male, two female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Two male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jay Woong Yahng [No Justice No Peace, p. 43; 48]
Former liquor store owner, Korean, heavy accent, 40s

Gina Rae Aka Queen Malkah [No Justice No Peace, p. 46; 48]
Community activist, African American, 40s

Keith Watson [Rocked, p. 61; 81]
Former security guard, co-assailant of Reginald Denny, African American, 20s

Shelby Coffey III [Rocked, p.64]
Editor, *Los Angeles Times*, White, patrician, 40s

Octavio Sandoval [Rocked, p. 70]
Occupation unknown, Latino

Federico Sandoval [Rocked, p.72]
Octavio’s brother, Latino

Katie Miller [Rocked, p. 73]
Bookkeeper and accountant, African-American, 40s

Talent Agent [Rocked, p.75]
Anonymous Hollywood talent agent, White, 40s

Elaine Young [Rocked, p.78]
The Beverly Hills Real Estate Agency

Jin Ho Lee [After dinner, p.141]
Korean-American, macho, 30s, heavy accent

Paul Parker [After Dinner, p. 143]
Chairperson, Free the LA Four Plus Defense Committee, African-American, well built, 20s
Casting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Actor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jay Woong (1)</td>
<td>p. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Woong (2)</td>
<td>p. 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gina Rae (1)</td>
<td>p. 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gina Rae (2)</td>
<td>p. 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Watson (1)</td>
<td>p. 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Watson (2)</td>
<td>p. 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federico Sandoval</td>
<td>p. 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jin Ho Lee</td>
<td>p. 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Parker</td>
<td>p. 143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

casts

The drama classes at Akane High School were taken by not only “Theatre group” students but also students of other majors for the purpose of general education. “Theatre group” students usually have theatre-related experiences such as being a member of the theatre club or being involved in theatre practices inside and outside school. Although the main aim of the drama class at Akane is not training future artists, with the current situation in which arts focused high schools are very limited in Japan, Akane attracts a number of students who want to become actors and some of the “Theatre group” students in drama class showed an eagerness to pursue a career as an actor or voice actor. Students of other majors often took the class with the purpose of having new experiences, or took it with more unrelated reasons such as because the class looked easy with no endterm examination. As such, students’ expectations toward the class varied. These classes are for second and third year students.  

In this study, the experiences of twelve students (6 girls: Maiko, Chika, Yuka, Risa, Mika, Nijiho, and 6 boys: Inoue-kun, Makoto, Tomo, Rui, Toshi, Shuji) who took Foundations

---

13 The Japanese educational system applies the six-three-three school system. Second and third-year students in Japanese high school therefore refer to Grades 11 and 12 in North America.
of Theatre Expression in their second year, which was the first year of my fieldwork, are central. The common characteristic of these students is that almost all them labeled themselves as or were labeled as *otaku*, which refers to those who indulge in *anime* and manga comics, and who are often viewed in a negative light. Six of the twelve students (Yuka, Risa, Makoto, Tomo, Rui, Toshi) belong to the school drama club. The positions of femininity and masculinity of these students varied, as I will look at in detail in the following chapters. Most of the students took both Applied Theatre Expression and Applied Theatre Theory in their third year.

In the second year of my fieldwork, students of other majors also took Applied Theatre Expression, including several male students who identified themselves or were identified as the “sporty type.” In Japan, students are often described by being classified into two categories: the “cultural type” (*bunka-kei*), which refers to a person with an arts background, often belonging to a school cultural club, and the “sporty type” (*taiikukai-kei*), which refers to a person with a sporty background, often belonging to a school sports club. While they are differently positioned in “school caste” as I will describe below, the students who join the drama club or are seen as *otaku* are often called a “cultural type.”

**Theatre Activities: Casting, Character Development and Performance**

The main theatre activities in drama classes were casting, character development and performance. In this section, I will describe each of these activities in the context of this research.

**Casting.** Casting was conducted in various ways, such as by teachers, an author of the text or actors. For the *Sketches of Daily Life* series in the second term of Foundations of Theatre Expression, the author of the script read out their stage direction and the classmates performed the plays. First, each author chose who s/he wanted each role to be performed. With these opinions taken into account, a teacher, Mr. Okamoto, did the final casting. For *Twilight: Los*
Angeles, 1992 in the third term of Foundations of Theatre Expression, students chose the roles they wanted to act by themselves. They could choose the same scene as that chosen by other students.

In Applied Theatre Expression, students first were asked which role of Shakespeare’s *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* they wanted to act. With these opinions taken into account, the teacher, Mr. Furuta did the final casting. As for the scripts written by students on the theme of love in Applied Theatre Theory, the authors conducted the casting. When the casting was conducted by teachers or authors (*Sketches of Daily Life*; the scripts written by students on the theme of love), the image with which an actor engaged through performances was mainly set by others. On the other hand, when actors chose the role that they wanted to act (*Twilight: Los Angeles, 1992*), the actor set herself/himself to engage with the image by herself/himself. *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* was in the middle of these as the actors had a choice but the teachers had the final say.

In class, I looked at the situation and reactions of students and teachers when a student was casted for a certain role. In their journal entries, students were asked for their thoughts and feelings at the moment when they were casted, and what they thought and felt about the role. For the second term of Foundations of Theatre Expression, they were also asked for their favourite role and the role that they felt was fun, easy, bad or difficult to act as well as the role that they felt closest to or most different from among the roles they actually acted. In addition, they were asked if there were any roles that they wanted or did not want to act among the roles that they did not act as well as the reasons for those. These answers were followed up in interviews. For the third term of Foundations of Theatre Expression, in which students chose the role by themselves, the students were asked for their motivation to choose the role.
**Character development.** Character development was one of the processes of theatre activities, through which student-character are explored. In Perry’s (2011) work, the character development process involves a “positioning exercise” and each student wrote a list of personal positions such as student, daughter, son or friend. In this study, through journal writing, I asked some questions to each student, saying to them:

Imagine the role you act, and introduce what kind of the person it is, referring to the following points as examples: character, age, appearance (body shape, clothes, one’s belongings), behavior, friendship, family relations, hobbies, and any other characteristics.

In their journal entries, most of the students described the role in narratives, while others listed simple words regarding the role. The reasons behind these narratives and words, written in their journal entries, were investigated in interviews. The narratives often included several social positions and the students often put themselves into the narratives by describing the similarities and differences between themselves and the characters, and the respective power relations (which is the majority and the minority). Throughout the process, a series of ideas, concepts and subject positions through which each student and the character were entangled has gradually become apparent.

As Perry states, this is the process of complicating “understandings of ‘performer/actor’ and ‘performed/fiction, ’ ” proceeding with “character exploration through their bodies, interacting in the space in their adopted character” (2011, p. 7). Perry regards the text of describing the role as “a process of engagement” which enables us to see “how [students] experiments in a corporeal world, smudging the edges of [their] own positions and [their] imagined alternative realities” (p. 12). Perry describes this process as follows:

[The] character becomes a space within which [students] can explore experience that flees from the structures and circumstances of [their] own. The historical, emotional and
material forces of [the ideas and subject position attributed to the character] can be seen as multiple forces of affect in the experience of adopting this character. (p. 12)

The narratives about the characters often revealed their affects toward the role such as longing and disgust in the students (e.g., longing in Maiko and Yuka’s story; disgust in Risa and Rui’s story), and circumstances in their own lives such as the hierarchy of the group (Tomo and Mika’s story). The relationship between a student and a character was sometimes described based on social group in class: otaku group/‘normal’ group (Tomo, Mika and Nijiho’s stories); “sporty type”/others (Yuka’s story); ‘JK’/non-JK (Risa’s story), and at other times, based on different positions in the same subject position: kyapikyapi/non-kyapikyapi (Maiko and Risa’s stories); burikko/non-burikko (Maiko’s story). The character revealed realities relative to each student, and it became an opportunity for each student to explore the realities and the relations. This exploration was sometimes conducted joyfully (Yuka’s story), ambivalently (Maiko’s story), with resistance (Mika’s story) and calmly (Chika and Inoue-kun’s stories).

When pursuing an inquiry into the character development process, Perry (2011) cautions us that analogical thought such as recognizing signifiers by describing the student, the character and the correspondence between these two entities is limited and problematic. She states that although it is “provocative to consider the interplay between student and character attributes,” “these alternative possibilities of being, brought forth by the students themselves for the purposes of character creation, serve to further demarcate their own subjectivity – we know ourselves through knowing our difference” (p. 8). Instead, Perry (2011) calls for mapping “the circumstances of [the] process [of character development], the contexts of the choices made and enacted by the students, the actions that occur, and the sensations and affects produced by the performances” (p. 8). In this way, the subject positions that emerged in the students’ narratives were those within which the participants functioned. Perry states that “the rhizome reveals an
understanding of a person moving through this world, where the signifier... is no more than a point of reference out of which erupt lines of flight to other positions, or away from them” (2011, p. 9). To consider Perry’s cautions seriously, the analysis of the process rhizomatically by seeing subject positions as interdependent is important.

**Performance.** Artistic performance is, in the words of Schecner (1988), the experience of “not me, but not-not me.” Role-play or acting consists of the practices of embodying “the other” by narrating others’ words, mimicking other behavior and attitude, and tracing ways of thinking. Through those processes, acting also involves making “mental pictures” which are “private images the actor forms of the character he is portraying, developed from the script,” transforming words into images, visualizing text (Massumi, 2002, p. 47). Massumi (2002) articulates the two types of space formed in different modes of acting: one, “the intersubjective world of the other-in-the-self, self and other identity-bound in mutual missed-recognition” and the other, “a space of dislocation, the space of movement-as-such, sheer transformation” (p. 51). Following the second view of space, I attempted to look at the incorporeality of the event in performance. In addition, Massumi (2002) states that “(t)he activity of the actor is less to imitate a character in a script than to mimic in the flesh the incorporeality of the event” (p. 64). I considered acting as practices of embodying “an event” rather than embodying “a personality of a character,” portraying a “scene” not a character.

Another aspect of performance is that the students physically collide with the text and explore an alternative way of moving and interacting in space and time. Perry (2011) states that “The character’s physical body becomes the vehicle of experience,” disrupting the semiotic authority of text (p. 14).

Also, I regarded the existence of audience or at least imagined audience is important. Perry (2011) states “as this body is watched and heard, the affects and relations (the rhizome)
can be seen to extend to the audience, the spectatorship of self, of peers, of witnesses” (p. 14). Perry (2011) also states that “the force of consensus” in the class is an important force of affect as a line of segmentality. In this sense, I regarded the experience of performing a role as different from the one of just watching a film, which was also sometimes included in a drama class. It was because watching a film lacks the opportunities to present or to imagine presenting the performance in a certain context in front of an audience after the student engages with an image of the role for a certain period of time.

In light of this, I did not regard the functions of a physical performance and a play reading (the style of performance used in the second term of Foundations of Theatre Expression) differentiated. This was because, although there should be some differences in the quality of the experiences between them, a play reading was also accompanied with memorizing the script, conducting character development and enacting performance in front of an audience. Nijiho mentioned the importance of voices in the performance of a play reading, saying, “Even if it is just our voices, if we put our feelings into those voices, then those feelings can be heard,” after watching her own performance on DVD in class. Mr. Okamoto and some other students also agreed with her view.

In class, I looked at what the performance was like, and what the reactions from other students and teachers toward the performance (fieldnotes) were. The flow of affects was sometimes grasped verbally and sometimes non-verbally such as in pauses and looks. In journal entries and reflection papers, which were followed up by an interview, the students were asked how they experienced the performance such as their thoughts and feelings during and after the performance. They were also asked about their strategy for performing, the points to which they especially paid attention, how they changed their approaches, and the goal for the next performance as well as their thoughts and feelings after watching their own performances on
video. The experience of performance in class sometimes influenced how the students would perform the role the next time, changing how affects flew among the actor and the role.

Organizing Vignettes

I organized the following analysis chapters based on the events of noticeable patterns of becoming (in reality, not becoming) and the factors that influence such patterns (Chapter 5), and the themes of femininities (Chapter 6) and of masculinities (Chapter 7). First, I identified the roles that the student in question was assigned and the images of the role with which the student engaged. Then, I looked at what nodes emerged between the student and the role, identifying the relationships between them. Each story was organized based on the movements of affects between the student and the roles, sometimes organized around the ideas which shaped the movements of affects (Chapter 5), and at other times around each student (Chapters 6 and 7). The main data of Chapter 5 is based on all of the classes during the fieldwork, while Chapters 6 and 7 are based on the second term of Foundations of Theatre Expression.
Chapter 5

Ways of (not) Becoming: “Japaneseness,” Gender Hierarchy, Kyara and “School Caste”

Throughout the fieldwork, I repeatedly heard that students mentioned their feelings of “having fun” when performing a different self through acting a role. For example, Yuka stated that the acting experience is the experience of “cultivating a new state” of herself. Maiko stated that it is the experience of “widening [her] own world” and “gaining different ways of thinking” for her. Reflecting on the whole series of the Foundations of Theatre Expression class, Maiko wrote in a reflection paper:

I thought that acting is deeeep. Just through a particular way of acting, a person can change dramatically, and I came to be more interested in acting. I felt that my world grew larger by acting as a person who is totally different from me. I became able to think in multiple ways and that made me find myself more interesting. She added during an interview:

You know, the fact that I could throw myself away made me feel really good. You know, we usually cannot change ourselves so easily. Honestly, I don’t like myself that much. But, if I throw it away and act a role that is totally different from my personality, I really feel it is fun!

Mika also regards the acting experience as an opportunity to widen her horizons. In an interview, she energetically stated that she feels the most enjoyment when she received a play script and had a role assigned to her rather than when she was doing improvisation. She stated that when she had a role assigned to her, she gets excited at the fact that “I’m allowed to get into the role by throwing myself away” and it is “fun” since “I feel that I am able to discover a self who is not me” and “the aspects which are not me inside me appear.” She added to say that the
more difficult the role is to act, the more she gets excited. “The more I think, the more I find it to be fun,” she said.

For Makoto, a male student, too, the acting is fun experience since it enhances his understanding of “the other” as well as expanding his viewpoint. While Makoto said, “I wanted to act every role since they are going to be good experiences,” the roles that he mentioned that he wanted to try acting were wide in range. The roles he mentioned include the roles of “a gay person” and of “a high school girl,” who is “like the joshi kō sei (JK), written in katakana,” meaning “a recent high school girl and a tidy, well-bred girl.” “It’s like a simulation such as of reading a novel,” he said. It is a good experience since “my outlook will expand” and it is “fun” since “I could do what I have never experienced,” he said. He explained, by acting, “a new personality appears in myself and I will be able to have the way of thinking like the character’s.” He stated:

It’s like a frame. I can apply it when caring for another person, can’t I? It’s like wondering what it is like to be a girl and if she feels cold when wearing a skirt. Then, I will think about turning a heater on, guessing that wearing a skirt might be cold. Maybe I use it in this way.

In this chapter, I explore the events of noticeable patterns of becoming (in actuality, mostly not becoming) in the acting experiences that students described above as such. To be precise, in this chapter, I map the factors, which noticeably worked on territorializing youth’s bodies at school. This way of analyzing data was actually not my original intention since I was more interested in exploring the experiences of becoming. However, what I soon realized in the field was how rigidly students’ territorialization occurred even in the drama class where at least at the curriculum level, transgression and border crossing of the self were literally encouraged by setting them as a class aim.
As influential factors that promote territorialization of youth, I firstly look at the identity category of ethnicity and nationality. Looking at the theme of gender crossing, I secondly address the girls’ desire for masculinity and the boys’ rejections of femininities, which pose the question of gender hierarchy. Thirdly, the notion of kyara (Japanese interpretation of the English word “character”) is considered as the factor that prevents students from imagining to be otherwise. Then, I pay attention to the idea of school caste, which divides students into hierarchical groups. Connecting the repeated patterns that I sensed in the field, this chapter draws the data from the whole of the classes throughout the fieldwork. These patterns of territorialization seemed to be working rigidly and I consider that these are the influential factors for students’ overall experience at school, regarding these factors as the foundation of the analysis in the following chapters.

“Japaneseness”: Ethnicity and Nationality as Rigid Boundaries, Muted Differences

In the third term of the Foundations of Theatre Expression class, students engaged in character development and presented their final solo performances based on the drama text, *Twilight: Los Angeles, 1992*. Based on the 1992 Los Angeles riots, the play is composed of monologues by people in diverse ethnic positions towards the riots such as “African American,” “Korean-American,” “White,” and “Latino.” What I found significant about the students’ experiences of character development and performance with the play was the lack of engagement with and transformation of ethnicity or nationality, while relating with the role. While I confronted this fact as an uncanny thing at first for me who just came back from the multicultural society of Toronto, I soon remembered my previous experiences of living in Japan. That is, in daily practices, seeing the world as a “Japanese” is taken as granted and performing as a normative Japanese is always expected without any space to see the possibilities of otherwise.
For instance, I found the engagement with ethnicity and nationality absent in the experience of Maiko who exclusively focused on the emotion of anger in her engagement with her role. Maiko acted the role of Keith Watson, “a former security guard, co-assailant of Reginald Denny, African American, 20s.” Reflecting on her perspective toward character development in a reflection paper, she wrote, “As for this role, I have been thinking about which part of and how much of this character is angry.” In an interview, she stated that she chose the role since “being angry is relatively simple, so I had a feeling that I could act it pretty much naturally.” Referring to the word of “black” in her description of the character with “black, bandy legs, male” as a character sketch, I asked what she thought about during character development. Pausing for a moment with a surprised face and implying that my question was unexpected, she seemed to find it difficult to make a sense of my intention for my question. “I didn’t deal with it much,” she said as if she was groping for confirmation that her answer was “right,” looking at my face. Then, I started to become concerned as to whether my question or my way of asking the question was “right.”

Engagement with ethnicity and nationality was also absent from the experience of Yuka, who regarded the role’s mentality as the focal point of character development. She chose the role of Gina Rae, who is a “Community activist, African American, 40s.” As for the reason for choosing the role, Yuka stated that she originally chose the role since it is a female role and she found easy to understand the scene, although she later thought that she could also be alright with a male role. She elaborately explained her process of character development such as trying to “stretch out [her] back” when walking, “draw in [her] chin” and “give [her]self airs but with a blank expression,” attempting to be “like an able person.” She stated, “I tried to stretch myself mentally as much possible” since the role was an adult and neat. Listening to those, I got a sense of her great effort to become like the role although (or because) she repeatedly mentioned that
she felt difficulty in acting the role since she said that “the image is totally different from me”
such as a different mentality and way of speaking and posture. Although she seemed to have a
clear image of the role and was eager to get close to the role, the concepts of ethnicity or race
were absent in her narratives and I could not see any capacity to relate with those. I asked her if
there were any other factors to choose the role, explicitly mentioning that the example is race. It
sounded like she sees it as irrelevant as Yuka stated in a clear voice, “No, I never thought about
if I wanted to act either White or Black.”

In another case, not only was race or ethnicity absent, but there was a case that the image
of the role was also unconsciously altered into a different race during character development
process. After I found out that race/ethnicity was not mentioned in Tomo’s detailed descriptions
of the role and acting experiences like other students, I asked him if race/ethnicity was
considered during his character development process in any way. Seeming to try to remember
any thought related with that, he took a pause and asked me if the role was a White person. I
was surprised by his question and looked again at the paper in which the description of each
character was written to confirm if my understanding was right. I told him that Gina Rae is an
“African American.” “Wasn’t it written as a White?” he asked in a surprised voice. “The image
inside of me was a White person!” he said. His flat way of saying it sounded as if he did not feel
any hesitation or feeling bad for his mistake as if his misunderstanding was not a big deal. These
statements of his seemed to imply that for him, race/ethnicity was not an important factor to
understand the person or the experiences of the person so that he did not care from the
beginning if the role is “White” or “African American.” Again, the engagement with
race/ethnicity was absent.

In addition, for some cases, the race was perversely not to be embodied even if it was
imagined during character development process. Reflecting the process of character
development, Rui stated that he did not search for any information about the role other than the drama text itself even though he had been told that he could find out much through a quick search on the Internet. He stated why he did not as:

From the first, I had imagined the role a little. The image of the character inside me was, you know Bolt, who achieved new world record at the Summer Olympics. Usain Bolt, I guess. He is the representative athlete of Jamaica maybe. I thought that he really seems most applicable to the role.

“You already had the image of the role from the beginning?” I asked. Rui answered:

Since the image was strong and had already grown large in my mind before I search, I didn’t want to find out that the person is actually a small guy with a suit by searching for the information. It would have been bothersome to reimagine the role at that point.

I asked what the image of Bolt was like for him. Rui stated:

The image was like that he is very sporty, being sturdy, and the words might be a bit dirty, but since he has good sportsmanship, his wordings are usually polite on the occasion that deserves it, such as when on TV.

Then, I asked if he thought that he could express the role in the way that he imagined in his performance. Saying that he could not express it well after all, he stated that he therefore decided to act the role merely as a sportsman, who does rugby, is well muscled and has a straight back/upright posture. He stated without hesitation that, although it was a bit painful to get his back straight due to his stooped shoulders, he thought that he was able to express a sportsman. His way of saying that sounded even confident. By hearing Rui’s narrative, I was first struck by the fact “Black male” was imagined as the stereotypical image such as being sporty and sturdy. I was also surprised by the fact that even this stereotypical image was altered and not embodied throughout the processes of any activities in class.
Throughout the process of the character development and performance overall in the field, I hardly detected effort by students to place themselves in relation with any other race, ethnicity or nationality such as “White,” “Black,” “Asian” or “American.” When they engaged with those processes, students seemed to tend to focus on other characteristics of the roles. Interestingly, even if they noted the signifier of the race or ethnicity of their roles and mentioned it to describe the role, those seemed not to be embodied, saying that these aspects did not influence their performance in any way. Students did not appear to place themselves in relation to the image of race or ethnicity, keeping the image separate from themselves. What is clear from this is that the experiences of acting the role did not function as an opportunity to explore their ethnicity and nationality to widen their possibilities to become something new in this aspect.

Considering the characteristics of the text, which focus on race or ethnicity and pedagogical invitation to engage with those in the class, I found this absence in students’ narratives rather very odd, especially when compared with other experiences of students’ engagement with femininities and masculinities as we will see in the following. At the first class of the third term of Foundations of Theatre Expression, we watched parts of the movie, Crash, directed by Paul Haggis and released in 2004, the theme of which also being about the issue of race in order to enhance the understanding the context of the drama text. We also watched some clips of YouTube, related with the L.A. Riots about which the text was written. Then, we had a class discussion on the issue of inequality and power relations among “races” especially between “White” and “Black” in the United States. After many students mentioned how unfair the situation is, the discussion went on about the issue of Eta and Hinin, who are still experiencing discrimination, regarded as different “race” from the majority of Japanese people. Some of the students such as Mika were especially very aware of the issues, and passionately
exchanged their opinions about discrimination. After these discussions, I distributed the students the drama script by Anna Deavere Smith, in which the character descriptions related to ethnicity or race were written. This was the context where students engaged in drama activities, full of the signifiers of particular race or ethnicity, however, as we saw, none of the subject positions of ethnicity, race or nationality emerged as the point toward which students experienced becoming.

Beyond this class lesson, this lack of consideration of race and ethnicity was consistent throughout the fieldwork. This lack was not only found in the classes that applied the drama texts written by students, such as *Sketches of Daily Life* series (Foundations of Theatre Expression) and the text with the theme of love (Applied Theatre Theory). It was also found in the classes which apply the drama text or the lyrics of the song whose context was not in Japan such as *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* (Applied Theatre Expression), *Antigone* (Foundations of Theatre Theory) and *Seasons of Love*, a song from the musical, *Rent* (Applied Theatre Expression). Referring to his kind of lack of attention towards difference in Japan, Kang (2001), a Korean Japanese postcolonial scholar, mentions that this is the reason why discussions about postcolonial issues in Japan did not develop after the Second World War, lacking self-reflection in relation with others.

One possible factor why race, ethnicity and nationality were not related to the youths’ self-making processes might be the influence of the quite extensive number of discourses on a national boundary between Japan and the *other*. Consistently affirming differences between those inside and those outside Japan, the discourse, which considers Japan in its entirety was repeatedly heard in students’ narrative throughout the fieldwork. The significant example was found in students’ narrative related with the theme of sexuality, especially of homosexuality. Reflecting on her impressions of watching *Rent* in Advanced Theatre Expression as “there are quite a number of scenes that are strongly full-on,” Yuka continued to state:
Well, how do I say it, it seems that there are several themes such as homosexual love and HIV, and well, I think that it is unique to foreign countries that homosexual love is chosen as a theme. I haven’t seen such a movie among Japanese ones. I do not mean that homosexual love is ugly – it’s free. Then, there was another scene, in which a woman dances in a place like a theatre. That dance was like a strip-show kind of dance. There are many seductive scenes, with considerable lack of clothing and I think that these are foreign country things. I think that Japan doesn’t do such a thing.

In this context, homosexuality and sexuality are narrated as uniquely the domain of “foreign countries.” Saying that she thinks the degree of freedom in the United States is different from Japan, Yuka also mentioned that “people in the United States are allowed to create scenes as they want to,” while, in Japan, she thinks that “there are many restrictions, like this is not OK, and like too much stimulation is not good for an audience.” She added to say that the movie made her think that “there are so many different people in the world,” since there are a lot of “strong characters,” such as “guys who love other guys, women who love other women and a guy who dresses like a woman in the movie.” To describe Japan as a “race” which is sensitive to normativity, implying therefore that “diversity” such as might be seen in “strong characters” in a movie is not allowed to exist in Japan, she mentioned:

I know that those [homosexual] people exist in Japan in a way, but I think Japanese are a kind of race who has a strong consciousness of feeling strange if something is different from the majority. In the United States, so many different races exist, right? The country is big as well. Many of them are immigrants. I think that that brings about different kinds of sense (toward homosexuality). It is like it’s free.

Maiko who shared her homosexual desire with me one time, also echoed the discourse that the US is free country while Japan is not, when she mentioned freedom to be homosexual in
the US. Articulating that it is “unique to the United States,” she mentioned, “I thought this work [Rent] absolutely could not be created in Japan,” adding to say, “In Japan, homosexuality is criticized, isn’t it? These things and HIV; I think that only a few people feel familiar about that in Japan.” Explaining the United States as a country where homosexuality is acknowledged, she clearly said, “The United States has a lot of freedom.” This statement which sounded like it included envy toward the United States was mentioned in contrast with her material experiences in class where she felt strong disappointment. Explaining the situation of watching Rent in class, when I was absent, in reluctant voice, she said that some male students in class kept giggling and also roared with laughter while they viewed the movie. Mentioning that those were really uncomfortable and uneasy experiences, she said that she was almost burst into tears by watching the attitude of these students, implying that her understanding of the relation between the United States and Japan might have been strengthened by this experience.

Seeing the United States with envy or aspiration, positioning it as “an individualistic country,” Shugi also described the nature of Japan, which seemed to be regarded as uniform within the national boundary. Positioning Japan as “lagging behind” compared with the United States, he explained how different the two countries are. He said that he thinks the United States being an individualistic country is why he thinks loving relationships like those depicted in Rent are possible, saying, “people are able to love someone, no matter the situation, and not caring about other people’s eyes.” Pointing out Angel, a male character with HIV as an example, he explained that “individualism” refers to “overcoming and not possessing a fixed idea of others,” saying in contrast, “In Japan, I think that there would be criticism in the end,” indicating Japan as “a non-individualistic nation.”

He continued to explain how people see those who are apart from normalcy in Japan. Giving “a woman who works as a dump truck driver in a factory” as an example, he said that
such a woman is “not normal like an office worker.” He said that many people would think such a girl is “lower than normal people,” and if someone wants to get married with her, “her partner’s parents would care about their reputation,” implying that if out of normalcy in Japan, people would suffer many consequences. However, while I detected his admiration toward “the United States” which he views as a free place where people do not need to care about other people’s opinions, in contrast with Japan, I detected his turmoil about keeping up with the expectations of being a Japanese and fitting in. He said, “I have a feeling that I try to fit in with public estimation because I was born in Japan,” however, he found this as “a very troublesome thing.” He said, “I want to open some new ways by myself.”

Regarding the United States as “sexually open,” “free,” “individualistic” and where “diversity is permitted,” which often includes the meaning of superior and more socially advanced than Japan, is heard in comparative discourse between Japan and the United States. The idea of “sexually behind” Japanese is constructed through differentiation of itself from foreign others, especially the United States. Students’ admiration for the openness for sexuality in the Unites States in a way reproduces the “normalcy” of homophobic practice and the “normalcy” of being “normative” in Japan regarding it as the nature of Japan. Pointing out the phrase, “we, Japanese,” Tai (2005) states that it consists of not only the image of foreigners which are in a binary contrast with Japanese but also seeing an essential sameness among Japanese. Looking at the phrase, “we, Japanese,” Sakai (1996) also argues about the issue of the myth of Japanese homogeneity. He states that the myth does not mean forgetting other ethnicities but rather that it means the wrong understanding of “we, Japanese,” which is that Japanese are based on one ethnicity, and communication and sympathy within the ethnicity is guaranteed - as long as they are Japanese people, people can all naturally sympathize with and understand each other.
A substantial number of Nihonjinron (studies of the Japanese) writers, for example, have attempted to define the unique characters of the Japanese and why they are unique, often using “the West” as their point of comparison (Morris-Suzuki, 1995, 1998; Refsing, 2003).

Nihonjinron is a form of discourse that become popular in Japan after the Second World War, reaching the peak of its popularity in the 1970s (Morris-Suzuki, 1998). It is considered by many to be the successor to the debates on national character that were published in Japan during the Meiji era and in the years leading up to the Second World War (Morton, 2003; Morris-Suzuki, 1995, 1998; Refsing, 2003). The assumptions in this discourse are the notions that the Japanese are a homogeneous people, share a single language, religion and lifestyle and belong to a single “Japanese race,” preventing people from acknowledging the existence of differences within the nation state. In other words, the national identity or Japaneseness is constructed around the “purity” of ethnicity.

Various scholars articulated that an ideology of homogeneity within Japan is also found in new discourses in relation to cultural difference such as kokusaika (internationalization), ibunka (different culture), kyōsei (co-existence) and tabunka (multiculturalism), which have become increasingly popular since around the beginning of 1990s (Burgess, 2004). While these discourses give the impression of an ideological shift from an ideology of homogeneity to an ideology of difference, in actuality they maintain and reinforce an ideology of homogeneity (Burgess, 2004). Exploring how the ideology function within the discourse of kokusaika, Nakamatsu (2002, cited in Burgess, 2004) points out discourses of kokusaika function as a process of “Othering” not by the process of exclusion but of inclusion. Burgess (2004) states:

Discourses such as kokusaika can act as powerful signifiers which “include” foreigners by locking them into a particular category of difference. With stereotypical forms of difference as the basis for inclusion, subjects are
sometimes marginalized and denied access to mainstream sites of power and full participation in the community. (p. 17)

Through those processes, “alien entities” seem to be isolated and controlled.

Considering students’ experience as we saw above, this argument seems to be applicable to even Akane, a high school that promotes international exchange as its unique strength and the fact that there are several international and immigrant students at the school. With the rapid increase of global economic competition, Japanese youth have been strongly encouraged to become an “international” person, or a Sekai de katsuyaku dekiru nihonjin (a Japanese person who can strive in global world), including significantly the meaning of acquiring English. However, the issue to be considered is that even in this situation, which being an “international” person is encouraged, Japanese youth are expected to preserve their position as a Japanese by avoiding actual integration of difference, which might lead to transforming the idea of “normalcy” entailed in the idea of the “normalcy” which is always entailed with the idea of “Japaneseness.” Refering to a superficial multiculturalism, Morris-Suzuki (2002) calls the situation where the mixture of cultural difference (such as food, music and fashion) is only allowed at the level of the commercial value but not at the level of integration and transformation of people as “cosmetic multiculturalism.” What is clear is that even if diversity is now praised in several discourses in Japanese society, students were still experiencing difference of nationality/ethnicity only under this kind of limited scope.

Unlike gender factors with which youth experience territorialization and deterritorialization in varied ways as we will see in the following chapter (Chapters 6 and 7), territorializing themselves as a Japanese without opening themselves up to the other ethnicities or nationalities was commonly seen throughout the fieldwork. As the examples above illustrate, national boundaries are regarded as obvious, rather than as fluid and transformable. Staying in
the same place as a Japanese, it seems to be difficult for Japanese youth to expand what “Japanese” means and construct alternative forms.

To conclude this section, I need to address with critical reflection, my own educational practices in the field, in which I see my unintentional involvement for reproducing the hierarchical relation of a “Japanese” with the external other. In the third term of the Foundations of Theatre Expression class, I joined the other teachers to assist in teaching. Asked by the teachers what drama text I am interested in using in the class, I chose the text, *Twilight: Los Angeles, 1992*, written by an American playwright, Anna Deavere Smith. I came to know the text in class in Canada and the major theme of the text is the issues of race and ethnicity in the United States. My choice of the text was based on my hope pedagogically to generate new relations for the students beyond national borders as well as to reflect on their current relations. Methodologically, it was based on my intention to explore the ways in which the students engaged with race, ethnicity and nationality in the context of Japan. However, the question of what I could be producing by using the text kept haunting my mind as I conducted these educational practices. Pedagogically, I needed to ask how engagement with the text actually produces new relations and how beneficial it is for the students, and methodologically, how this text is actually useful for me to understand the ways that Japanese youth experience race, ethnicity and nationality, or alternatively “Japaneseness.”

Constantly asking these questions, I felt paralyzed especially by questioning whether I was perpetuating the colonial relationship between the United States and Japan, while excluding other possible relations that students might have engaged with. Since the opening of the country in the Meiji Period (1868-1912) in the late 19th Century, Western values and systems including a modern school system were rapidly incorporated into Japanese society in its modernization effort. While adopting and reinventing the western systems in order to overcome the threat of
colonization, “Japanese” national identity has been constructed as uniquely “Japanese” and “Asian” (Suzuki, 2005). Incorporating the text of “the West” into the educational practices and thus setting the opportunity for Japanese students to engage with relations with it, I wondered how, if in any way, I reproduced the image of a “progressive” country of the United States.

When I moved to Toronto to attend a PhD program, in my head, Canada was the country of progress with advanced knowledge and practice of multiculturalism and drama education, and the place where women are treated more equally. Regarding Japan as the nation with a conventional educational system and socially behind in the issues of equity and diversity, I was one of many young Japanese women, who longed for liberation from the discriminatory social system in Japan, and decided to join the exodus to the more “free” and “equitable” West (Kelsky, 2001). In addition to my previous embodiment of the imagined relation between Japan and “the West” like this, my educational migration seemed to have placed me in a privileged position, given an opportunity to teach the class, while seen as a legitimate educator and researcher who must know the newest and better educational practices. This was the context in which the students’ experiences occurred, and all these complications of the context needs further critical examination.

Another issue of my own educational practices was concerned with the relation with the other “Asian.” Specifically, it was about the issue of my avoidance to mention the term “zainichi” in class. During the class discussion after watching the movie, Crash, and some clips of YouTube related to the L.A. Riots, in Foundations of Theatre Expression, students started to talk about the issues of discrimination in Japan, articulating specifically the issue of Eta and Hinin. Considering the locality of the school with a zainichi community in the vicinity, the issues of zainichi could have been another topic to be discussed. While facilitating the discussion,
however, I hesitated to bring up the topic in class, feeling intimidated to do so, and I failed to lead the discussion in that direction.

One of the factors that might have shaped my behaviour in the class, was my previous experience of visiting another school with a drama class in order to find the school for my fieldwork. Explaining to a teacher about my research interest, I mentioned that I am interested in exploring the issues of multiculturalism in Japan including the issue of ethnicity such as zainichi. Hearing the word of zainichi, he quickly dismissed my proposal and told me that it is not a good idea to deal with those at school, saying that something unexpected might happen and he cannot be responsible for that. He then added to say that discussion of the politics between Japan and the West could be possible, implying that they are much less controversial, while talking about zainichi is taboo at school. Producing in me a fear of exclusion, the direct rejection shocked me, who had just come back from an academic environment in Canada where I was used to engage with discussions of diversity.

Analyzing the silencing of zainichi identity in Japanese society, Park (2007) articulates that the act of not mentioning identity categories means that the category is considered inferior. Such avoidance of naming reflects on the situation that such identity categories are unlivable, indicating how racism is maintained in this manner rather than through physical and verbal violence. All of these experiences of mine show that the name zainichi is still literally cast out to “the other side” of speakable ethnic identities at school in Japan, and the memory of Japan’s colonial history is silenced at the school in the same way that it is being silenced by the contemporary Japanese government’s revisionist politics.

Thinking back now, I believe that the two teachers at Akane High School must have supported or even might have encouraged me to bring up the topic in the class. However, my fear of the exclusion from the field, and ultimately Japan, and my lack of critical reflection in
this situation shaped my behaviour, stopping me from crossing the border of normativity as a “Japanese.” In addition, I believe that my feelings of uncertainty as to if by applying the knowledge that I gained in Toronto, I would be able to explain the intention of my research to the teachers and students in an intelligible way also have caused my behaviour in class. The fact that even I, who was interested in pursuing the promotion of equality in Japan, was not able to overcome the fear and perpetuated the behaviour as a normative “Japanese” posed rather an important question in terms of how severely the politics of exclusion have still been working in Japan. Through my own educational practices, it was me who possibly reproduced the normativity as a “Japanese,” positioned with the sets of binary positions between a “superior” West and a “lagging behind” Asia, preventing the transformation of “Japanese.”

**Gender Crossing: Girls’ Desire for Masculinities and Boys’ Rejection of Femininities**

As another pattern of movement of affect, one of the common desires that I encountered repeatedly throughout the fieldwork was the deterritorialization of femininities in relation to masculinities. For example, in female students’ narratives, their eagerness to act the male roles was often expressed. Maiko said that acting the male role was more fun since she could “express her nature (じ地).” She explained that acting the role of Keith Watson from *Twilight* was “fun” since “I’m a bit manly and can’t help being strong-minded.” Saying that she had “a manly image” for that role, she described the image of the role variously as “male, bowlegged,” “angry, angry, angry” and “man, man, man.” She added to say, “I really find it fun when acting an exaggerated role. After all, such a role is more suited to me.” These statements of Maiko seemed to imply that she enjoyed her masculine performance, since it suited her temperament well.

Acting male roles was often narrated by girls not only as fun experiences but also as empowering experiences. For example, the experience of acting a male role was described as one in which they could achieve “stress relief,” for Risa and Miki, and the one in which Nijihoko
feels allowed to say “the words she usually cannot say.” Interestingly, in opposition to the girls’ desire for acting male roles was that their hesitation to act the role of “girlie” girls that I often heard (Risa, Mika, Maiko, Shoko, Sayo). While the significance of male domination of time and space in school is documented (Mac an Ghaill, 1994; Paechter, 1998), this girls’ desire for gender crossing might be interpreted as a radical disruption of and resistance to male domination, subverting emphasized (hetero)sexualized femininities (Currie, Kelly & Pomerantz, 2006; Renold, 2008, 2009; Renold & Ringrose, 2012).

As discursive practices of multiple femininities, this might be also situated within the practices of “female masculinity” (Nayak & Kehily, 2013; Paechter, 2006; Renold, 2008, 2009). However, even if quite a large number of female students expressed their eagerness to act male roles in interviews, these experiences were not often given to the girls in drama classes. Positioned outside of the normative Japanese femininity, girls’ desires for masculinity were not recognized and were silenced, and the possibility of a girl’s masculinity was effectively omitted in the class, especially in the stage of casting. In the class of Foundations of Theatre Expression, for example, Mika was the only female student who acted a male role.

While the gender difference of the Japanese language is acknowledged (Jugaku, 1979; Nakamura, 2007, 2012), Mika was a student who often described herself using the masculine first-person pronouns, *boku* and *ore*, which are almost exclusively used by males in Japan. Japanese first persons are gendered unlike the English “I.” While *watashi* is the most commonly used first person pronoun for girls, *boku* and *ore* are usually used only by boys. It is rare for girls to use those words, and if girls do use them, it is often considered strange and awkward. In the first journal entry, she wrote, “By the way, don’t mind that I use *boku, ore* as the first-person pronoun for myself.” Mika was also a student positioned by her peers and herself as “otaku” (Miyadai, 2009; A. Nakajima, 2009; Saitō, 2011). Mika introduced herself as a big fan of anime.
and manga comics, calling herself an “anioita (abbreviation of anime otaku)” and “two-dimensions person (referring to the world of animation rather than 3D live action films).” She mentioned, “I’m the kind of person that is OK as long as I can moeru (萌える) anime kyara.” Moeru is the word which is often used among otaku community and is the verbal form of moe, which refers to “a euphoric response to fantasy characters, to representations of them” (Galbraith, 2009, online).

Uema describes “otaku” as those who wear “plain clothes” and are “not breaking the school rules much” as well as those who seem to “be awkward since they do not pursue kogyaru-ness or are not able to do that well” (2002, p. 49). Being often positioned with imposed exclusion, otaku is also regarded as one form of oppositional femininity and alternative configuration such as “beautiful fighting girl” (Saitō, 2011). This view of alternative configuration might be considered what made it possible for Mika to be selected to act the male role and to act it out.

The male role that Mika was assigned was Toji in “Taste.” In an interview, Mika mentioned that in order to be seen as a guy, she tried to make her voice deeper. She said that she was OK with speaking “male language” (男ことば, otoko kotoba) since she usually uses such words, and the difficulty to act the role of Toji was only a matter of mastering the pitch of voice. Throughout the practices for the performance in class, Mika’s voice was getting louder and deeper, and she came to speak the lines in a clear voice. When Mr. Okamoto advised her to make her voice a little deeper, Mika responded by saying, “I’ll do my best (Ore, gambaru).” Reflecting on her experiences of acting in her journal, she wrote about the pitch of her voice every time with the intention of considering how to improve it.

Mika stated that she thought a lot about the role before and during her performance, modifying the performance by actually trying out ideas and moving her body. During the
process, she said that she had been imagining that “a man is like this” and then, she would do “this kind of movement,” remembering “what I did before.” She said those experiences were “really fun.” Repeatedly mentioning, “It’s fun” and, “The male role is fresh” in a joyful tone, she stated that she got the most excited with the role of Toji since the role was different from her as well as surprised by the fact she “could act this kind of the role” surprised her.

Not only the student who actually acted the male role in Foundations of Theatre Expression, Mika also seemed to be a rare student who kept involving herself in acting at the same level throughout the whole of the drama classes, even after “sporty type” students joined the drama class. However, Mika’s becoming seemed to be accompanied by some compensation, that is, the exclusion by and abjection from the “sporty type” students. Mika’s performance seemed to be considered too masculine for women.

In addition, how “masculinity” is desired seems to be related with the different positions within femininities. For example, unlike many of the girls, Chika who was often positioned in a “girlie” femininity did not express the desire of acting a male role. Also, although Nijiho, who was positioned as a relatively “girlie” femininity, expressed her interest for acting the male role, she said that she would act the role only with a condition that others find the role is suited to her. Renold and Ringrose (2012) state that girls are not able to easily take a lived subject position of the fantastical figure of ‘phallic girl,’ illustrating “the abiding regulative rhythm of phallogocentric power in schooling” (p. 48). Pointing out “the risk of marginalization within peer cultures,” Currie, Kelly and Pomerantz ask, “What makes their alternative self-representations possible?” (2006, p. 419)

In opposed to girls’ desire to deterritorialize femininities, I detected that most of the time that masculinities territorialized in relation with femininities. The majority of male students often articulated that they did not want to act in female roles or that they have never considered
it as a choice for them to act. The following are examples that I heard as reasons for that. “Since the soul, ways of thinking and a mental state are different between man and woman, first of all… it’s absolutely impossible” (Tomo). “The male and female are different creatures… [which means] males cannot understand females” (Kazuya). “As it is different from the kind of feelings of a male, guys cannot express the peculiar feelings of females” (Inoue-kun). Referring to tomboy girls in manga, Inoue-kun said that even if tomboy girls pretend to be tough, they are different from boys and “we will know who the [actual] guys are after all.” The fundamental point repeatedly heard was that men and women are innately different, which means that if a man acts a female role, it is only going to be a “laugh” and a “joke” (Tomo, Rui, Kazuya).

For some students, acting a female role was never considered as even possible. Rui, who was positioned at the low hierarchy of masculinities as we will see in Chapter 7, said in a determined tone, “I never want to act kyapikyapi (“girlie”) girls” and “I could never imagine that.” “To be honest, I don’t think that the role of a kyapikyapi (“girlie”) girl can be assigned to a real male,” he said. Rui explained that it is not only about him but “it would never be possible for all male students in class” since they are all “real males.” He said that if he imagined that man who is “sturdy like broad-shouldered” and “tall height” with a “changed voice” acting the female role, “it’s really gross!”

For a few male students, a female role can be acted with some conditions attached. Inoue-kun considered that although a graceful role would never be possible for boys to act, it is possible for a frank girl to be acted by a boy. However, even if the role is a very frank girl, Inoue-kun said that he would act the role by changing it to that of a boy after all. He said, “So, I’m OK if the role is the one whose tone sounded like both male and female, and who can be seen as both a man and a female.” Tomo, who acted a female role, Gina Rae in *Twilight*, also said that he acted the female role by changing it to that of a man. He said that since he thought it
was impossible to become a woman, he changed the gender of the role in his head, although he originally had a clear image of it as being a female. Referring to his attitude, “such arrogance…but I thought that it [changing the role to that of a male]’s normal,” he said.

While their way of disengaging with the female role has been normalized, a sense that ‘the boys’ and ‘the girls’ are different creature is territorialized in a very strict way. Only exceptions for that were Makoto, who mentioned his desire for acting the girls’ role, and Shuji, who mentioned that he is interested in acting the female role. However, it still seemed to be conditional, such as Makoto being into acting only when the “sporty type” students were not around and Shuji would be interested in acting a female role only if the role is not too young. T. Watanabe (2009) mentions that borders of gender are easier for females to cross, while it is more difficult for men to cross. One reason for that might be explained by how masculinities are generally constructed through feminine disassociations (Connell, 2005; Renold, 2005).

Overall, the practices of the youths that I encountered seemed to be reconstructing the structure of masculinities and femininities at school and in the nation. A Japanese feminist scholar, Ueno (2004), demonstrates how patriarchal gender order and normative femininities are utilized and reinforced in the construction of nationhood, positioning men as centre and women as the internal other. As if following this script, girls’ gender expression in the field were restricted within the boundary of the normative Japanese feminity, which does not threaten the patriarchal gender hierarchies in the nation. The clear difference we saw between the girls’ desire of embodying masculinity and the boys’ rejection of embodying femininity poses us the question of how to intervene in this unequal relationship between femininities and masculinities.

**Kyara: Trapped by “Individuality”**

Another factor which I soon noticed works on territorializing youth’s bodies in the field was that the idea of *kyara* (Japanese interpretation of the English word “character”), which is
deeply inscribed in the students’ consciousness. It was repeatedly heard in their descriptions of the self and the role, and shaped their understanding of how to choose and perform a role. For example, describing herself, Mika said, “I’m the kind of kyara that doesn’t care about romance.” Nijiho described herself by saying that she is an otaku kyara but also the third-party intermediary in class, who can go back and forth between the otaku group and the “normal” groups. Students also used the word kyara for describing roles. Maiko described a mother role in “Morning War” as a “mother kyara” and Yuka described the role of Chiharu as the “high-tension” kyara. Risa stated that the role of Ichigo was a kyapikyapi (girly) kyara, and Rui called the role of the hairdresser in “Beauty Salon” as an “okama (“queen”) kyara” or a “joke kyara.”

The notion of kyara was also used when students expressed their feeling towards roles and their respective evaluations of their performance. For example, Risa expressed her feelings toward the role of Momoki, by saying, “I simply don’t like the kyara of a person like Momoki.” Rui expressed his feelings in saying, “I have some resistance toward the okama [gay] kyara inside me.” In other cases, reflecting on his performance, Rui stated that he could not get an okama kyara to “explode” all in one go in his final performance. When Risa evaluated her own performance, she noted that she could not act the kyara that would allow her to feel satisfied with her performance.

Kyara is now a very popular word among young people in Japan (Doi, 2009; Honda, 2011; Senuma, 2007). While “kei (系)” (Namba, 2007) refers to “the group” in which particular cultural practices are conducted, kyara refers to an “individual” within the group (Senuma, 2007), especially the “role” of that individual within the group (Mori, 2005). Doi (2009) states that kyara is being used in order for young people to manage complicated relationships in the complex and fluid society of the postmodern world. Pointing out that the notion of kyara sees a
person as a fixed individual, Doi (2009) states that this notion of kyara has great force in making the person act in the manner that the particular image of the kyara dictates.

Indeed, the idea of kyara seemed to urge students to choose roles that were similar to their own kyara, preventing them from using extra imagination to act a role that is very different from their own kyara. Considering whether or not the role fits the self, the kyara seemed to operate as the criteria for students to choose roles. For example, Ayumi explained that her kyara affected her way of choosing the topic of the poem she wrote in a class, saying that she thought that choosing a topic related to romance is not right for her; she says, “I’m not such a kyara.”

In a class in which Shakespeare’s A Midsummer Night's Dream was performed, Risa said that she first wanted to act the role of Helena, one of main characters in the play. However, she said that she felt too embarrassed to write the name on the request form because she did not think she is such a kyara and she thought that Nijiho, her friend, fit the role better. Doi (2009) mentions that youth try to avoid “Kyara ga kaburu (overlapping of the kyara with another in a group)” in order to keep their own position within the group. Staying in her own position, Risa’s action of declining the chance to play the role of Helena might be interpreted as being caused by her trying to avoid this “kyara ga kaburu” in her friendship group.

The influence of the idea of kyara was also seen in Rui’s understanding of the way casting was undertaken. Rui stated that in his daily life, he is a “yarare role” (someone always on the receiving end) and he prefers to play a role similar to his real-life character. He said, “I haven’t been casted in the role of a kyara totally different from my image,” saying that “I have always been casted in the yarare role, always the yarare role.” He mentioned that some of his classmates actually told him that the “yarare role” suits him better than a “cool” role before and he has been praised for how well he could act the “yarare role.” He stated that, although he first actually preferred a “cool” role, he later became proud of how well he could act the “yarare
role,” implying that he had accepted that this was the direction he should take. At the end of the interview, however, when answering my question as to if he is interested in acting a main character, he said, “YES!” without any hesitation, and he said he still actually wants to become cool.

*Kyara*, the conception of which is often shared among group members, is mainly imposed by the other and not chosen by the self (Senuma, 2007). Although the image of *kyara* is accepted sometimes more eagerly or without any doubt, it is sometimes accepted more reluctantly or with a feeling of rejection. Then, conflicts between the *kyara* they are imposed with and the one they want to pursue sometimes emerge. Notable examples, in which uncomfortable feelings toward the *kyara* were directly expressed, were in Rui’s experiences of a gay *kyara* and in Maiko’s experiences of a mother *kyara*. As we will see the details in Chapter 7, responding to other people’s expectations, Rui acted the role as a gay man and tried to get a laugh, compensating for the way that he actually wanted to act the role. While he was praised on how good he was or how suited he was to the role, Rui continually said that acting out the role made him exhausted and the experience was not actually really good. Also, as we will see the details in Chapter 6, Maiko has been casted a mother role several times, even if she is not sure if she is a mother *kyara* and she actually wants to try other types of roles. What is notable is that these experiences that *kyara*, which they do not really like, being imposed are often the experiences of those who are usually positioned at “low status” at “school cate.”

Conducting questionnaires to junior high school students in Japan, Honda (2011) points out that “status” in classroom shapes the degree of how much young people perform *kyara* and that students categorized as being of “low status” and “*ijirare*” (someone who is teased) tend to perform their *kyara* stronger than others. Indeed, this point echoes the cases of Rui and Maiko above. However, interestingly, Chika, who was often positioned in the privileged “girlie”
femininities, also said that she has been troubled by the kyara with which she has been imposed. She said that she is often called tennen kyara (天然キャラ, literally “natural character”), which refers to the person who says something different from the norm and often regarded it sounded foolish. She stated that, if she honestly tells her thoughts and feelings to her friends, they often tease her with smile, calling her tennen. Expressed her dissatisfaction of being called that way, Chika explained the reason of it might be stemmed from the fact that she was into swimming and did not watch TV often and therefore did not know what her friends usually knew.

Being teased as tennen kyara might connotate different meanings (often with fondness) from Rui’s experience of being imposed as a gay kyara. However, the kyara still seems to function as fixing her within one label imposed by the other, causing her uncomfortable feelings. Taking these into consideration, it is important to consider how the notion of kyara operates in relation with the range of becoming. In particular, how the difference of hierarchical position influences the capacities of body in relation with the notion of kyara, as well as how different types of kyara such as ijirare kyara and tennen kyara are experienced differently should be questions worthy of further exploration.

Another aspect of kyara is that it is understood based on the idea of “individuality.” For example, an idiom, “kyara wo tateru (putting up one’s own kyara)” refers to displaying “jibun rashisa (being true to oneself)” (Nakanishi, 2004), and “kyara ga tatsu” refers to “being individual” (Doi, 2004). Acquiring kyara and “kyara wo tateru” is regarded as an important work in order to be recognized and to maintain one’s own ibasho (place/standing) within a group (Nakanishi, 2004; Senuma, 2007). Doi (2004) mentions that youth now often feel the pressure that they need to find their own individuality or own kyara.

Overviewing the discourses related to “individuality,” Doi (2004) states that “individuality” has been treated as what he calls “introverted individuality orientation.”
“Introverted individuality orientation” regards identity as innate, inside the person, which people acquire by “going deep inside themselves.” This is opposed with “social individuality orientation,” which regards individuality as being constructed by interacting with others. By encouraging youth to find the core or essence of the self, the idea of “individuality” tends to prevent youth from being plural. This function of fixity of “individuality” is ironic since the idea of “individuality” was originally introduced in such areas as educational policies with a stated aim of fostering respect for diversity by respecting for “individuality.” I suggest that this contradiction that the idea of “individuality” contains extends to explain the function of kyara as well.

The predicament of kyara is that it is seen as having an unchangeable, inherent and fixed nature, but at the same time, young people are also expected to do “kyararing (switching kyara)” according to the relation, context and situation (Asano, 2006; Doi, 2009). Miyuki’s narrative illustrates the difficulty of “kyararing.” Miyuki, who belongs to the drama club, said that she felt uncomfortable acting in class because she got confused about her own kyara. She said that there is a kyara she creates for herself among friends who hang out in class and there is a different kyara of her that she creates for the drama club. “If they come together at the same time, I get very confused,” she said. Miyuki here tells us that she tried to sensitively read whom she should and should not be in the specific moment of drama class. Since she tried to tactically act depending on the people and the situation, the simultaneous mixed messages from different audiences caused her to become confused and uncomfortable.

For Mika, kyara is rather something she creates by herself. Explaining what “expression” means for her in her reflection paper, Mika wrote that expression is not for just expressing self but also for creating self. She explained it as, “there are some occasions when you can be a “pure self” (素の自分, su no jibun) and there are other occasions when you have to
create [another version of yourself],” saying, “basically, it’s a kind of rule that you cannot be a “pure self” in front of teachers.” As an example, she explained how she behaves in front of teachers, especially scary ones. She said she acts “with a humble attitude, using honorific words, and not having too much ‘high tension’ [which is to say enthusiasm] but not too much ‘low tension’ either.” “In order to do that, I create ‘myself.’ I think I can say I make my own kyara,” she said. Saying that she is sometimes a “pure-me” and sometimes a “not-pure-me,” she ended her comments with a strong statement: “I hate a collapse of my kyara the most!!” Mika’s tactical strategy of creating her own kyara indicates the demand on youth for navigating the very delicate negotiation that such efforts entail.

As another point, Doi (2004) points out that while the kyara is imposed from outside and expected to change according to the context, youth are required to ensure that others do not notice that they are “acting” the kyara but to present it as natural/pure (su). This contradiction of simultaneously regarding kyara as natural (su) while “acting” it in actuality should explain another aspect of the predicament for youth with regard to kyara, who try not to allow their own kyara to collapse.

As we could see here, the notion of kyara deeply shapes what young people think of who they are or should be, limiting other possibilities of imagining or believing to be able to become someone who is beyond the image of their own kyara. That is, rather than augmenting the self, the idea of kyara functions to territorialize their bodies, blocking the possibility of becoming otherwise and transformation. In addition, it is noteworthy that this notion of kyara and its fixity operate in the context of Japan so that the function of this notion, which does not allow youth to become different, might also be working to reproduce the system related to “Japaneseness” and gender hierarchy within the nation. In a situation in which young people often spend more effort reading other people’s expectations on their own kyara rather than making new connections
with the other, it is important to examine how to interrupt the current notion of kyara and “individuality,” which strongly shape youth’s practices of self-making.

“The School Caste” at Schooling: Dividing Students into Hierarchical Groups

The idea of “school caste,” which I repeatedly heard when students explained their experiences at school, was another factor that territorializes youth bodies, preventing them from being different and fixing their position into a certain hierarchy.

Imagining an audience for his performance, Tomo strongly stated that performing in drama class is much different from doing that in his homeroom class. He explained that it is due to the difference of his own positions in each respective space. Tomo explains about “the caste” in class.

The caste or the ranking in the group. It’s like a microcosm, I think. I think that in the group, whether one likes it or not, ranks are going to be created, like there is a teacher, the people who are loved by everyone, the normal people, then the lower people, and then the trash, I think.

As for his respective positions in homeroom class and drama class, while he is “in the middle” or “maybe a bit higher” in drama class, he stated that he is “not as bad as trash” but “a kind of a person who is in the lower caste” that comes after the “normal group” and “top group” in homeroom. He described the situation of how he feels it to be difficult to act or do something different than usual in homeroom class as:

You know, if the person who is not usually pushy and quietly eats lunch suddenly said “NO WAY” (in a loud voice) among girls who are saying “wa-, wa-” while everyone is having lunch, or playing a card game, people are going to be like “what happened?” aren’t they? You will draw away from the person, won’t you? I’m afraid of that so I won’t do it. If I could do that, I think that I would feel good, though.
Tomo’s narrative indicates that he really cares about the differences in “the caste” and its hierarchical order, and tried to accommodate, altering his own behavior to match the position. Nijiho described students in Foundations of Theatre Expression as “like a gathering of the otaku of the grade,” and therefore drama space seems for Tomo, who identifies himself as otaku, a chance to be allowed to act the role freely.

Ethnographic studies at high school indicate a hierarchy of subcultural groups in which “otaku” is positioned as the lowest, while “gyaru” is positioned at the top (Suzuki, 2012; Uema, 2002). Especially, Uema (2002) describes how “kogyaru” exclude “otaku” by such attitudes as ignoring them or attacking their hobbies. This exclusion of otaku resonates with Nijiho’s narrative. Nijiho said that “normal people” who are the majority in class, have more power. She explained, “Basically, otaku can’t say their opinions when something is decided in class. Even if otaku do, the majority turns down their opinions. It’s like a dismissal.” She said, otaku are “made to be left out,” “have no existence,” and “out of sight for normal people.” This situation also applied to Mika who described how quiet she is in her homeroom, trying not to interact with “normal group.”

Differentiating drama classes from other classes, the majority of the students who took drama classes described that drama space as special, a place where “individuality” is respected and their true nature (su/素) can be expressed. Reflecting on the whole class of Foundations of Theatre Expression, Inoue-kun wrote that “I thought that drama class draws out your individuality.” Shuji also said “different from usual classes, I thought that I can really express my own nature (素, su) [in the class].” He added, “Since everyone was having fun, the individual nature of everyone emerged,” although “their nature (素, su) cannot be expressed in ordinary classes.” Finding the possible reason in the style of the class, Shuji stated that “it might be because of the difference of whether people move or not [in class].” He said:
While in ordinary classes, people usually sit at the desk and write something or listen, in Theatre Expression, people often move in several ways such as walking, standing and sitting. This difference from ordinary classes might change our consciousness.

Reflecting her solo-performance of an angry male role in *Twilight*, Maiko also said that she could express the strong emotions and herself in class. In the interview, Maiko stated that the most interesting thing for her among others’ responses to her performance was the praising responses along the lines of “you can even do such a role.” In class, seeing the video of her final performance, Mr. Okamoto stated in a surprised voice, “And yet Maiko used to speak in a voice like a mosquito!” Maiko replied to him, “With a coarse tone, I can express myself more.” Reflecting on the moment in an interview, she said, “I was surprised. Because that was normal to me.” “It was interesting to know that people had a totally different image of me,” she said, which made her wonder what images of her they had, she said. On the contrary, she also mentioned how different she is in other classes. She stated, “Others’ eyes [are important]. I don’t want to stand out. People don’t have good impressions of such things, don’t you think?” I asked, “You mean if you are noisy?” “Yes,” she replied. “I tend to make myself up [in other classes]” and “It’s, like, bothersome, usually,” she said.

Through acting the roles of Chiharu in “Taste,” Yuka also said that she could express her “inner self,” which is not a creation, or “me at home,” who is frenetic, bossy and making a fuss, different from her submissive outer self. For some students, especially those who identify themselves as *otaku*, drama class served to be the space where they could have more fun and express their “inner self.”

From one perspective, the space of the drama class has high possibilities to be a safe space or “a good-enough holding environment” (Winnicott, 1971) where *otaku* students could experiment on creating a new self. These indicate that for some students, drama classes are
“smooth space” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987), in which “movement is less regulated or controlled, and where bodies can interact – and transform themselves – in endlessly different ways” (Hickey-Moody & Malins, 2007, p. 11).

In addition, the space of drama class was often described in contrast with that of their homeroom. As the students’ fear of “the homeroom” is pointed out (Suzuki, 2012), Rui said that he never wanted to act an okama kyara in his homeroom class since he knew that his classmates would make fun of him. Yuka also clearly articulated that she did not want to take the drama class with her homeroom classmates. She wrote in a journal entry about the drama class: “Different from other classes, it is very fun (smile). I could talk honestly about what I am thinking.”

However, for those who saw drama class as a fun or safe space, it was only to be so in the classes that did not have any of the “sporty type” students attending. Students who participated in both classes often stated that the addition of the participation of the “sporty boys” altered the space of drama class. In the first day of Applied Theatre Expression, I also remembered that I became dizzy and overwhelmed as soon as I entered the judo room from the noisiness that echoed throughout the room. I found that the new students who identified as “sporty type” people were the boisterous students who had their hair cut neatly, suntans from outdoor practice and cared about the way they wore their uniforms. I soon felt that the space of drama class was taken over by them.

I clearly observed that the students’ way of engaging in performance decreased in classes with new “sporty type” students also attending, as we saw Makoto and Tomo in the previous chapter on masculinities. I also never heard in an interview students talking about their in-depth acting experiences for the class of Applied Theatre Expression or acting experiences of A Midsummer Night’s Dream. One time, Toshi, who belongs to the drama club, mentioned
during his interview that he regretted that he did not put in much effort in the class in front of
the new students in the third year. He said that he felt that it had been a waste of time even
though it was a great learning opportunity for him being taught by professional actors. In one
sense, the space with the “sporty boys” students seemed to be more “striated space” which is
“rigidly structured and organized, and which produce particular, limited movements and
relations between bodies” (Hickey-Moody & Malins, 2007, p. 11). It tended to be a space that
was “hierarchical, rule-intensive, strictly bounded and confining” (Tamboukou, 2008, p. 360).

Suzuki (2012) addresses that for students in a “lower group,” it is fun only when
surrounded by fellow members of the same group and they cannot do many things when the
upper group students are also present. Suzuki (2012) also points out that students at the higher
hierarchical position of school caste also feel hardship in having to behave according to their
own status in order to keep their position.

Articulating that there is no interaction between the different castes and boundaries
between them are rigidly drawn, Suzuki (2012) addresses the idea that students consider status
as a fixed thing, which cannot be changed by them. Echoing that point, Nijihio stated that, “It’s
apparent that Shibuya-kei (Shibuya is the place where “gyaru” often gather) and Ahihabara-kei
(Ahihabara is the place where “otaku” often gather) do not go together no matter what they do.
It’s like they are opposite people.”

However, in another sense, the drama space seems somehow to be a potential space
where rigidly structured hierarchal relationality of school caste such as popular/cool “sporty
type” students and otaku students might be mobilized. Indeed, Yosshi who identifies as one of
the “sporty type” students said that it was scary to join the group of “drama people” in drama
class since they seem to “have their own world and no similarity with” him. He was worried
especially at the beginning of Applied Theatre Expression, he said. Kocchan also told me that he
was nervous every time he came to the drama class, especially because he acted the main role of Shakespeare’s *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*. Drama class can allow a change in the dynamic of school caste from that in the homeroom class.

Furthermore, not only can it mobilize the hierarchy of the group that students are already aware of, I suggest that drama space has the possibility to allow new relations, which students have never previously imagined, to emerge. It is important to note that “non-Japanese” students were not even included within the range of hierarchy of school caste, when students such as Nijiho and Tomo described it. Referring to the students with Chinese background who were mentioned in group discussion at class, I asked Nijiho how these students fit in with the classification of school caste. Seeming to be surprised by my question, Nijiho stated, “They are Chinese. They are different.” Saying that “they don’t belong to either the *Makino-kei* [“normal people”] group or the *otaku*” and “Chinese gather with Chinese.” She seemed to justify her way of drawing a boundary between Japanese and non-Japanese.

Even several discourses such as *kokusaika*, co-existence started to be heard where diversity is celebrated, “include” foreigners are often superficial. Although I often heard Chinese on a corridor and there are diverse students at the school, they are not recognized. foreigners are often locked into a particular category of difference, subjects are sometimes marginalised and denied access to mainstream sites of power and full participation in the community, the politics of school caste. What must be kept in mind is that school caste operates with the assumption that only “Japanese” are allowed to or have to participate in the politics of school caste, and the non-Japanese students are excluded as external to the hierarchy. In this sense, the school caste not only fixes the position of “Japanese” students at school but also has another hidden function, that is, reinforcing the boundary between Japanese and non-Japanese students.
These positive impressions of drama space were not for every occasion and every student. For example, Yuka noted that, even if she felt comfortable to be with and talk with the members of the drama class, she became quiet sometimes even in drama class, if there are other students who are talkative.

I suggest that the pedagogical invitation of drama, that is, inviting students to perform “the other,” enhances the potential to create the space through which students engage with unexpected difference, leading to new formation of assemblages. In any case, however, even drama space with this potential is always a contested space where both “striated space” and “smooth space” coexist (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987), and those spaces tend to operate differently for students who are differently positioned in school caste.

**Conclusion**

In this chapter, I have explored the factors to promote territorialization of youth, which have been seen throughout the fieldwork. These include the idea of Japaneseness with the identity category of ethnicity/nationality, the gender hierarchy and the notions of kyara and school caste. Although drama space has the potentiality of allowing experimenting with self-making, territorializing was often seen around these factors in relation with several discourses such as Japanese as homogenous, the inherent difference of gender, the kyara which is innate and determines “individuality” and school caste which is fixed hierarchal position. As we will see, these were the factors which fundamentally shaped youth’s experiences of affects at school in Japan, indicating as whom they can perform and what they can possibly become. In the following two chapters, shedding light on the events around a sub-category within the same subject position, I look at the detailed movements around Japanese femininities (Chapter 6) and Japanese masculinities (Chapter 7).
Chapter 6

Assemblages of Japanese Femininities at School: The Territories of “Girlie” Femininities Arrived at from Diverse Directions

In the Applied Theatre Theory class where an author of a drama script was casting for a film on the theme of love, the author, Okawa-kun, explained what kind of girl he was looking for to act a particular role. Wearing the designated school uniform, which is a white shirt with a red or green ribbon around the neck, a checked dark green and gray skirt, dark blue high-length socks and black regulation school shoes, five female students sat in a half circle facing a blackboard along with six male students. Juggling Risa or Nijiho to decide who to assign to the role, Okawa-kun said, “Not showy (hade; 派手), not plain (jimi; 地味), but a middle-rank girl.” At the mention of “a middle-rank girl (chuk en-joshi; 中堅女子),” the classroom burst into laughter. “It’s like normal girl,” Okawa-kun said. “That means no special characteristic,” Risa’s voice sounded reluctant. “Don’t get sulky,” Takako-san, an artist teacher, said to Risa, while Shuji, a male student, teased her, saying “you’re ‘a middle-rank girl!”

On the other hand, Nijiho said in a more positive tone, “Oh, I am seen as normal!” As the class got louder, Okawa-kun took a pose and added to say with confidence in front of all his classmates, “It’s according to the atmosphere. Thinking normally, the role is going to be Risa or Nijiho!” During the process of casting at drama class, students and teachers often tried to match the image of the role and that of the students. Then, the student put himself/herself in relation with the image of the role, which was when feelings such as delight or disgust were triggered. In the end, Okawa-kun chose Risa for the role.

In an interview with Okawa-kun later, reflecting on the moment I asked why he chose Risa for the role. Explaining what his image of the “middle-rank girl” was, he stated, “If I express it in a very modern word, she is not a charai girl (A Japanese slang word meaning
shallow, rough, and standing out). With this scope, she is a cheerful and good person, and not plain but a good kyara (Japanese interpretation of the English word, character). Sort of in the middle in this sense.” He added, “In short, she is not ‘gyaru’ (a Japanese corruption of the English word girl, which refers to an ultra-feminine, strong character).” and “her way of speaking is neither aggressive nor graceful. With regard to the image of a girl in this kind of position,” Okawa-kun then added, “I thought that the appearance of the role was closer to Nijiho, but the character of the role was closer to Risa,” and he therefore chose Risa in the end.

Upon starting the fieldwork, I soon noticed that femininities are important assemblages in which female students are entangled at school. This chapter explores key assemblages of femininities, organized according to the experiences and ideas of four students (Maiko, Chika, Yuka, and Risa). After noting “affective spots” (Ringrose & Renold, 2014), at which affects intensively flow or are rigidly stuck in relation with femininities, I look more closely at what kinds of femininities the assemblages are and how territorialization and deterritorialization are occurring around each student overall.

**Between Motherhood and “Girlie” Femininities: Maiko back to square one**

Maiko was the only student who was repeatedly assigned roles of the mother in plays. In the Foundations of Theatre Expression class, the three roles for which Maiko was assigned at first were all mother roles in three drama scripts: “Morning War,” “A Commonplace Summer,” and “Come On, Spring.” In a journal entry, Maiko described a mother role of “Morning War” as “her personality is relaxing, bright, and gentle. It is a so-called mother kyara perhaps? She seems to like Korean stars (smile).” Later, she mentioned that this role is like a “good wife, wise mother,” the kind who does such chores as “the cooking and shopping.” As for the mother of “A Commonplace Summer,” she wrote in a journal entry, “her personality is dry and never niggles.
She tends to find things bothersome. Similar to my father (smile). It seems like she likes games,” adding later that this role is not like a “good wife, wise mother.”

Charlebois states that motherhood is regarded as “synonymous with femininity to the point that it ‘eclipses all other identities’ ” (2014a, p. 6), and these motherhood femininities are those with which Maiko has been engaged throughout the class. As we saw the way that Maiko described the roles above, one of the ideas that strongly shapes motherhood in Japan, is the “good wife; wise mother” ideology. Regarded as a social norm for contemporary Japanese women since the late nineteenth century in Japan and also a basic idea to a nuclear family after Western-style modernization, the “good wife; wise mother” ideology includes the assumption that women take the roles of wife and mother and do all the housework and childcare (Koyama, 1991). After World War II, while men worked as a “salaryman,” the majority of Japanese women became “sengyō shufu (a full-time, professional housewife)” and “provided the indispensable domestic support that enabled men to dedicate themselves to their workplace organizations” (Charlebois, 2014a, p. 5). Charlebois points out that Japanese “emphasized femininity” (Connell, 1987), which is in a subordinate relationship to hegemonic masculinities, and refers to “full-time housewives who devote themselves to the house” (Charlebois, 2014a, p. 15).

Motherhood femininities are largely defined by an aspect of “caring for others.” As Carol Gillian pointed out in the 1980s, care has been regarded as a female ethical norm and role (cited in Inoue, 2009). Charlebois (2014a) recently points out that Japanese femininities are continuously defined by discourses of “women as natural caregivers” (p. 35) and “women as primary caregivers” (Charlebois, 2014b, p. 2), which expect women to do roles such as the housework, childcare and elderly nursing care. By implication, Japanese femininity is, therefore,
mainly constituted as “a form of ‘other-centeredness,’ which means that women derive self-fulfillment through supporting the needs and interests of others” (Charlebois, 2014a, p. 15).

In the way she spoke about the roles and her experiences of acting them, I detected Maiko’s dissatisfaction in repeatedly performing the mother role and being seen as a mother kyara. While she was performing a mother role in class one day, Shuji, a male student, watching her performance, shouted to Maiko in his big voice, “Wow, a mother kyara really suits you!” While other classmates also agreed with him, Maiko was bashfully smiling and acted like she was glossing things over for the moment.

When pointing out the event in an interview at the end of the course, she directly expressed her feelings of discomfort toward the kyara, which other classmates imposed on her in the class, and said that she actually does not think she is a mother kyara. “Am I a mother kyara? I don’t know. I don’t think that way,” she said. She told me her estimation of why people see her that way, even if she does not think so. She said, “Maybe it’s because I take care of Mika [her best friend]. That might make me a mother kyara, I am not sure.”

Saying that she often acts as a go-between for her friend who often troubles others, she said that, while she does this naturally, her female friends have told her that she is a healer since when friends are down, she takes a role of cheering them up. Later, I learned that her mother had died when she was still a little girl and now she lives with her father. Denying that she is a mother kyara, she stated, “It’s very much a mystery to be thought that way since I don’t have a mother.” In her narrative, I detected her rejection of becoming towards motherhood, which would not be what her classmates would think.

Actually, in the second journal entry, Maiko chose an older sister role (another role she was assigned later) as the closest to her among all the roles she acted since other roles are all mother roles (I assume that her feeling partially came from the similarity of age.) Her sense of
closeness with an old sister role also came from the same interest with the role. She stated that she and the role both like the same actor on TV so she felt that it was very easy to act out the role’s way of raising the “tension” (a Japanese corruption of the English word that is closer to “excitement” in contextual meaning). However, even if she does not feel comfort or pleasure in being identified with motherhood, the whole process during the class seemed to strongly function to consider her in relation with motherhood, imposing the image on her.

Meanwhile, there was an incident that might have made Maiko’s break from the assemblage of motherhood possible. One day, Risa, the author of “Come On, Spring” changed the casting for her script and assigned Maiko to the role of the older sister. Maiko stated, in an amazed voice, “Me, an older sister!” and Mr. Okamoto, the artist teacher for the class, was surprised and queried, “The mother role is going to Nijiho [a student who acted an order sister role before and was often identified with “girlie” femininity]?” In the journal entry, Maiko reflected on her experience about that day as: “it was really fun to act a role other than a mother role for the first time today,” although she also said, “at the same time, it was ‘difficult’ to act as a ‘normal’ girl (smile).” In an interview, she spoke excitedly again about the moment when she was assigned the older sister role. I asked Maiko how fun it was and she stated,

I had acted only one kind of role before that. Since it was only a villain’s role at the cultural festival and only the mother role in class, I thought: Oh, it is my first time to act as a normal girl. Although I thought, a little, a little, wa- [excited] and I was happy, it was actually rather difficult to act.

She revealed that it was a happy experience for her to act as “a normal girl,” repeatedly conveying joyous sensations of preparing for and performing the older sister role to her heart’s content. Detected in her excitement to act an older sister role, the experiences of acting the role
seemed to function for Maiko to all at once move beyond the motherhood femininities, marking an important transition.

Also, the exciting experience was actually combined with a feeling of difficulty in acting the role. When I asked in what way it was difficult, she first explained that the difficulty came from the similarities of the role’s character to her own personality. Saying that it was not like acting, she stated, “Well, I was not sure how to grasp the idea of acting a ‘girl’ as a role, it was too close to me so that it was difficult to act in character.”

Then, her excitement of acting the role, a role different from that of “the mother,” was immediately replaced by deep disappointment and disgust at her own performance which she thought would be seen as being a burikko (an unnaturally, overly cute girl). She mentioned that watching herself performing in the video of the final performance in class triggered those feelings in her, expressing intense feelings of embarrassment and disappointment at herself. Reflecting on her feelings watching the video in the class in her reflection paper, she wrote “I got severely depressed. Who would dare think that I spoke in such a burikko-like voice….!!! Uwaaaaaaaaaa orz (a Japanese ASCII representation of a posture of depression).” In an interview, she also stated, “I tried to be like a girl but then I became like a burikko and it was like awww…” and with a very low, depressed voice, she added, “I guess I was disgusted with myself…”

Maiko explained that the part where she especially noticed “burikko-ness” was the scene in which she said “yes” responding to her little brother, saying, “The way of speaking was like very buririko.” Elaborating on her impression of her own voice in an interview, she said:

The voice was totally different! It was too high and sounded like a little kashimashi-kei (a grouping of girls based on the concept of “kashimashi” a word literally meaning “three women” and implying the pointless noise of female chatter, somewhat akin to the
western concept of the “bimbo”), a noisy group of girls such as like gyaru, like girls who are working too hard to try to flatter boys by acting cute-like, burikko.

As to the reason why she dislikes girls who fit in this kind of burriko-kei category, she referred to how they deliberately perform, she stated:

Well, it is like purposefully acting like she is cute even if she is not. I don’t like the part that it’s on purpose. I am OK with if she is naturally cute, like a girl who says something pointless naturally. If it’s obviously being artificial [I don’t like it], well I don’t know how to explain.

She added that she maybe does not like the kind of person who thinks of herself as cute. She talked scornfully about the burikko, trying to disidentify with them.

In a sense, Maiko’s resistance to being seen as burikko indicates her resistance towards a hypersexualized “girlie” femininity. Burikko is a female subject, which could be defined as approximating the Japanese equivalent of “girlie” girls (Reay, 2001; Renold, 2005). The “girlie” girls are described as “girls who consistently invested in their bodies as heterosexually desirable commodities, aligning themselves with, performing and desiring hyper-heterosexualized femininities” (Renold & Ringrose, 2008, p. 334). Embodying traditional heterosexual relations, the “girlies” are “intensely active in the work of maintaining conventional heterosexual relationships” (Reay, 2001, p. 159). Also, as Reay (2001) points out that “girlies” are often seen in a derogatory light by both girls and boys, these reactions were also found here in Maiko’s narrative.

Maiko also expressed her fear of other people’s eyes. She stated that classmates had been watching her, and seeing her as being a burikko from this performance made her feel so embarrassed and depressed. “Everyone must have been seeing me that way all the time during practice in class.” “I hate it, I hate it,” she exclaimed. This was despite the fact that, in the
course of my observation at least, her performance had never been directly viewed negatively by peers or teachers. In the end, she described her performance as “a big failure.”

She added that she felt disgust since the result was in spite of her intention to the contrary. She had intended for her performance to be “acting ‘normal’ [and] a little more cheerful than my usual self [but] not having the image of burikko in mind,” but stated that her performance went in a different direction from what she was aiming for. She noted that she did not know why that happened. Saying, “I don’t know what to say and what it is. I am not sure…but it is a bit…” she tried to find the words to describe her performance and her feelings about it. With a pause, she said, “I didn’t intend to be doing it that way.”

What is interesting in Maiko’s experiences is the fact that her affect toward and understanding of each role gradually changed throughout the whole process especially after the day on which she saw her performance on video. In a reflection paper after watching the video, Maiko wrote that her performance of the mother role in “A Commonplace Summer” was unexpectedly the best among her performances. In an interview, she stated that it was easier for her to get into the mother role in “Morning War.” I asked the reason why she changed her mind. She stated that although she still questioned her similarity with the mother role in general, she concluded by saying, “I was gradually getting used to the mother role of ‘A Commonplace Summer.’ Although I needed to put in some effort, in the end, I feel that I could get it ‘right’,” implying that she accepted that she would pursue motherhood femininities after all.

In an interview, she also said that her initial thought of being close to her image for the older sister role was a one-sided belief and now she could not consider that an older sister role was close to her. She added, “I was feeling very good when I was acting but even so… [Still] it was like fun!” Surprised at herself, she added, “Wow, my opinion changed so much.” Her
elation at playing a different part from what she was usually type-cast disappeared over the process.

In a journal entry, she suggested the hyper-feminine role of Ichigo of “Greatest Memories and Spring” in Nijiho’s text as the role she would most like to have acted, given the chance. She ended the sentence with a meaningful smile. However, when I asked whether she still wanted to perform Ichigo after she spoke about her “failure” of performing the older sister, Maiko rushed to deny her desire, and said she wants to delete her comments. She said, “I am glad that did not act this [Ichigo]” with a big laugh, and added, “If the older sister came out that way, I believe that Ichigo would have been worse than that. It’s because Ichigo is a girl, a ‘normal’ girl [I assume that she meant hyperfeminine heteronormative girl, differentiating form her.” Reflecting on what she wrote in a journal entry, she noted, “It seemed interesting to act the part of a normal girl, it seemed fun, like, I wanted to act the heroine role for once. That was my longing...” However, she ended the sentence with, “But I have stopped thinking that way.” Looking over her experiences of acting in class, in the end, she seemed to feel compelled to deny that desire.

Maiko seemed to vibrate with wider ambivalence in female heterosexual assemblages. As we saw in her detailed reflections on aspects of her performance such as voice pitch, Maiko had enjoyed her performance of the older sister role among all of her performances. Expressing an uncommon affective reflection about acting the role, she was unlike other female students such as Chika and Nijiho who both performed the role associated with heteronormative femininity without any doubt.

Engaging with her narrative for analysis, I was reminded of one scene in class. One day, before the class, girls were chatting in a group. Maiko, who kept her hair a little below her shoulder, with it usually seeming not to be combed well and without any hair ornaments, came
into the room, wearing black and gray coloured headbands. Pointing out her headbands, the girls started teasing her about it and one said, “It is OK if it’s Nijiho.” Maiko clumsily smiled and nearby Nijiho, who wears pink headbands as a matter of course, was standing prim and proper. “Everyone is hard on me!” Maiko said, seeming to laugh it away. With such social regulation of the boundaries of the “girlie-girl” subject position, Maiko’s desire for heteronormative femininity seemed to be denied within the community of girls who made a judgement of who is suited to wearing headbands and who is not. I am not sure how this affected her feeling about her femininities. However, the desire for heteronormativity coupled with revulsion of burikko in her account seemed to exemplify the pleasure and the pain of her participation in heterosexualized femininities.

Reflecting on her overall experiences, I wonder where the mixtures of her affects such as excitement, anticipation, fear, and embarrassment that accompanied her experiences in class will bring Maiko. Maiko’s passion to act the role of an older sister ended up being lost, as she came to reject the proximate relation with the image of buriko, that is, heteronormative sexualized femininity. Separating from that femininity, and settling back into the comfort of “motherhood” seemed to have been accomplished when she concluded that she felt that she fit best with the mother role in the end. Indeed, I was able to trace the connections between being assigned and performing a mother role, her practices toward her friends such caring and her dream to become a nursery school teacher. However, this also can be seen as territorializing and blocked her way in becoming different, preventing her from moving out of the motherhood femininities.

As “privileged femininities,” heteronormative femininities in general contain territorializing elements, constructing the idea of what the ideal female subject is. However, in the case of Maiko here, they also seemed to indicate the potential direction for deterritorializing the ideology of the “good wife, wise mother” and its related discourses, which Maiko has been
repeatedly directed into. I wonder if there is any way that her desire will move into different femininities other than motherhood after this.

**Heteronormative Hypersexualized “Girlie Femininities: Chika Stuck at the Top**

Chika was assigned to the role of Ichigo in “Spring and the Best Memory” and it was the only role that she acted in the class. Chika wrote in a journal entry that Ichigo is the role of a girl who is “falling in love,” a “17-year-old” whose appearance is “like a girl” and “bright.” The role is involved with heterosexual romance and associated with “girlie” femininities (Renold & Ringrose, 2008), which are dominant heterosexualized femininities, and some female students such as Maiko and Risa directly expressed their hesitation to act it in class.

Wearing makeup, Chika was in a short skirt, with her thin, smooth, light brown and loosely curly hair down to her waist. I detected her intent to maintain the image of herself as a girlie-girl, heterosexualized femininity, evidenced by her belongings such as the hair ornament made from pink, light blue, and yellow coloured toweling material on her wrist, and the IP recorder decorated full of pink stickers as well as the pink cellphone hanging from her neck. In her journal, she introduced herself as someone who often goes shopping and that her favourite brand of clothing is Lizlisa, which is known as an exemplar of the fluttering girly style. The practice of accessorizing with such items as pink items, ribbons and frills is a recognized practice of proclaiming femininity.

She stated that she wanted to get married soon and often talked/wrote about her boyfriend and their dates on the weekends such as going to a game center (Japanese version of the video game arcade) together and bringing lunch boxes, which she made for them both. As boyfriend/girlfriend culture is regarded as the salient site where girls construct and regulate (hetero)sexualized femininities (Renold, 2005; Ringrose, 2013), the ideas of being in a
heterosexual relationship and wanting to get married soon that Chika emphasized are repeated patterns associated with normative (hetero)sexualized femininities.

Indeed, I observed that Chika was often positioned as the ideal female subject with girlie-girl femininities by her peers and the teachers alike in class. For instance, commenting on Chika’s drama text, Mr. Okamoto asked Chika if “a girl” is always like that, positioning Chika as being representative of “girls.” On another occasion, when Mr. Okamoto assigned the role of Ichigo to Chika in class, Nijiho shouted, “Wow, great!” in a happy voice, implying that Nijiho regards Chika to be the ideal female subject to act the feminine role of Ichigo. Makoto, her classmate, also stated in an interview that Chika is the only “normal girl” in the drama class, unlike the others who he views as being otaku to varying degrees. Although, in the interview, Chika explained that Ichigo is more “kyapikyapi (girly)” than Chika herself, the role of Ichigo seemed to overlap with the overall image of Chika. In the interview, she stated that she could sympathize with Ichigo’s feelings about meeting a boy whom she likes after not meeting him for a while so that she could understand the role.

Throughout the character development process and performance, I hardly detect any effort on her part to get out of her current position by defying the conventions that keep her where she is. It seemed that she was hesitant to enter into intimate relationships with others. On the occasion of the first practice of her performance in class, Chika read the lines in a low and flat tone. Mr. Okamoto said to Chika:

I don’t know if Tomo is your type and if you’re Tomo’s type, but this is about the story of a girl’s romance. Don’t hesitate. Feel the freshness. You’re going to talk to the guy you like and approach him, you know that right?

After another practice of the performance, Mr. Okamoto stated that Chika’s performance was like she was just doing an errand, and Chika laughed in a way that seems to be trying to hide her
embarrassment. “Let’s practice,” said Mr. Okamoto. The next week, while trying to urge Chika on, Mr. Okamoto told her to try to be brighter in performance, and Chika smiled. Nijiho, the writer of the drama script, also directed Chika to be a little bit more kyapikyapi.

The week before the final performance, Mr. Okamoto again advised Chika to express the role’s feelings more and to try to double the volume of her voice from the current level. In a reflection paper about the final performance, Chika wrote, “I didn’t get nervous much. I just did it well.” “I didn’t think anything special as always. Although I was thinking a bit about what I was told during practices before to pay attention to while performing, I did it properly without effort.” Reflecting on the final performance in class, Mr. Okamoto asked Chika how she performed, and Chika stated that she was alright and she thought that it was a trial and she had to do it, while smiling. When Mr. Okamoto asked Chika if she had ever willingly tried these things, she said that, if she was asked, she would do it, but she had never willingly done it by herself.

The lack of her passion to engage with the role was also illustrated by her journal writing. In her journal, she at first wrote the longest and the most detailed self-introduction among other students, adding, “Ask me anything. I will tell you anything.” However, from the second journal entry, in which she was supposed to write about character-development and performing experiences in class, her responses dramatically became shorter, with just one or two sentences and sometimes left blank, repeatedly saying, “I don’t know.” For example, when asked about the role that she would have wanted to act other than Ichigo, she simply answered, “Nothing special.”

While reflecting on her experiences of acting, Chika repeatedly mentioned that she felt that performing was difficult for her. In her first journal entry, she wrote that the class is difficult since she has never experienced acting and she is not good at acting. While she stated
that she tried to make her voice a little high and girly to act the part, she noted that the most
difficult aspect of acting was reading lines while getting into the role and acting by moving her
own body.

Indeed, she mentioned that she had rarely experienced acting before, and in her first
journal entry, she wrote that she did not have special interest in drama itself but she chose the
drama class since she did not want to study more “academic” subjects and her homeroom
teacher, Mr. Kobayashi, recommended the class to her. Here, her remaining unmoved, in the
same position, seemed justified by the reason that she lacked acting experience. However, I
consider this not as the issue of acting skill per se but moreover as the issue of dislocating her
perception from her moving body without opening herself up to “the other,” preventing her from
becoming different.

Chika stated that just imagining the role was a fun experience. It seemed that imagining
being different person in the character development process was perhaps the only way for her to
actually engage with the role. In a reflection paper, she wrote, “I thought that performance is
nice since we could imagine various scenes by ourselves.” Despite her joy in imagining other
roles, however, Chika did not appear to place herself in relation to the image, keeping the image
of “the other” separated from herself, as evidenced by her lack of interest in putting her body in
motion and the way of saying “by ourselves” in the above quote. This way in which Chika
engages (or does not engage) with difference could be interpreted as the exoticization of
difference in which the process of consumption is involved, critiqued by bell hooks in her article
“Eating the Other” (1992). In this way, the image seemed to have remained merely as an object
to look at rather than the one in which she could constitute or invest herself and through which
she becomes.
As we see in Chika’s accounts of the practices of character development and performance, Chika’s story was very much about being stuck rather than becoming. Unlike most of her female classmates who enjoyed becoming different more or less, a functioning of heteronormative femininity seemed to limit Chika over the entire course of the class, and she remained apart from relationships with other bodies, ending up staying in the same place. She (subconsciously) seemed to preserve her privileged position and superiority in the assemblage of heteronormative femininities by avoiding integration with “the other.” To put it another way, she appeared to have no control of her becoming, although becoming provides ways to escape from the normalizing tendency towards the image of normalized femininity.

The lack of management of her own becoming might relate to her feeling of anxiety toward the future. Changing the tone of her voice during an interview, she revealed her puzzlement about her plans for the future, saying that she is not sure if she wants to go to a university or vocational school, or get a job and she does not have any future vocational aspirations. She stated that all she knows is that she wants to get married soon. She also stated that she does not feel like coming to school every day since she does not have any fun time at school with troubles such as her studies and relationships with her friends. In a journal entry, she wrote, “It is weird to say it by myself, but I think that I am diligent. I cannot play truant from school even if I want to and I always do my homework in spite of myself…. I recently don’t understand myself,” and, “With everything happening on top of one another, all is tough,” she added.

I detected Chika’s turmoil about keeping up with the expectations of peers, teachers and herself in the way that she could not feel that she could be her. In the empirical work, which explores girl cultures and femininities in the London primary school classroom, Reay (2001) states that the “girly” behaviour follows conformist patterns in comparison with “spice girls.”
In a similar instance, Renold observed that “girlie-girls,” especially those who consumed and followed high-street fashion, were “sacrificing their own personal taste for a collective taste (usually dictated by media, magazines and high-street fashion stores) that enabled them to fit ‘in’ with the hope of making them ‘feel good’ and ‘look pretty’” (2005, p. 48). This practice is often known as “keeping up appearances” as seen in the ethnography of Skeggs (1997). Then, the process of “consuming, embodying and projecting sexualized femininities” is accompanied by the pressures and anxieties of keeping up social and cultural practices (Renold, 2005, p. 47), and this might be what Chika is experiences, while not finding opportunities to become what she wants to become through deep engagement with “the other.”

Furthermore, the sacrifices and pressures that “girlie” girls experience lead to the experiences of being positioned as powerless, that is, seen as being stupid or childish, for example. For instance, Reay (2001) observes that the “girlies” are descried as “stupid” and “dumb” by boys, although they are actually far from being so. Also, this could be explained through the usage of the Japanese word, kawaii. Kawaii which is approximated in English as “cute” means “childlike; it celebrates sweet, adorable, innocent, pure, simple, genuine, gentle, vulnerable, weak, and inexperienced social behavior and physical appearances” (Kinsella, 1995, p. 220), and is often directed toward “girlie” girls as it is to Chika. Driscoll points out that being positioned as kawaii means being positioned as powerless without their agency. She states:

Kawaii is popularly associated with girls, especially when inflected with a rising exclamation as a total description of an object. This visibility as object-directed infers a special childishness in Japanese girls based on the developmental model by which objects are relinquished for external normative sexual objects - a model with apparent relevance to discourses on girlhood in Japan. A kawaii girl, indisputably girl as object, is
often construed as “attractive…but lack[ing] libidinal agency of her own” [here citing Treat, p. 281]. (Driscoll, 2002, p. 296)

Although Chika’s story exemplifies the compensation and pain of being stuck, one story stood out as different. During a break on my first fieldwork day in class, as if differentiating herself from other students in the drama club, Chika said to me that she belongs to the swimming club and I felt that her way of saying it sounded like she was very proud of it. She wrote that she has continued swimming since she was a three-year-old and that she can relax in the water. She repeatedly spoke about her passion for swimming, and her description of her experiences of swimming provides a tiny glimpse into the joyous affect that she experiences through bodily movement. It was as if, in swimming, Chika seems alive and an unconstrained being, and swimming is the only place where her body becomes alive but also the place for her to retreat and to escape from the gaze of peers. In their ethnographic study, Ivison and Renold (2013) also pay attention to the story of swimming “as an entry point into a different modality of being” (p. 711). I see her story of swimming as an entry point, which holds the potential of becoming into a different modality of being and of revitalizing her body in daily life in the long term. Then, I wonder that how swimming may not just be a retreat from daily life, but rather could be such an entry point for Chika to explore the possibility of becoming different from “girlie” femininities, connecting and traversing herself in her daily life.

Liberation from Marginalization: Yuka’s Transformation, But Only in Drama Class

Yuka was assigned the roles of Miku in “Yurikamome” and Chiharu in “Taste.” Yuka wrote in a journal that Miku is “the usual me outside,” while Chiharu is “me at home,” choosing Chiharu as for her favourite role since she is “high tension,” a Japanese English expression meaning something akin to “frenetic.” “Yurikamome” is a story of going to a comic market with friends, which is often identified as an “otaku” activity. Yuka stated that she usually hangs out
only with those who have exactly the same interests as her and the role of Miku has similar kind of affinity with others as her. On the other hand, Yuka said that Chiharu could be expressed as being her “inner self” or herself with her family and close friends. Yuka wrote her image of Chiharu as:

She is cheerful and seems to be childlike. Although she seems not to be able to read the air (kuki) it, she actually can read it well. [She is] high school student age. She puts a large ribbon on her school uniform. Energetic! Very energetic! She seems to be stubborn once she decides something. She has many networks but she feels the most comfortable with Akiko, perhaps? She absolutely likes eating food while walking around [usually a taboo in Japan, especially among older generations and on the other hand recently often seen among trendy youth].

In an interview, I asked Yuka about this image and she stated as follows:

This is just my own image but you know, AKB (a famous female pop idol group with many members in Japan. AKB stands for the name of a well-known place in Tokyo, Akihabara). They wear school uniforms, their faces are “cute girls,” putting “cuteness” forward, wearing a big or pink ribbon or a checked skirt. I thought her appearance is like that. In the classroom, it is like that, where high school students cackle over trivial talk. Yuka said that she does not think that Chiharu is a “sporty type” (taiikukai-kei; 体育会系) but more gyaru-kei if she were to choose one of the two. She described the role as being somewhere in between gyaru and girlie girl.

Describing the students in her class, Yuka explained about “sporty type” students. A “sporty type” student belongs to a sports club like the soccer and basketball club students in her home class. Saying that their voices are all loud, she said, “Although it is not like they are bad quality (gara; ガラ), with their attitudes, something is different. It’s strange to say that they are
bad *gara*, but well, their ways of using words are bit rough.” Saying that their hair is cut short, often shorter than the boys, she added to say, “they are like men, like manly women.” The “sporty type” that Yuka mentioned here should resonate with the “sporty girls” who Paechter (1998) describes as subordinated femininities or being outside of the feminine. Paechter (1998) states that in excelling at physical education and sports, “sporty girls” have “a similar presence to that of the power-embodying male” (p. 100).

Yuka explained that some other students in class are *gyaru-kei* to whom she also feels intimidated as she does with the “sporty girls.” The category of *gyaru* (or sometimes *kogyaru*, which means young *gyaru* and transliterated in English as “kogal”) is characterized by their fashion, which is “knee-length loose socks, bleached hair, distinctive makeup, and short school-uniform skirts” (Charlebois, 2011, p. 15). Kogal are also characterized by their unique speech style, which “subverts traditional notions of normative women’s language such as innocence, modesty, and deference” (p. 15).

Drawing on queer theories, Charlebois considers Japanese kogals as one of the queer heterosexual femininities, which contradict gender norms and “subvert heteronormative conceptualizations of passive female sexuality” (2011, p. 15). Satō also mentioned that seeking not only to be “cutie” but also “standing out,” “*gyaru*” is a symbol of “liberty and power” (2009, p. 401). As seen in the fieldwork of Arai (2009), which describes “*gyaru*” cultural practices out of school, “*gyaru*” could be considered as a form of alternative, oppositional femininities against traditional, normative, hyper sexualized femininities.

I argue that the discourse of “*gyaru*” overlaps with the subversive nature of discourses of “Girl Power” (Aapola, Gonick & Harris, 2005; Gonick, 2006), a term which emerged in the early 90s in reference to a movement of young, mainly white, and middle-class women in the United States. Gonick states, “Girl Power celebrates the fierce and aggressive potential of girls
as well as reconstitution of girl culture as positive force embracing self-expression through fashion, attitude, and a Do-It-Yourself (DIY) approach to cultural production” (2006, p. 7).

Continuing to illustrate the demography of the girls in class, Yuka said that some other students are “girlie” girls whom Yuka considers to have a position in the hierarchy that is similar to that of the “gyaru.” The others are like “those who are quiet and doing nothing,” Yuka said. Reflecting on the interview with Yuka, I remember that I consciously sat next to her in order not to coerce her and that I was worried that she might feel intimidated if I looked directly into her eyes so I often looked away. Wearing a school uniform without any decoration, she maintained an impassive facial expression seen below short, dark hair during the interview, which, however, gave way to an occasional blast of laughter in the middle of our discussion. In drama class, she often spoke in a whisper with small, embarrassed smiles. All of her mannerisms made me easily imagine her constantly excluded, low position in the class.

As we looked at the differences between the two roles Yuka performed, she elaborated with a description of herself. She stated that there is a big gap between her inner self and her outer self: she is bossy at home but submissive elsewhere. In an interview, she explained about herself:

Well, I usually only make a noise like gya- or make a fuss with really close friends, well when there are many people around, it is difficult to raise my own motivation and like chat like wa-, like this, like this. How can I say it? Inherently, I have a personality that wants to make a commotion but with others around, I cannot do it.

She stated that people have different impressions of her such as “boys sometimes get surprised like ‘are you like this?’ ” and “the senior students also might have different images [of me].” Also, she stated that she feels irritated when people get surprised by seeing her do something unreliable (iikagen; いい加減) since they usually see her as being serious.
As for these two sides of her, Yuka revealed her story of attending previous schools when she had difficult times. She explained her life story as follows: Until Grade 4 at a certain elementary school, she was fine with school but after Grade 5, things got bad for her. These things got even worse when she went to a junior high school along with the same members her elementary school class. At the junior high school, she belonged to a badminton club but she felt that she did not fit in well there and did not have any good memories of those times, especially with regards to relationship in the sports club.

She stated that a hierarchy of superior-inferior relationships between senior and junior was severe, and the junior students had to use honorifics for greeting the seniors but the seniors did not reply to these greetings. She mentioned that she also felt that it was very unreasonable that some seniors’ favourite students did not need to use honorific words (this is often regarded as an important practice in a hierarchical relationship between senior and junior students). She said:

I did not fit in well with the sports club, the way of thinking of it. People around me also belonged to the sports club, and they were active and aggressive. I could not get used to it. I first came to dislike the club, then the school. I ended up not going to school.

Yuka stated that she became bad at being part of a group and she continued, “I think that many things get intertwined. I lost my voice once at junior high school. So many things happened. I did not go to the school for a while.” She stated that, even if she had something she wanted to talk about, she built walls against other people and there were so many things she could not express. She openly shared her story, and her ability to reflect on and talk about a poignant episode was striking. I came to recognize how she ended up not speaking out in class through these previous school experiences.
Yuka said that, although she never had experienced drama education nor was she originally interested in theatre, she entered the drama club at high school because she wanted to change something about herself. “I couldn’t say my opinion, using my body and voice. I could not stand up in front of people. Then, after entering the drama club, I began to feel the fun in doing these things.” She explicitly stated that entering drama club marked an important shift in her life, stating that otherwise she would have become a hikikomori, a person who has withdrawn him/herself from society. She added to say that she was trying to get back to being more confident and cheerful especially since she wants to become a nursery schoolteacher and she thinks such qualities are necessary in that profession.

When Yuka spoke of her experiences of character development and performance of the Chiharu role, she conveyed joyous sensations. Her narrative was animated and full of excitement as she vividly described details of her experiences of acting Chiharu. Reflecting on the experience in class one day, Yuka wrote in her journal:

It is fun to act as Chiharu since she is a “high tension” kyara. But, I am concerned that I could not keep up with the tension. Although I always try to perform with all my heart for the line of “sacred white rice…!” I could not do it as well as I expected.

The next week, she wrote that her performance had improved: “today, I feel that the role of Chiharu of ‘Taste’ went better than usual. It is the part of ‘sacred white rice’ (smile). I try to act as cheerful as possible.” The part of ‘sacred white rice’ is where Yuka thinks that Chiharu has the highest tension or gets excited the most. Yuka stated that she especially paid attention to matching her tension or rhythm with Chiharu’s. Yuka wrote in a journal entry, “It is fun to act the role of the cheerful character since I usually don’t make a scene ” In an interview, Yuka stated that acting as Chiharu was fun since she could be noisy and be herself at high tension.
Unlike others in her class who would spontaneously become animated or who continued to talk about their experiences in plain tones, Yuka’s descriptions were unusual in that she seemed to be on a high throughout the practices of character development and performance. While she repeatedly mentioned that she tried to act “cheerful,” “bright” and “with all my heart,” the joy seemed to be associated with becoming cheerful and confident, and thereby releasing energy stored in her body.

The moving body-with-cheerful and confident girl and the rush and thrill of the experiences seemed to mark an important transition beyond the loss of her confidence in herself, launching Yuka into becoming toward a little more confident. It was as if the movement of her body in performing Chiharu seemed to vitalize a part of Yuka that was usually hidden at school and mimetically reference what had been lacking in her earlier life. Disconnecting from the past and the mundane flows of being shy, reserved and passive, the space of Chiharu seemed not simply the space where she could be herself whom she referred to being “me at home” or “inner self.” It is also the space for her to form connections from herself before her poignant experiences at school to herself after that; from herself with her family and close friends to herself with classmates in the home room; from her current self as a student to her future self as a nursery school teacher.

The timing of her experience seemed to be significant since it is right in the middle of recovering herself through the experience of drama club. The space of Chiharu seemed to have been a liberating force for Yuka and afford her a sense of amplification. Throughout her narrative, I detected her ambition to overcome the past and transform herself into more empowered person, imaging a brighter future.

To note, in spite of Yuka’s experiences of lines of flight, her becoming seemed to occur at only particular occasions or spaces. In her journal, she wrote, “I really don’t want to take this
class with my classmates. I am so happy that there are none of my classmates here.” Yuka clearly resisted acting in front of her homeroom classmates and spoke of her anxiety of her performance being watched by her peers in her homeroom class, especially the sports club students. Reflecting on the performance day, Yuka also stated that she was very nervous since the senior students of the drama club were there. In a reflection paper, she wrote, “I was thinking how many senior students that I knew were there” and she has tried not to look at the audience’s eyes during the performance. Having experienced hardship with senior students and friends before, her concerns are not surprising. For her, it was if the space of drama class provided a safe space or “a good-enough holding environment” (Winnicott, 1971) that she could experiment with creating a new self, while the space in other classes did not.

**Resisting Heteronormative “Girlie” Femininities: Risa’s Turmoil**

The roles assigned to Risa were all girls of similar age to her: an older sister in “Morning War,” Akiko in “Taste,” Momoki in “Me in the Dark,” and a customer in “A Beauty Salon.” She chose Akiko of “Taste” as her favourite role, saying that she felt it was fun and easy to act, and that she “could act naturally.” Risa stated that it is partially because the role of Akiko’s good friend was in turn acted by Risa’s good friend, Yuka, and mainly because she felt familiarity with Akiko such as with the conversations in which Akiko engaged, Akiko’s “tension” and Akiko’s way of speaking by looking down on others, *uekara mesen*. On the other hand, in contrast to these positive descriptions of Akiko, Risa talked about Momoki in more negative tone. Risa stated that she does not feel anything in common with the role of Momoki in “Me in the Dark,” feeling awful about acting the role.

Risa explained the image of Momoki, comparing her with Akiko. The following is the summery of Risa’s explanation. Akiko and Momoki are both high school girls, but their ways of hanging out with friends are different. Although Akiko speaks directly only with close friends,
Momoki is “everybody’s friend.” While Akiko gets along with her friends narrowly but deeply, Momoki gets along with her friends shallowly and widely. Risa stated, “Like some people in class, she is like doing [the stereotypical image of the] JK (high school girl). It is like having a ponytail on the side and putting shushu (frilly hair band) around her wrist, and a short skirt. She is like a [typical] high school girl!” “This kind of girl exists at Akane,” she said. I asked, “Having an image of the role like this, you feel you understand them?” Risa replied with, “Understand?” with a surprised voice. She stated that she does not understand them, but it is like “they are there,” implying that she does not identify herself with them.

Risa also stated that one strategy for acting the role of Momoki was trying not to see the surroundings and not to care for the others but to go into Momoki’s own world. “I simply don’t like the kyara of a person like Momoki.” Saying that Ichigo often described as a kyapikyapi (“girlie”) kyara and Momoki are similar and therefore that Momoki is also kyapikyapi, Risa stated, “I don’t want to become her enemy. It’s going to be muddy, dorodoro (nasty),” and said that she wants to become a friend with her on the surface. For Risa, Momoki is linked with the JK (normative high school girl), who is in turn associated with girlie femininity, and Risa’s description of Momoki sounded scornful.

In the class after the final performance day, Mr. Okamoto asked the students if they got nervous while performing. Raising her hand, Risa stated that she had not been feeling well from the morning as she felt that she could not act the kyara that would allow her to feel satisfied with her performance. At the class in the next week, Risa again expressed her feeling of self-hatred after watching her performance on DVD. In an interview, saying that she did not fit well with Momoki from the beginning to the end, she said, “It was difficult to actually act and express Momoki.”
Risa stated that, even if she had an image of Momoki, she did not have a “drawer” for
the role in herself so she needed to cultivate herself for the role and needed to put in much more
effort for that. Risa explained that she sometimes uses similar words as Momoki but her way of
saying them is different from Momoki’s, in the way that Momoki speaks “in a higher voice and
overreacts,” giving me an example by actually saying the same line in two different ways.
Referring to her experience of acting the role, she said, “It was fun but I didn’t like it. I tried
hard but in the end, I got to hate doing that.” Furthermore, Risa stated, “There was a sense of
acting in me when performing as Momoki, and the way of speaking sounded like the lines of a
script.” She continued by stating, “I could understand the content of the lines, and I tried to do
my best to get into the role, but on the other hand, seeing the performance objectively, I thought
that I was acting the role along the lines of the performance in a school play.” Throughout her
narrative, I detected her disappointment in and her rejection of performing Momoki by not
engaging with the role fully and performing artificially.

What Risa refused by acting the role artificially might be engagement with “girlie”
femininities, the dominant heterosexualized hyper-femininity. It especially made sense,
considering the fact that she said that she is usually keen and finds it fun to act the role that is
different from her. Risa once acted the role of Ichigo of “Best Memory and Spring” in class,
which Nijiho, the author of the script, told Risa to act in a kyapikyapi way. Saying, “I am really
bad at acting the kyara of Ichigo” in a low voice during practice in class, Risa stated again in an
interview, “I really didn’t like acting Ichigo in front of my close friends and I felt the same
about Momoki.” I detected the ubiquitous fear and disgust of engaging with girlie femininities
in her narrative. This might correlate with another occasion in which Risa expressed her disgust
of “girlie” femininities.
It was during the break of the class of Applied Theatre Theory a year later, in which students involved in filmmaking on the theme of love, girls started to talk about their hetero/homosexual relationships with great excitement. Listening to that conversation, Risa revealed that she was not into that kind of conversation, while mentioning her critique of the routinized boyfriend/girlfriend culture.

What is interesting to note is that while expressing the disgust toward such femininity, on the other hand it was as if she sometimes simultaneously seemed to long for it. While she seemed compelled to deny acting the feminine role in front of her close friends, I could detect her longing and interest to do so at certain occasions such as where close friends are absent. Referring that her feelings toward acting are ultimately influenced by who the audience is, Risa stated that she is not happy with acting as Momoki in front of her close friends, such as the classmates in drama class but is fine with acting the part in front of other students who are not her close friends. Risa stated that she sometimes does such a character of Momoki in front of her not close friends, and if she reads the lines of Momoki by herself without thinking about anyone else, she wants to act as Momoki. She said, “practicing Momoki in my room is fun, but doing that in class is depressing.” Her ambivalent feeling toward the girlie femininities was also apparent when she mentioned the casting in the class of Applied Theatre Expression. She stated that she actually wanted to act the role of a main female character who I detect is associated with dominant femininities, but she gave up her candidacy for the role since she thought that she is not such a kyara and Nijiho, her friend, is the better person for the role.

As we saw with Risa’s disgust of “girlie” femininities, in a way, Risa could be understood as investing in and creating cultural distance from the heterosexualized hyper-femininity of the “girlie-girl” subject position. However, at the same time, displacing herself from the “girlie” femininities might be able to understand that it has been caused by the
difficulty of her accessing the dominant discourses through exclusion in a continual hierarchical struggle. As a relevant point, Renold articulates that “some of the daily feuds and ‘falling out’ did at times seem to be indicative of each girl’s struggle to be ‘in’ ” (2005, p. 48).

Overall, growing up as a girl for Risa seemed full of struggles and conflicts rather than a smooth negotiation of femininities. Risa seemed to be entangled in the complicated, ambivalent assemblages of femininities, simultaneously pulling away from girlie femininities and being attracted to them. Appearing to find it difficult to either move forward to or move away from “girlie” femininities, whether consciously or subconsciously, Risa seemed to be stuck in place without becoming a new being throughout her experiences of femininities.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has explored how young girls’ bodies are entangled within several femininity assemblages. I have traced the patterning of the momentary fluctuating affects, which varied across the four participants. I have alluded to the events of becomings and being stuck, pulled by many competing and at times contradictory impulses. The kinds of categories of femininities with which students are becoming or territorialized varied (e.g., motherhood, “girlie” girl, “gyaru,” “sporty girls,” and “otaku”), while the meaning and the way of experiencing each category shifted depending on each event as I will show below through examples of “girlie” femininities. Also, the way of experiencing one category with other categories differ for each student. For example, in the vignette of Maiko, motherhood femininities were experienced in opposition to the “girlie” femininities. Then, Yuka experienced “gyaru” and “girlie” femininities as opposed to “otaku” femininities as a means of overcoming the trauma of “sporty girl” femininities.

What I noted through engaging with the girls’ experiences in their entirety was the fact the experiences of becoming are only a small portion of the total. I only detected the becoming
in Yuka’s experiences and partially (diminished in the end) in Maiko’s experiences. Other cases were all the experiences of being stuck, such as being stuck like Maiko in motherhood femininities, Chika into “girlie” femininities, and Risa into non-girlie femininities.

As I was crafting the vignettes of each student, I was struck by the fact that all students engaged with “girlie” femininities, and yet how differently they engaged with them. For example, the “girlie” femininities were engaged with as experiences of becoming (Maiko at the beginning and Yuka), as territorialized experiences (Chika) and as against that which was territorialized (Risa). While some girls resisted moving toward “girlie” femininities (Maiko) and stepping out of them (Chika), another (Yuka) seemed to have experienced them as expansive becomings; that is, movements of liberation.

In addition, although these vignettes are context specific and singular events, what is important here is not to take what occurred as caused by the individual attitude or ability of young girls. Instead, how they engage with the “girlie” femininities must be approached with an understanding of how they have been positioned with the femininities. To pursue this analysis requires attending not only to their life histories and future aspirations, but also to the social context of the event that makes the respective present engagement possible. Also, to advance the discussion, those understandings need to be further situated within broader discussion of how affects circulate around “Japanese femininities” in this particular national and socio-historical context.

While I did not originally plan to focus on the “girlie” femininities, the fact that all girls engaged with them suggests that this is an area worthy of investigation. In her ethnographic work, which explores the ways in which girls construct their femininities, Renold points out that “individually and collectively, the girls in [her] research study seemed to have one of two choices: to be ‘girlie’ or ‘not-girlie’ ” (2005, p. 40). By “either aligning themselves with (and
thus desiring) or against (and thus in opposition to) dominant sexualized feminine discourse,”
Renold explores “how girls are multiply and hierarchically positioned and actively position
themselves in relation to other girls/femininities, especially heterosexualized ‘girlie’
femininities” (2005, p. 40). Indeed, this is one aspect of what this research has shown as well.

On one hand, Chika was the main case of choosing or being chosen as “girlie.” On the
other hand, Maiko and Risa were examples of choosing or being chosen as “not-girlie.” They
challenged, to some extent, the dominant practices of dominated heterosexualized hyper-
femininities by seeking not “fitting in,” although the ways of distancing themselves from the
femininities were distinct and contrasting. Other ethnographic studies have also pointed out the
cultural practices against “girlie” femininities especially in relation with gender identities such
as the “tomboy” (Renold & Ringrose, 2008; Reay, 2001; Renold, 2008), “square-girls” who
were preoccupied with academic success (Renold, 2001), “spice girls” who drew upon
discourses of sexual independence and non-conformity (Reay, 2001; Renold & Ringrose, 2008),
and the “top-girls” who are a popular close-knit friendship group (Renold & Ringrose, 2008).
The subversive practice of girls is in need of further examination in the context Japan by looking
at such femininities as the “sporty type” and the “gyaru,” who are described as opposing
femininities.

What is important to pay attention to is the exploration of “girlie” femininities in relation
with hierarchical status or the position of school caste. This is because each student’s different
hierarchical status, or the position within the school castes, seemed to affect the way of being
“not-girlie” and its meanings. For example, Renold (2005) articulates the girls who “could jump
between competing femininities” (p. 50) and engage simultaneously with non-girlie and girlie
femininities, accessing and maintaining contradictory subject positions. She states that they are
those who are the most popular and romantically desirable girlie-girls and who are in “a
privileged position to try on and feel comfortable accessing ostensibly competing discourses” (pp. 56-57). On the other hand, for the students at less popular and marginalized position, Renold states that:

The transition to and mobility between subjects (whether daring to be “different” or struggling to conform) seemed almost impossible either without [the privileged] (hetero)normative base, or without the collectivity of a like-minded friendship group which seemed vital in being able to carve out and sustain a social and cultural space in which to perform non-hegemonic femininities. (2005, p. 57)

The students who are in the first position were not to be seen in the field of my study, while the latter position indicates the possible reason why Maiko and Risa gave up on engaging with and moving around “girlie” femininities. This range of potential mobility related with “girlie” femininities should be further examined in relation with the hierarchical status or the position within school castes, especially by looking at affect to consider its subtle movement.

The importance of further exploring “girlie” femininities can be found in the issue of the hierarchical orders of these femininities in relation with normative masculinities. Skegg (1997) states “femininity becomes the ultimate legitimator of masculinity …it offers to masculinity the power to impose standards, make evaluations and confirm validity” (cited in Renold, 2005, p. 47). Following this view, Renold (2005) explores “how girls construct different versions of femininity in relation to boys and hegemonic heterosexual masculinity” (p. 40). Indeed, “emphasized femininity” (Connell, 1987), which is in subordinate relation to hegemonic masculinities, has been blamed for “girls’ lowered self-esteem, dissatisfaction with their bodies, and disordered eating” (Currie, Kelly & Pomerantz, 2006, p. 419). In order to be popular and take a top position in the school castes, girls must be regarded as girly, heterosexual, and cute, the traits which are seen as subordinated by masculinity. In opposition to that, Renold observed
some who achieved “a real sense of power and agency in her newfound ‘sexy’ body” (2005, p. 47), but this case was not seen in this study.

Another important point to consider regarding the relation between femininities and masculinities is whether or not gender hierarchy, which is utilized in the construction of national identity as a Japanese, was subverted or reconstructed, through the ways of engagement with normative Japanese femininity. Gender hierarchy seemed to be reconstructed through Maiko’s experiences, which kept her in the motherhood femininities, part of “emphasized femininity” in Japan. Another form of keeping place in gender hierarchy was found in Chika’s experiences, which left her in heteronormative girlie or kawaii femininities, being positioned as powerless or stupid. The possibility to subvert gender hierarchy was found in Yuka’s experiences of becoming a “sporty type” (taiikukai-kei; 体育会系) or more gyaru-kei, which are characterized by alternative, oppositional femininities, subverting traditional notions of normative femininities. Considering how to expand girls’ imagination beyond patriarchal gender hierarchies is an important theme to pursue through these works, while discussing femininity on their own rather than discussed with reference point of male desire and evaluation.

In the geographical context of the West (e.g., Canada, UK, USA), young femininities and schooling have been widely explored, drawing attention to the process of coming into being a woman (Gonick, 2003; Renold, 2005; Reay, 2001; Renold & Ringrose, 2008; Walkerdine, 1991). In this chapter, I attempted to build on these works by especially paying attention to the context of cosmopolitan city, Tokyo, in Japan, and the aspect of experiences of territorializing and deterritorializing of young girls. Previous empirical studies about femininities and schooling in Japan are still overall few in number. Several notable exceptions exist, such as Miyazaki’s (1993) work illustrating the dynamics of four subcultural groups of “study group,” “Otakki [otaku] group,” “Yankii [rebel] group” and “Ippan [normal] group” at school and the ways of
criticizing different femininities in each group; Uema’s study (2002) which depicted the hierarchies of three groups, “Top,” “Kogyaru” and “Otaku” among female high school students and the ways in which their relations changed; and Kimura’s (1999) work which analyzed the groups of female students who draw on the contradicted messages of school norm and gender norms. These studies tend to highlight how social boundaries of subcultural groups are drawn and shifted and more research is needed regarding affective circulations as well as discursive practices in the process of becoming a woman in the context of school in Japan. This chapter has offered one perspective on this relatively unexplored area; that is, femininities and schooling in Japan. In the next chapter, I will explore the experiences of Japanese masculinities at school.
Chapter 7

Assemblage of Japanese Masculinities at School: Salaryman Masculinities Still Prevent Becoming?

Along with the assemblages of femininities, I soon realized after I started the fieldwork that masculinities were also important assemblages in which the male students were entangled at school. This chapter explores key assemblages of Japanese masculinities, organized according to the experiences and ideas of four students (Inoue-kun, Makoto, Tomo and Rui). I look at what kinds of Japanese masculinities the assemblages are and how territorialisation and deterritorialization are occurring around each student.

Heteronormative Masculinities: Inoue-kun Being Held in the Similar

Inoue-kun is a deputy leader of the pop/rock music club. He stated that he had never had any experiences of acting before except for a school performance at elementary school, which was mainly just for fun. He said that it was first time for him to think about how to act by himself, and to repeatedly read the lines for memorization and practice. He said that, since he is in charge of vocals and the guitar in his club, he took the drama class to enhance his ability to express his emotions and make his voice more expressive in singing.

He was mainly assigned two roles: male #1 of “Fortune Telling” and Tomo of “Curry and G and Sea-man.” Answering which role he felt closer to or different from in an interview, he stated that there was not much difference between the roles. If he were to choose one of them, however, he stated that male #1 of “Fortune Telling” might be closer to him since he also feels sleepy in the morning, while the story of “Curry and G and Sea-man” has less commonality because his relatives do not live near Inoue-kun’s house. As for his favourite role, he chose male

---

14 Since he was absent on the day of the second journal writing sessions, he answered several questions for the first time in the interview. I believe that this should have in some way influenced how he answered each question in the interview as well as the quality of what he said.
#1 of “Fortune Telling,” in which male students are on a train, since he always comes to school by bicycle so the idea of taking a train to school is novel for him.

What is significant about Inoue-kun’s description about the roles is that the imagined alternative realities of the roles rarely seem to become an opportunity for him to transform himself. By hearing him saying that the roles he acted are “not much different from him” in a calm tone, I could imagine that he performed the role without smudging the edges of his sense of himself. It may mean that he acted as himself in merely different situations. This stabilizing tendency was also seen in the reflection of his experiences with the performance.

When I asked him if there were any roles which he felt were easier or more difficult to act, he repeated my question and said, “easy to act?” in a surprised voice. While other students often immediately answered this kind of the question, he looked for a moment as if he did not understand the meaning of the question. Striking a pose, he calmly stated that he did not feel any difficulty in acting either of the roles. He said, “It is just that the roles fit myself by chance this time,” implying that he did not find the need to come out of himself to get close to the roles. I asked him if it was fun for him to act the roles, and he said, “It was just like that I was intrigued by that” again in a plain tone, which sounded as if his experiences had not elicited such a high level of fun. In these narratives, he seemed to dis-inhabit the body of the roles. Unlike other students, therefore, I could not detect ideas, concepts, subject positions or the like that entangle him and the roles, and through which becoming and even territorialization is experienced. None of these seemed to become distinct in his narrative.

Indeed, both roles he acted were male high school students, and they can be considered as being positioned in a relatively similar way with Inoue-kun in terms of age and gender. However, if I look at Inoue-kun and the roles more closely, I find that the subject position and the kinds of masculinities Inoue-kun himself seemed to engage with are somehow different from
those of each role. For example, Inoue-kun is often described in positive ways as the one student who is different from the other students in the drama class. One day, teachers told me that, as he is regarded as reliable and trustworthy by both classmates and teachers, Inoue-kun can be a leader with good management of the group, and classmates often go to talk to him if something happens in class. Teachers also said that his grades are not bad so he is trying to go to university in a tone as if they think that his future is bright. On another occasion, Makoto, a classmate in drama class, described Inoue-kun as an only “sensible” boy in the drama class. In this sense, Inoue-kun seemed to resonate more closely with the assemblage of the hegemonic masculinity, that is, normative masculinity.

The hegemonic masculinity refers to “not necessarily the most common type on view [but] generally exerts its influence by being able to define ‘the norm’ ” (Swain, 2005, p. 220). In Japan, “salaryman” masculinities have been considered to be the hegemonic masculinity (Amano, 2006; Dasgupta, 2000, 2013; Hidaka, 2010; Louie & Low, 2005; Roberson & Suzuki, 2003). The salaryman is described as “a middle-class, university-educated middle-aged man, with a dependent wife and children to support, working for an organization offering such benefits as secure lifetime employment guarantee for permanent employees, and a promotions and salary scale linked to seniority” (p. 1).

Regarded as the “corporate soldier” (kigyō senshi), the salaryman would be expected to display “qualities of loyalty, diligence, dedication, self-sacrifice, hard work” (Dasgupta, 2000, p. 193). These qualities are those which had been associated with another discourse of masculinity, that is, the bushidō of the samurai (Dasgupta, 2000). What is notable is that these qualities largely overlapped with the qualities which are often described as “Japaneseness,” which have been used heavily on drawing the boundaries between Japanese or non-Japanese. Dasgupta further elaborates the explanation of salaryman as a mature citizen as follows:
The salaryman embodies “the archetypal citizen… [someone who] is a male, heterosexual, able-bodied, fertile, white-collar worker” (Mackie, 2002, p. 203). In other words, in the sociocultural imaginary of postwar Japan, the salaryman was the quintessential male *shakaijin* (literally “social being,” but more generally, a “socially responsible” adult). (2013, p. 2)

Influencing imaginings of Japan, both within the country and outside of it, this salaryman masculinity emerged “in the context of Japan’s process of nation-building and industrialization after the establishment of the Meiji state in the late nineteenth century” (Dasgupta, 2000, p. 192). This masculinity should heavily influence the formation of the hegemonic masculinity at school and the figure of the ideal male students, which are often considered to include such elements as loyalty, dedication to study, and group work that greatly overlapped with Inoue-kun.

On the other hand, the two roles he acted seemed to exemplify different kinds of masculinities, which rather question the model of the salaryman. Since the end of the so-called “Bubble Economy” boom of the late 1980s, and through the subsequent recession called the “Lost Decades” of the 1990s and 2000s, Japan has undergone economic, social, cultural, political shifts, and the salaryman model of masculinity and its associated assumption have been problematized (Dasgupta, 2000). Although the hegemonic discourse of salaryman masculinity is still powerful, new types of masculinities that are in opposition to it such as “herbivorous masculinity” (Charlebois, 2013; Chen, 2012) have emerged, replacing the masculinity of the old salaryman model.

I suggest that the roles Inoue-kun acted rather follow these new types of masculinities. For example, “Fortune Telling” is about two male students who depend on fortune telling for making the decisions of how to live their future lives. “Curry and G and Sea-man” is about
youth who keep doing TV games endlessly even if they actually do not find it enjoyable. These texts could be interpreted to depict scenes full of emptiness and uncertainty, which are often pointed out as phenomena of the “Lost Decade.”

Although I could see differences between Inoue-kun and the roles, and the possibility for him to engage with the roles in a transformative way, his way of disengaging with the roles without his becoming has been normalized in his narratives. For instance, this disengagement was normalized when he spoke about the casting. Saying that he is still in the beginner stage, at which he cannot reach the point where he makes the image by himself, he said, “By chance, I was assigned the roles for which I could think ‘aha’ soon after I was directed to do them,” justifying being cast in these roles based on his previous experience in theatre (or lack thereof). As an example, he mentioned about “Fortune Telling,” saying that he could immediately form his own image of the two roles and his vision of how to act his part in them. He explained that this casting happened since, unlike those of his classmates who have much acting experience, he was unskilled, assuming himself that he would not be able to perform a variety of different roles.

What is normalized here is, similar with Chika’s narrative that we saw in the previous chapter, the idea that a beginner cannot do well was never questioned in Inoue-kun’s narrative. However, considering other students who also did not have much acting experience but actively engaged with the roles, such as Maiko, I supposed that a deeper engagement with the role could have been seen in Inoue-kun as well, if he had wished for it.

Another example of Inoue-kun’s disengagement with the role was narrated when he imagined acting a gay role. Considering acting a gay role, the hairdresser of “Beauty Salon,” he stated that it would be difficult for him to do so since he does not have such feelings as the role. He stated, “Those people [gay people] speak in such a manner because that is what they are. But I don’t regard myself as such a person so I think that saying such words is difficult” and “I
cannot imagine myself saying such *Onée* [queer] words.” When he reflected on the experiences of his performance, his narrative only focused on his ability with regard to expression such as his articulation, tone and volume of voice, rather than understanding the role or his relations with them. What is clear from this is that the experience of acting the role did not function as an opportunity to offer him wider options of exploring how to be a boy.

Throughout the character development process and performance, Inoue-kun’s story was very much one of being stuck rather than of becoming. While I was struck by how he continuously spoke in the same calm tone throughout his interview, his acting experiences did not seem to become the place for him to experiment in relation with difference. Blocking him from moving out his place by being entangled within the system of hegemonic masculinity, it seemed to be difficult for him to become alternative forms of masculinity. What takes place was territorialization of hegemonic masculinities, keeping him in a privileged position. Ultimately, Inoue-kun was more stuck in place than the other boys in the class. As we will see in the following section, the difference between him and Makoto, who experienced becoming, a chance to explore his horizons, the most amongst the boys, is apparent.

**Varied Augmentation: Makoto’s Disruptive Ways and Becoming Different**

Makoto was assigned to the largest number of roles in the class. His five roles were: Ko of “*Aruaru* (That’s the Way It Is),” Naoki of “Curry, G and Sea Man,” the younger brother of “Come On, Spring,” male #2 of “Fortune Telling,” and the older brother of “Morning War.” As for his favourite role among them, he wrote, “All of them. It’s because it’s easy to empathize with each of them and I feel that they are all endearing” in a journal entry. He also stated that he has never been assigned a role with which he did not empathize and with which he could not find any commonalities to date.
Describing the commonality with him of each role such as being a younger brother and the listless feeling of being a high school student, he stated, “I have a trait of trying to get to like the roles by finding the commonalities with me by any means.” He describes his relations with the roles as, “I’m currently just in the middle of all the characteristics of the roles that I act.”

The artist teacher, Mr. Okamoto, noticed the constant changes apparent in Makoto in each performance and while watching the video of his final performance, said that Makoto showed different kinds of expression. Mr. Okamoto asked Makoto if there was any difference he felt in himself each time, and Makoto answered that he tried to perform by becoming like the role in question.

In an interview, Makoto elaborately described his methods of acting. He stated that first he removed his own habits and then he tried to embody the habit or atmosphere of the role. For example, with the role of the older brother in “Morning War,” he stated that he changed his way of standing from stance with his weight on one foot to stance with weight placed on both feet, and then, he tried not to be so brisk but neither to be so listless.

Regarding voice as an important element of the performance, he also stated that he changed his voice into a higher and cuter pitch for Naoki of “Curry and G and Sea Man.” Then, as an overall strategy of acting, Makoto wrote, “I try not to be myself [even though but moreover because] there are some points which are similar to me. I try to come closer to the role rather than make the role come closer to me,” saying that he voluntarily tried to go to meet the roles.

Makoto’s interview was animated with clear articulation and vivid memories. Throughout his narratives of describing characters, character development and performance, I could picture him acting, through which his body transpositis in several directions, while switching back and forth playfully between several roles. Creating a relational intimacy, he
seemed to put effort into entering reciprocally into the roles’ worlds with joy and fondness. In those moments of creating the connections through constant movement, Makoto’s body seemed to be experiencing “lines of flight,” that is, becoming something new. As the role that he wanted to act, he stated in an affirmative tone that he wanted to try all the roles without any hesitation including the female roles associated with girlie femininities as well as the gay role, implying that he was ready to place himself in relation to any difference.

When I pointed out the possibility of his body’s transformation in daily lives through acting experiences, he stated, “I am going to definitely change. I will become like an Onee [camp]. I think that I am going to talk like that [he changes his voice to a high and sexy intonation]. I am going to be like, ‘hey, listen.’ ” As for such a transformation, he stated, “That’s interesting for me but maybe others are going to pull away,” but “if I care about that, I cannot do anything.” Traversing boundaries of gender and sexuality, Makoto seemed to absorb what intrigues him, to forge new and different connections and to experience a sense of liberation and amplification, which suggests heading towards a more expansive life.

Through actively transforming, Makoto seemed to subvert and challenge hegemonic masculinities, that is, salaryman masculinities here, which construct the subject of ideal students at school. Renold identified three key factors through which those resistances toward hegemonic masculinities became possible: “humour and parody;” “locating ‘safe spaces;’ ” and “drawing upon collective peer group support and solidarity” (2004, p. 254). The space of the drama class without “sporty boys” seemed to become a “safe space” for Makoto to experiment with himself.

Indeed, I often found subversive tendencies in the very way that Makoto spoke about his own school experiences, while teachers frequently described him as a “problem” student. Wearing his school uniform loosely with his shirt untucked, and often coming to school late or being absent, Makoto talked about how he does not fit in with regard to school regulations. For
example, he stated how bored he feels in the usual classes, and how incomprehensible he feels the school teachers are, giving me an example of when teachers made him write several letters of regret during a school excursion.

When Makoto experiences becoming, that could be regarded as happening toward/along with various kinds of non-hegemonic masculinities. Those non-hegemonic masculinities could be alternative masculinities called “softer” and “transgressive” masculinities (Frosh, Phoenix & Pattman, 2002), which are not necessarily subordinated or oppositional. “Soft masculinities” in Japan have been discussed in relation with herbivorous masculinities, or sōshoku-kei danshi (“herbivore men”) (Charlebois, 2013, 2015; Chen, 2012) or bishōnen (“beautiful boys”) who are “idealized in anime (‘animated films’) and manga (‘comics’)” (Charlebois, 2013, p. 94). While a recent phenomenon, Chen (2012) sees a link between sōshoku-kei danshi and the shinjinrui, the “new generation” of the 1980s as a reflexive masculine discourse.

In addition, Makoto’s experiences could be considered as the transformation toward what Swain (2006) proposes as alternative masculinities that he calls “personalized masculinity [or masculinities].” In his ethnographic research on the construction of masculinity such as “hegemonic masculinity,” “complicit masculinity,” and “subordinate masculinity,” he addressed “personalized masculinity” as an attempt to compensate for an element lacking from the masculinities suggested by Connell (2005). “Personalized masculinity” is made up of “boys who appeared content to pursue their own types of identity, and did not aspire to, or imitate, the leading form” (Swain, 2006, p. 331). He states that they “had formed themselves into a series of small, well-established friendship networks with boys who had an array of similar interests, such as in computer games” and they are “generally nonexclusive and egalitarian, without any clearly defined leader” (Swain, 2005, p. 221).

However, I found that Makoto’s experiences of transformation could only happen in the limited place of “safe space;” that is, the drama class of Foundations of Theatre Expression.
While Makoto seriously participated in that class, I observed him become more disruptive in the class of Applied Theatre Expression in the following year, when several “sporty boys” also joined. In the class of Applied Theatre Expression with “sporty boys,” Makoto only acted a relatively small role, a craftsman in *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, although he was a leading actor in the previous class. In the final interview, I asked him if he was not interested in acting the main role. He stated that he could not act such a main role even if he wanted to since acting is not his thing, in a low and unanimated tone, which was a clearly different tone from those of previous interviews with him. Through his narrative, I detected his intention to justify his pandering to the “sporty boys” as a problem of his lack of acting skill. Listening to that, I wondered if he actually wanted to seriously participate in that or not.

The cultural practices of those students who are seen as sporty, which construct hegemonic masculinities, have been well documented in school-based research in contexts outside of Japan (Connell, 2005; Fine 1987; Mac an Ghail, 1994; Parker, 1996; Renold, 2005; Walker, 1988). In addition, for boys, the peer group is regarded as an important element in their school lives, especially to construct masculinities (Swain, 2005). Within the peer group, boys are expected to perform group norms with a great pressure (Adler & Adler, 1998; Connell, 2000; Mac an Ghail, 1994; Swain, 2005). I presumed that the way in which the actions not only of Makoto but also of other boys in drama class altered after the addition of the participation by the “sporty boys” could be interpreted as maintaining hegemonic masculinities, which have great forces of exclusion.

In this space with the “sporty boys,” Makoto seemed to consent to the hegemonic form of masculinities, which I presume was not his actual desire. This tendency of declining participation was also often seen in other male students who attended both classes, the class with
“sporty boys” and the one without them, including Tomo, whose experience I explore in the following section.

**Heteronormative Masculinity and *Otaku* Entangled: Tomo’s “School Caste” Mobility**

Tomo, who is a member of the theatre club, said that the theatre has been inside him as a “natural thing” since he was young, from the time when he joined the club through which he had watched children performing theatre in his community. He stated that he does not know why but theatre is the only thing that he has been able to keep doing without losing interest.

He was mainly assigned to two roles: guy 2 of “Somehow, Irritated” and Mario of “The Best memory and Spring.” He also acted as Natsuhiko of “My Taste” a few times. As for the role that he considered to be the most enjoyable to act, he chose Natsuhiko and wrote, “It’s because he is very different from me.” For the same reason, Tomo also chose Natsuhiko as the role that he felt was the most difficult to act. In a journal entry, Tomo describes Natsuhiko as, “He is seventeen years old. He might be adult-like (he is not dark.) He is calm. Basically, he gets along with everyone, not with any particular person. He might do some sports. He seems to read *Jump* (a Japanese comic magazine). He has a normal build, a slightly better build. His clothes are a little adult-like. He is an elder brother with a younger brother and a younger sister.”

Natsuhiko is the character that is most often described with the adjectives or phrases associated with “cool masculinities.” For example, Maiko, an author of the text, describes him as “cool-kei” (cool-type) and Shuji refers to the character as “a good-looking man.” Tomo also repeatedly described Natsuhiko using the word “cool” such as, “It’s like, he doesn’t speak much. He speaks, but he is cool. Cool? Well, he does not say extraordinary things, and is very quiet or not quiet but cool? I felt he was like that.” Martino (1999)’s study on young masculinities at school address the “cool boys,” distinguishing them from “party animals,” “squids” and “poofers.” He states that “being cool” is “established within the context of a hierarchical set of
social relations with their peers in which there is a constant jostling of hegemonic and subordinate masculinities” (p. 254). As he investigates the ways in which boys fashion “sporting masculinities” and negotiate “‘cool’ masculinities,” Tomo imagined that Natsuhiko is involved in sports. However, in opposition to the assertion that “cool boys” are seen as “establish[ing] themselves as rebels in their rejection of the institution’s values” (Martino, 1999, p. 254), Tomo did not see any rebellious trait in Natsuhiko but rather positioned him as a “normal person.”

Tomo repeatedly puts Natsuhiko in the “normal person” category. For example, when I asked the meaning of reading Jump, which he mentioned as Natsuhiko’s practice, he explained that, although this might be his personal prejudice, he feels that Jump is the magazine, which normal people read. “Conversely, I have an image that abnormal people, people whose way of thinking and behavior is like otaku do not read Jump,” he said. Tomo explained “normal people” in contrast with otaku who have been the object of discrimination and viewed in a negative light.

Otaku masculinity is regarded as a “subordinated masculinity” (Tanaka, 2009), which is in direct contrast to hegemonic masculinity and is positioned outside the legitimate forms. “Subordinated masculinity” is regarded as “controlled, oppressed, and subjugated” (Swain, 2005, p. 221). Tomo explains otaku as “noisy” and “strongly self-opinionated,” such as “talking loudly about the otaku movie site on the Internet in front of people.” Instead, as the point that he takes care with for acting the role of Natsuhiko, Tomo wrote, “I am acting it adult-like. I lowered the tone of my voice to make it sound adult-like.” While he implied that this was a way for him to become a “normal person,” he also said, “But honestly, I am not sure what ‘normal’ is” and “I define people like Natsuhiko as normal here.”

Further, hierarchical relationships featured in Tomo’s narrative to describe Natsuhiko, referring to the so-called “school caste.” As Suzuki (2012)’s work describes, the “school caste”
is currently one of the most significant themes used in understanding student experiences at elementary and junior high schools in Japan. Indeed, this is not only limited to Japan. Previous educational studies pointed out that gaining popularity and status is a significant element for boys at schooling, and documented how the hierarchy of masculinities is negotiated and established among boys at school (Connell, 1989; Mac an Ghaill, 1994; Martino & Pallotta-Chiarolli, 2003; Walker, 1988). Tomo said, “You know, there are castes in the ring of the people that make up a class. Natsuhiko isn’t excluded; he is in the circle but doesn’t speak too much. He doesn’t take the role of the person who brings the class to life either.” He added to say that Natsuhiko is not alone like him either. Showing his awareness of the differences and the associated hierarchy among the top group, which everybody including teachers likes, the normal group and the otaku group, Tomo puts Natsuhiko in the middle between the dominating noisy top group and the subordinated quiet groups such as otaku.

Revealing his own position in class, the story of himself being opposite to that of Natsuhiko, as Tomo considers himself an otaku, was deeply woven into his narrative about the role. In addition to the fact that he does not read Jump at all, he wrote in his journal that his favourite things are: “manga, reading novels, watching theatre, playing with robot figurines, and thinking about stories like those of a drama text... [and that] I love ‘Masked Rider (仮面ライダー)’ (a Japanese animation) even if that means people say that I’m otaku.”

When I referred to the part where he wrote that he does not mind being called otaku in an interview, he said that he actually does care about what he is called but he tries to make himself feel safe by thinking that “[Masked Rider]’s not an otaku thing but more like a subcultural thing.” He continued to say, “If normal people see that, I think that [they would think that] it’s otaku, from a ‘normal’ point of view, an otaku-like hobby.” “In my heart I’m shocked; I mean it’s scary,” he said.
While addressing his own interest in hobbies associated with *otaku*, he stated that he gets extremely afraid of how people think about him, especially of being seen as *otaku* as well as speaking about his abjection toward the term “*otaku*.” He said:

I hate to be thought of as *otaku*. But maybe, I have the nature of an *otaku*, so I hate them like the hatred of the similar. By denying people like that, I think that I am trying to think that I am different from and superior than those people, and I am closer to normal people.

Tomo added to say, “I know that I and the people around me despise those people, and I am barely on that side [on the side of not being *otaku*].” Reflecting on his own attitude of trying to think that he is different from *otaku* and his own feelings that “*otaku* is gross,” he wondered why and from when he started to feel that way. He said that maybe it is because people around him think that way, even if he does not actually think so. “I don’t know. But it’s still gross,” he said.

Here, what I see was his attempt to try to be “normal” or “average” which is regarded as the safest position in the formal school culture (Swain, 2005). Swain states, “it is a paradox that although pupils attempt to construct their own individual identity, no one aspires to be, or can afford to be, too different, and they are conscious that they need to be ‘normal’ and ‘ordinary’ within the strict codes set by their own peer group” (2005, p. 217). In order to be seen as “normal,” Tomo is careful not to show his *otaku* hobbies as well as despairing of people who have distinct hobbies or features, who are different from “normal people.”

The desire to be seen as normative or be climbing up the status was more apparent in Tomo’s narratives about his participation in Applied Theatre Expression with the new “sporty boys” in the following year. In opposition to Foundations of Theatre Expression, where he seriously participated in drama class to the degree that he mentioned that the drama class was a
“mental food” for him to continue doing theatre from then on, becoming friends with the “sporty boys” became the most important factor for him in the following year. He stated that, during the first term, the relationship (with “sporty boys”) was very awkward, and then, in the second term, he was on the point of becoming friends with them or not. As for his way of participating in the class, he said that he thought that doing a performance with those male students is not going to be “serious” and how “funny” the performance is going to be was the central thought for them so that Tomo tried to match their spirit.

Throughout the class, he seemed to try not to be seen as either a theatre person or an otaku and to give up pursuing his passion towards theatre. However, he also mentioned that he wanted to participate in the class seriously as well. Reflecting on his participation in that class, he said that he could not clear up these two things within himself well, saying that even if they are too noisy backstage, he could not tell them off although he actually wanted to do so.

Overall, Tomo seemed to construct his masculinities, vibrating with wider ambivalence between normative masculinities and otaku masculinities. Reflecting on Tomo’s narrative, what struck me the most is the fact that he talked about his experience of acting Natsuhiko with focus and passion, even though he only performed Natsuhiko a few times. That suggested that these experiences might have impacted him in a certain way. On one hand, acting Natsuhiko has a meaning of rising in the hierarchy of masculinity from an otaku masculinity to a normative masculinity. On the other hand, the desire for normative masculinities also has the function of blocking or distorting his productive affect toward otaku masculinities in spite of his own passion toward otaku or the theatre.

His intensive scorn and othering practices toward otaku seemed to work as a defense against being contaminated by otaku and his fear of being excluded by “normal people.” Further, as much as he himself scornfully treated otaku as subordinated and pathologized, this actually
seemed to be an indication of his feeling of surveillance and being policed by heteronormative masculinities. His ability to reflect on his disgust and prejudice toward *otaku* is remarkable but in the end, he continued to perpetuate the hierarchical structure of masculinities without subverting it and stayed in the same place. Entangled in hierarchical structure, the performance of Natsuhiko did not appear to function as space for Tomo to experiment himself, to figure out how to transform himself within the normative masculinities nor how to subvert the hierarchical relation. In the end, Tomo seemed to remain stuck in his ambivalent and relatively still position between normative and subordinate masculinity.

**Subordinated Masculinities: Rui Territorializing Homosexuality and Being Picked On**

Wearing glasses with naturally curly hair, Rui is a member of the drama club. Although there were a few roles that Rui was assigned to cover for students who were absent, his permanent role was as the hairdresser of “Beauty Salon.” Rui stated that he originally imagined the hairdresser as being “a normal, young manager who is a bit dandy,” “works neatly,” and has “charisma.” He repeatedly used the word “normal” to describe the role in an interview, as if he was trying to describe the difference from the role that he ended up actually acting. As Rui and other students practiced the skit several times, Mr. Okamoto one day directed Rui to perform the role as a gay man. Other students got excited and the classroom was full of laughter.

Reflecting on the moment, Rui stated that both Chika, the author of the script, and Rui were surprised since they never expected the change. He said, “At first, I did not want to change it, but I made up my mind.” Rui was the only student in the class who was requested to change the original image of the role from what he had pictured, and his words sounded like he was disappointed about that. He stated that if he was directed or requested to do something and if it was like “I want YOU to do it,” he will do anything even if he felt resistance at first, saying that it is like there is no alternative.
In this narrative of describing the new image of the role and his relation with it, I could detect his intent to remain distant from it. The tone of his voice expressed the disgust he felt toward the role, and he said, “I have some resistance toward the okama [gay] kyara inside me,” and, “Since I am not okama, I don’t feel anything in common with the role at all.” Further, regarding himself as ordinary and okama as not ordinary, he seemed to try to justify his separation from the role. He stated:

The theme (of the drama script) is daily life, isn’t it? It’s strange that okama appear in daily conversations, isn’t it? I am not sure if there is such a place where an okama hairdresser is a part of our daily lives. I don’t know well since I have never met such a hairdresser.

Boys’ homophobia is one of the important themes for masculinity-making activities in school (Mac an Ghaill, 1994; Martino & Pallotta-Chiarolli, 2003; Nayak & Kehily, 1996). Violence as a manifestation of homophobia is suggested to play a significant role in regulating and constructing dominant heterosexual masculinities (Estein, 1996; Mac an Ghaill, 1994; Martino & Pallotta-Chiarolli, 2003; Nayak & Kehily, 1996). Previous research address the idea that dominant masculinity regards homosexuality as a threat and it therefore attempts to distance itself from homosexuality by oppressing it through homophobia (Connell, 1992; Epstein & Johnson, 1998; Gilbert & Gilbert, 1998). The word gay is pointed out as frequently being used to “confirm hegemonic masculinity as exclusively heterosexual and to position [homosexual] boys as different and attack their identity” (Swain, 2005, p. 222). Throughout Rui’s narrative about the role and his relation with it, I could detect that Rui positions himself as heterosexual through his homophobic reaction and perpetuates the unequal relation between heterosexual and homosexual that is currently prevalent in Japan.
Rui told me that he put a lot of thought into how to perform the role. He stated that, for example, he was especially careful about the way of speaking, mimicking female vocal patterns and extending the end of words, which he practiced at home after all his family had gone to bed. In addition to that, the most significant strategy of his acting for the role was to act it as “a joke kyara.” He said, while he does not really like a crude joke on the stage, since everyone in class started to get a laugh from the skit, he also ended up seeking laughs. “I thought if nobody laughed at the performance, even one person, I thought that it was going to be the end for me. So, when I heard giggling, I was like ‘all right’ and ‘I won,’ in my mind,” he said. Also, he mentioned that the length of the script was one factor in seeking the laughter since he thought that the performance should end with just the initial impact. He explained:

To some degree, I am solidly built. Although I don’t have very broad shoulders, I am relatively solidly built. As a guy, it is not so much, though. I don’t know, but I regard myself as a normal guy and my clothes were not okama kyara so that everyone knows that I am a guy. I know all the senior students sitting there. So, they know that I am a guy. Knowing this, they see my performance. Then, it’s an okama kyara. I think that the first impact is going to, like, make many people laugh. It’s like, wow this is a joke.

Rui stated that, if a manly guy acts the roles of an okama or a female, then that will increase the comedic tone. He emphasised, “Looking at it normally, I think that that was just a joke kyara,” indicating that there was no option for him to do any different kind of performance. Other male students also often mentioned this role of a hairdresser in interviews and told me how they could have acted it as a joke in a funnier way. For example, Tomo said that if he had acted the role, he could have been better and funnier. Toshi also mentioned, “the role was one where you could be playful,” and “I felt that I could have fun with the character development,” as well as that “it would not be ordinary but could be really fun.” The male students all talked
about the role with an assumption that the way of representing the homosexual role could only be limited to being acted out as a joke.

Indeed, humorous exchanges are considered as “constitutive of heterosexual masculine identities” and humour is regarded as “a technique utilized for the regulations of masculinities and the negotiation of gender-sexual hierarchies within pupil cultures” (Kehily & Nayak, 1997, p. 69). In this sense, getting laughs in this performance could be considered for Rui and other male students as a part of negotiating their own status in the hierarchy of masculinities within peer groups. This way of acting also inevitably influenced the way Rui engaged with the role. Rui stated that he stopped thinking about the role itself during the process of character development. Focusing on the audience’s reaction and seeking laughter, his process of character development rarely included the experiences of getting to know the role itself by putting himself into a proximal relationship with the role. I assume that the burden of negotiating the hierarchy of masculinities in class as well as his own feelings of homophobia prevented him from doing so.

Whatever the reasons for his dis-inhabiting the role are, being imposed on to perform a role from a certain perspective, which is different from his personal preference for acting the role has a possibility of being harmful in regard to his self-making processes. Becoming a clown that made people laugh and feeling the anxiety of not being able to live up to people’s expectations seemed to be at the blurred boundaries between what constitutes a “game” and what constitutes “bullying,” as those which school researchers on boys and masculinities have articulated (Renold, 2005; Skelton, 2001; Thorne, 1993). While Rui struggled over “the game” or “bullying,” which contain unequal power relationships, these experiences left him with great fatigue, increasing his dissatisfaction or self-hated. He repeatedly mentioned that acting out the role made him exhausted and, in an interview, he explained:
Maybe, at the time, I still didn’t get rid of the feeling of resistance [toward the role], I felt embarrassed by being watched and that meant I used up a lot of energy. I don’t know why but I consumed a lot of energy only for that role. I internalised *okama* words and *okama* ways of speaking, which I thought about a lot. Rather, I focused too much only on those and I got really exhausted. I didn’t get tired so much with the other roles, though.

In his journal entry, I could detect his confusion of how to respond to others’ expectations. He wrote, “Since I was told that ‘I can exaggerate’ last time, I tried to make it that way but then I was told that my acting was too exaggerated. It seems that there is an allowable limit even when you are told that you can exaggerate.” He said, in the end, he felt like “I don’t care anymore, let’s just make merry and forget my troubles.”

His reflection on his final performance was also full of negativity. While he said that he got really nervous with the final performance and could not do it as he had practiced, he stated, “I was just a lump of failure. It was not only about the way of expressing emotions, but also my movements were strange.” Noticing that his body moved and twisted unconsciously during the performance when watching a video of it afterwards, he stated in a strong voice, “I hated myself. It’s disgusting. Watching it and noticing that [I was moving strangely], I got goosebumps. I hate it.”

In a tone of regret and disappointment, he concluded that his performance became the compromise “as a result of his reason and instinct colliding,” and he could not get the *kyara* of an *okama* to “explode” all in one go. Unlike other students, his negative emotion haunted him for a long time even after the class ended to the point that he told me in an interview that he had been thinking about the final performance a lot every day since he had watched the video of his performance in class.
Martino and Pallotta-Chiarolli (2003) explore “the extent to which bullying practices are implicated in wider regimes of masculinity” (p. 34). Exploring how the hierarchical relationships of masculinities get played out in boys’ peer group cultures, they address that “boys who do not ‘measure up’ to the norms of what it means to be ‘cool’ or a ‘normal’ boy become targets, and life for them at school can become unbearable” (p. 34). In an interview, Rui told me that his position is one of a “yarare role” (やられ役; someone always on the receiving end) in his daily life and I often encountered situations in which I saw other students putting him into a subordinated position. For example, Nijiho described him as being an “ijirare role (いじられ役; someone who is teased)” in class, saying “it doesn’t mean that I don’t like him, it’s a kind of expression of love,” and “he will have meaning in his life by being teased. He lives only for being teased,” and “it’s like that I’m teasing you for you.”

In Uwatoko’s study (2011) about student subculture and gendered order in junior high school in Japan, this action of “ijiru” is observed among both boys themselves and girls who join in with boys, while their targets are the boys who do not share the “gender code.” As such, “ijiru (tease)” or “ijirare (be teased)” is one of the featured practices among youth at school in Japan, and it is apparent that being positioned in a subordinated role such as a “yarare role” or an “ijirare role” influenced Rui’s experiences in class, preventing him from becoming a new self in a way of expanding his possibilities.

Even the drama class, in which Rui seemed to experience a kind of bullying, is still a much safer space for him, in comparison with his homeroom class. He said that he never wanted to act an okama kyara in his homeroom class since he knew that they were going to make fun of him. He said, “I could clearly see the future, which is to say that as soon as I acted the role, I was going to be picked on” in class. He said that, although people in drama class laughed at his performance a lot, their laughter was of a different kind from that in homeroom. He stated that
the people in his drama class were still warm, such as giving him some suggestions for acting, while it seemed people in his homeroom just regarded him as a fool.

Rui had a lot to say about his experiences in drama class, and the narrative weaved together many trails that dip in and out of a range of topics and emotions around his experiences of acting the role of a hairdresser. Although he spent a lot of energy in figuring out his performance, Rui’s story was very much about being stuck in terms of his self-making experience. Rui repeatedly said that he was not able to get into the role well, nor did the role fit him well, and he seemed to engage with the role in a very fixed and distanced way, so I never detected his experiences of transforming his self in relation with the role. Dislocating his affects toward the role from his moving body, he did not appear to invest in his moving body for the role. It is ironic that this happened despite his strong passion for theatre, his dream being to become an actor, and he stated that he likes to act in a way that allows him to explore new parts of himself by acting out different roles. It seems that there are some areas that he cannot allow himself to explore.

Following the dominant scripts of sexuality and masculinities, he was territorialized in the assemblage of hegemonic heterosexual masculinities, that is, disciplined into a narrow way of being a boy without the possibility of imagining otherwise. As I detected Rui’s urgent need to keep up with the heteronormative standard, which was expressed stronger than in other boys, his territorialization could be considered as mainly caused by his fear of exclusion as well as his own homophobic reaction. Taking on performing homosexuality as a way of managing his position among his peer students, he seemed to incur high social and emotional costs in the performance, as boys in a subordinated position are often doomed to experience. Overall, he reconstituted the structure of power relations between heterosexual and homosexual without
being able to access anti-homophobic practices, thereby perpetuating his subordinated position in the hierarchy of masculinities.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has explored how young boys’ bodies are entangled within several masculinity assemblages. Affects are always momentary, but the directions and movements of these affects gradually emerged with a certain pattern for each participant. As I was collating the vignettes of each student, I was struck by the fact of how less becoming happened, while all students engaged differently with different kinds of masculinities. That is, the significant pattern among their events was being stuck. For example, Inoue-kun was stuck in the salaryman masculinities in opposition to other kinds of subordinated masculinities. Pulled in both directions, Tomo stayed in the middle zone between normative cool masculinities and “otaku” masculinities. Also, Rui remained unmoved within the assemblages of hegemonic heterosexual masculinities in opposition to the homosexual masculinities. Another pattern, that is, an event of becoming that I only found was in the experiences of Makoto. Among the boys in this study, Makoto was the only apparent case of jumping between and engaging simultaneously with different masculinities.

What I found interesting was that even if those repeated experiences of being stuck among boys, boys constructed their masculinities with a variety of different kinds. This was in contrast with the girls in this study, who have constructed their femininities by somehow engaging with one particular type of femininity, the heterosexualized “girlie” femininities. Of course, salaryman masculinities are still influential as Inoue-kun’s and Makoto’s events tell us. However, the influence of such masculinities was largely rather indirect in other events. For example, normative cool masculinities (Tomo) and heterosexual masculinities (Rui) should be a part of the idea of salaryman masculinities, but neither boys’ narrative included clear indicators
related with the main ideas associated with salaryman masculinities. This might be largely because of what masculinities were depicted in each drama text in the first place. The salaryman masculinities seemed to be only clearly depicted in the role of the father of “Morning War,” and most of the male roles in the drama scripts tended to be allied with those described as oppositional masculinities such as “herbivorous masculinities” and “otaku masculinities.”

An important point of their experiences of being stuck was that fact these experiences seemed to be influenced by each student’s different hierarchical status, or the position of school caste. For example, among the events related to being “stuck,” I found great difference between the case of Inoue-kun and that of Rui in the rigidity of this tendency to be “stuck” and how this territorialization occurred. Indeed, those who are in a relatively higher position such as Inoue-kun, not to mention the “sporty boys” who joined the drama class in the following year and were joking around in the class, seemed to find it almost impossible to transit between several positions. However, they seemed to rather actively choose to stay in place because of their self-protection of being privileged rather than any particular desperate need to be included within the community. This might be a similar practice to what Davies and Harre (1990) conceptualize as “reflexive positioning.” “Reflexive positioning” refers to “children as active agents who position themselves” (Renold, 2005, p. 148).

On the other hand, for Rui, who is positioned in a less popular and marginalized caste, there seemed to be no option for moving because of severe violent policing to keep him where he is. The similar tendency of being impossible to become who they want to become is often pointed out among the boys in subordinated position (Renold, 2005). This seemed to be greatly influenced by the practices of what Davies and Harre (1990) describe as “interactive positioning.” “Interactive positioning” refers to “how children are positioned by others through
social interaction as gendered (and classed, racialized, sexualized, and aged) beings” (Renold, 2005, p. 148).

Another distinctive movement, Makoto’s becoming in several directions, needs to be considered further. The important question here is what made it possible for Makoto to move, and what prevented him from doing that. Drawing upon the ethnography of children’s constructions of their gender and sexual identities in primary schools, Renold problematizes “the notion that children who transgress gender/sexual norms follow a trajectory of marginalization and subordination” (2005, p. 147). That is, “those children who engaged in non-hegemonic practices were not always subordinately positioned” (p. 148). At the same time, this engaging in non-hegemonic practices without being in a subordinated position seems to be only possible “so long as they successfully accessed other ‘hegemonic’ discourses and practices - in particular, heterosexualized discourse” (p.148). For me, this non-hegemonic but not always subordinate position seemed to be the direction toward which Makoto’s becoming emerged.

In addition, along a similar line of thought, the concepts doing Other and being Other offered by Renold (2005) are helpful to understand the event further. Renold (2005) differentiates between these two in order to “explore more fully the interrelationship between hegemonic and non-hegemonic gender identities” (p. 146) as follows:

Doing Other: the ways in which some (usually dominant) girls and boys could try on and temporarily engage with Other ‘non-hegemonic’ femininities, masculinities and sexualities.

Being Other: the ways in which girls and boys consistently located themselves and were located by others as ‘different’ from hegemonic and other dominant forms of masculinity, femininity and sexuality. (p. 148)
While *being Other* seemed to be allied with Rui’s case, Makoto’s event seems to be in line with *doing Other*. However, a question in my mind is to what extent Makoto could be considered a dominant boy, regarding his conflicts with normative school strata and his apparent decreasing engagement in class when it was dominated by “sporty boys.” The event of becoming needs to be further investigated in relation with the interrelationship among hegemonic and non-hegemonic masculinities and hierarchy status of the subject position or the position of school caste.

Another important view to consider is if hegemonic masculinities, or salaryman masculinities have been reconstructed or disturbed through the affective events of masculinities in the field. In the event of Inoue-kun, it was perpetuated, keeping him in the same place. In the cases of Tomo and Rui, hegemonic masculinities seemed to be supported without direct participation, but instead by trying to avoid becoming otherwise, even if the chances to engage with these hegemonic masculinities were not given. Makoto was only the case that I could see the possibility to disturb the hegemonic masculinities. The important question is, then, how we promote such subversion at school. When and how is it possible? It is especially important that the masculinities that previously were undoubtedly dominant, the hegemonic masculinities are losing their positions, as influenced by social changes in Japan, while the gender hierarchy is still maintained.

By looking at the experiences of territorializing and deterritorializing of young boys, this chapter built on the ethnographic studies of young masculinities and schooling (Davies, 2003b; Gilbert & Gilbert, 1998; Martino & Meyenn, 2001; Martino & Pallotta-Chiarolli, 2003; Renold, 2005; Skelton, 2001; Swain, 2000; 2003; Thorne, 1993). In opposition to the context of the West (e.g., Canada, UK, USA), where these studies have been widely explored, empirical studies about masculinities and schooling in Japan are much in need of further examination.
The previous research about gender and youth culture at Japanese school illustrated the dynamic of subcultural groups, highlighting how social boundaries of subcultural groups are drawn and shifted. For example, Tsuchida (2008) describes three types of male high school students: “high school record boys,” which she identifies as similar to the “ear’oles” (Willis, 1977), “sporty boys,” which is similar to “the lads” (Willis, 1977) and “lonely, unconfident boys.” While Tsuchida (2008) states that “lonely, unconfident boys” have had less attention paid to them to date, more research on the subcultural groups in different hierarchical ranks of masculinities needs to be explored not only regarding their discursive practices but also their affective circulations in the process of becoming a “man.”

Masculinities have been constructed as the center of national identity (McClintock, 1995; Ueno, 2004). As for such masculinities, how to subvert gender hierarchy between masculinities and femininities is another important perspective. While current young boys are becoming skeptical of the salaryman lifestyle, the norm of which is corporate dedication and obedience without self-fulfillment, other kinds of masculinities such as “herbivorous masculinities” and “otaku masculinities” are coming to gain quite a deal of influence (Charlebois, 2013; Chen, 2012; Fujimura, 2006). Otaku masculinities have potential to function as “personalized masculinity” (Swain, 2006), which might be another possible form to subvert hegemonic masculinities, pursuing their own types of identity and establishing friendship networks with people who had an array of similar interests. In such case, gender or national hierarchy might find a way to be subverted by connecting with otaku femininities and the otaku community beyond national borders. For example, Iida (2005) also discusses “feminization of masculinity” as a means for young men to create alternative gender identities that transforms patriarchy in Japan.
However, the question that remains is whether or not these new forms of Japanese masculinities actually disturb gender hierarchy? How is masculinity, which does not need to let femininity be subordinated possible? Is male feminization, or male femininity actually accepted? These are the questions which should be considered along with the question of how rigidly the old-fashioned ideal of becoming a salaryman still territorialize young boys in Japan.

While I applied the concept of “hegemonic masculinity,” which has been employed to theorize masculinities at school (Connolly, 1998; Frosh et al., 2002; Kenway & Fitzclarence, 1997; Mac an Ghaill, 1994; Skelton, 2001; Swain, 2003), it is important to pursue the analysis of the practices as a singular event in the specific context. In other words, how affects circulate around Japanese masculinities should be understood in this particular national and socio-historical context, situating the meanings and the construction of “salaryman masculinities” (Dasgupta, 2000, 2013; Hidaka, 2010) within broader discussion of Japanese masculinities such as in the historical context (Amano, 2006; Frühstück & Walthall, 2011), in contemporary context (Roberson & Suzuki, 2003; Tanaka, 2009) as well as in the geographical context such as considering various forms of East Asian masculinities (Taga, 2005).

One of the important points to consider about Japanese hegemonic masculinities, that is, salaryman masculinities, is their strong connection with the area of work and professional success. This is distinctive in the context of Japan, considering that important elements of hegemonic masculinities in the West are often regarded as being “tough” and “hard” (Tanaka, 2009). Within this norm, those who do not or are not able to work such as NEET (people who are “Not in Employment, Education or Training”), hikikomori (socially withdrawn), or furi-tā (a Japanese English expression, freeter; unemployed casual/temporary workers with little chance of finding permanent work) are considered to be bearers of a crisis for hegemonic masculinities
(Tanaka, 2009). This suggests that exploring the transformation of hegemonic masculinities needs to be considered in relation with the ideas of the area of employment.

Another important theme on salaryman masculinities is the idea of normativity. For example, Toshi, who acted the role of the father in “Morning War,” repeatedly mentioned the word “normal” when he described the role and how to act it. In a journal entry, he described the role of the father as, “is bad at fights, relatively mild, 45 years old, slightly chubby ossan [middle age man] (wearing a suit) and often makes a sigh (deep sigh), ...[he] often watches baseball [and] his hobby is golf.” He stated that this is the image of a father and “the role suits well with its normal image.” He mentioned, “the role is as normal as if I read the lines without thinking about trying to act it out and act naturally, I am going to get into the role easily.” It sounded like he tried to adjust the role to his own character, while he was arrested and territorialized in the idea of normativity. What I found interesting is that, while normativity seemed to be an important idea to shape his images and performances, the criteria of being normal was taken as granted, implying that he assumed that his judge is a universal one. This idea of normativity seemed to make becoming different difficult. Then, how the idea of normativity within salaryman masculinities territorializes young boys and justifies their immobility are questions to be explored.

Furthermore, investigation of the relationship between normativity and salaryman masculinities will become more sophisticated by paying attention to its connection with cool masculinities. This interest emerged through my encounter with the event of Shuji, a member of the pop/rock music club. He was assigned to the role of Guy #2 of “Irritated for Some Reason,” and describes the role as a “freeter,” who does not work and “is better than a NEET,” but “feels languid about work and life.” Saying that this might be his own future, although he does not want it to be at all, he stated that he could share the feeling of the role such as finding things to
be too much trouble and having no energy to do anything. As for the experiences of acting the role, feeling familiarity and nothing incongruous with the role, he said that “I felt that I fit the role,” “my performance was purely (素; su) myself” and “I put my ordinary self into the role.”

On the other hand, in choosing the role of Natsuhiko as the one that he never wanted to act, he expressed strong rejection of the role. He said, “I cannot act such a cool role. I cannot do it at all” and “the cool role is impossible. No, I am honestly bad at it. If I did it, it would be absolutely acting cool.” He stated, “If I were to choose one or the other, I am definitely a clown rather than a hunk,” “I think that the cool role is not completed inside of me,” and he does not have the courage to act a role that is different from him. Shuji’s narrative indicates that he stayed at the subordinated “freeter” masculinities and refused to move toward cool masculinities at the same time. This narrative made me ponder how salaryman masculinities and cool masculinities intersect to territorialize boys, how these intersections relate with or exclude other non-hegemonic masculinities such as “cool but not salaryman masculinities,” and ultimately, how these different relations among masculinities influence boy’s experiences of transformation in the process of becoming a man.

This chapter has offered one perspective on a relatively unexplored perspective in the work of masculinities and schooling in Japan. More research on young boys at school in Japan is needed regarding not only the diverse hierarchy of masculinities as they relate to different subcultural groups and its transformation but also regarding male students’ experiences of becoming in relation with the several new forms of Japanese masculinities, taking deterritorialization of gender hierarchy and Japanese-ness into consideration.
Chapter 8

Toward Drama Pedagogy to Experiment Affective Relations

Although the focus of this study was not the pedagogical intention (aspects) of drama or the philosophical views of individual teachers, I observed that the teaching styles or class objectives directly shaped the students’ affective experiences in the classes. In this chapter, I consider how students’ experiences might have been influenced by pedagogical aspects, especially how these aspects might have restricted or could have enhanced students’ affective experiences. At the end, I sketch several points which I suggest are important to consider in applying drama pedagogy for experimenting affective relations.

One of the most significant characteristics that I have detected to be prevalent in defining drama within the overall framework of classes was the view of realism or naturalistic acting. For example, in the Foundations of Theatre Expression class, character development and performance in activities of Sketches of Daily Life were mainly conducted with an aim of properly representing the world of each student’s drama script. Although Mr. Okamoto did the final casting, the author of each script first chose who s/he wanted to perform each role. In most of the cases, the student who was considered close to the image of the role was chosen for the cast. After practices of each performance, Mr. Okamoto asked the author if s/he thought that the performance closely represented the world that they wanted to express. If not good enough, Mr. Okamoto asked the author how performances could be changed for that purpose.

Through these processes, the classmates were expected to perform the plays based on direction from the author of a text faithfully. In addition, the performance was also practiced partially with the purpose of presenting it to an audience at the final performance. Mr. Okamoto gave students some advice on acting in order to provide some impact to the audience as we saw in Rui’s acting of the role of the hairdresser.
I encountered this view of realism or naturalistic acting in other classes as well, such as where students practiced performing Shakespeare’s *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* and when students were making films on the theme of love. As we saw in the mechanism of *kyara*, rather than an intention to experiment the self through acting, casting was often conducted according to how much the image of a student fitted the role. The most significant factor, which I especially sensed to be operating, was a gender division. That is, male students were almost automatically assigned to the male role and female students were assigned to female roles, with a few exceptions: Mika who acted Natsuhiko as well as Maiko and Risa who acted Puck.

Sometimes, such division was clearly directed such as when Ms. Furuta said that only girls could act the roles of fairies, when announcing the casting for *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*. Also sharing his thoughts on casting, Toshi directly stated that gender-crossed casting was unnatural. Reflecting on the casting in *Sketches of Daily Life* and the possibilities of his taking on other roles such as the role of Ichigo (which refers to a strawberry, signifying a “girlie” girl), he said that he thinks nobody will actually assign the role of Ichigo to him, saying “I think that in order to express the love of a girl who loves a male star, no one will deliberately choose a male for the girl role.” Here, interrupting the norm and imagining other possibilities through border crossing in acting experiences is not considered as the primary practice in class.

I see that this view on acting in drama classes is influenced by the wider view of the traditional type of acting, utilizing “psychological realism.” Best known as the Stanislavsky method (1948), the premises of psychological realism or naturalistic acting are that: “all human beings share a common nature,” “commonality matters more than individual differences,” “actor and character can and should (...) connect through a shared human nature,” and a character has an “inner core,” “truth,” or “essence” (Thompson, 2003, p. 128). Smith (1993) called these acting practices as “self-based” approaches, and in there, “that characters live inside of you and
that you create a character through a process of realizing your own similarity to the character,”
while distinctions between the actor and the character are encouraged to disappear (p. xxvi).
Thompson states the problem with this approach as follows:

Because the character represented must remain within the emotional and experiential
range of the actor, the range of identities and emotions possible for the character are
constrained by the much more limited range of identities and emotions actually
experienced and already known or at least imaginable (through the “magic if” or “as-if”) by the actor. (2003, p. 129)

Considering the purpose of enhancing the students’ possibility to experience self-
augmentation, an alternative conception of acting is necessary. In addition, reconceptualization
is also important in order to take the aims of the class written in syllabus more seriously, such as
of Foundations of Theatre Expression, “experiencing the difficulty of communicating and the
enjoyment to overcome it, students will acquire the technique to jump into unknown spaces.”

Another feature of drama pedagogy that I observed in the field was found in the aim of
the educational practice of “expressing the self” by digging deeply into the self and the world of
that self. For example, in the Sketches of Daily Life series, students were expected to express an
aspect of daily life as a form of drama text through reflecting on their own daily lives and
ultimately their selves. In the class, the main points to be considered were if students were able
to express each of their lives as a drama text and if that drama text could be adequately
expressed in a performance.

This view of “expressing the self” was also emphasized in the practices in the Applied Theatre Expression class. In this class, expected to explore the meaning of the words in a poem,
the students presented a poem they wrote or their own favourite poem to the other students.
During the process, the students were encouraged to express it by putting emotions into the
words and cultivating their methods of self-expression. In these activities, understanding the self by confronting the self was focused on much, and the relationship between the actor and the role (or the world of the poem) and the relationship between the actor and the audience were not particularly the focus as immediate aspects of learning in class.

The third feature of drama pedagogy that I observed was its focus on the experiences of acting out rather than on reflection about those experiences. For example, practicing the performance toward the final performance day or video making were commonly seen educational practices in classes such as the Foundations of Theatre Expression, Applied Theatre Expression, and Applied Theatre Theory. In the syllabus of the Foundations of Theatre Expression class, for example, the aims of the class are described as: “Exploring ‘what each of us feels and thinks ourselves, here and now, and how we communicate it to others,’ this class aims to deepen the understandings of self and other.” However, in spite of being a class objective, the students’ experiences in acting were often not directly reflected upon in class. What they feel and think or how they understand the self and the other were not the main points of reflection during classes, it seeming to be that these were regarded as tasks for the students to do by themselves inside or outside class.

I argue that these features of drama pedagogy in the field are largely influenced by how the image of theatre has been constructed at school in Japan. The main kind of theatre conducted at school in Japan is the gakkō-geki (school play), which children performed during the gakugei-kai (school performance day). Different from the characteristic of theatre as an art, Ueda and Uema (2013) address that the characteristic of gakkō-geki is that it is “a play without acting.” With its own unique form and expression style, they say that expression in gakkō-geki only follows a fixed pattern, which is full of overemphasized lines and un-naturalistic expression. As another characteristic of gakkō-geki, Ueda and Uema (2013) also articulate its lack of “live
connection.” They state that it is lacking in dialogue that involves the process of transformation, responding interactively with others on stage and with the audience. That is, in most cases of gakkō-geki, drama/theatre is not regarded as the place for self-exploration where the students are expected to physically collide with the character’s body and explore an alternative way of moving and interacting in space and time.

In addition, I consider that the image of theatre constructed at school also shaped the expectations of students and ultimately, their experiences in drama classes. That is, the lack of viewing the place of drama for self-exploration in the only form of acting at school that students have experienced up to high school might be one reason preventing students from doing so in the high school drama class. For example, rejection and unwillingness toward affective experiences in acting were often heard from students and the “sporty type” students in particular. Reflecting on the practices of performing A Midsummer Night’s Dream, “sporty type” students repeatedly mentioned how acting in drama class is an embarrassing and difficult experience for them. Yosshi described the drama class as the place where he does embarrassing things such as doing unfamiliar things and speaking in a loud voice.

Some of them, such as Ōkubo-kun and Kocchan, said that they consciously chose the role with few lines in the casting process. Kocchan, who was unexpectedly chosen for the main role against his will, said that although it was fun to watch the performance of other students, he never wants to do acting again by himself. Participating in performances at cultural events was seen as a fun thing even for “sporty type” students (Yosshi, Kisshì). However, this was not because of the acting experience itself, but rather because it is “doing something with everyone” for them. In spite of the pedagogical possibility of drama, which invites students to imagine and act a different self, some students, especially most of the “sporty type” students who are
positioned as centered in the peer group relationship, repeatedly narrated their refusal to engage with difference and be open to affective experiences in acting.

“Border crossing of the self,” set as an educational aim in drama class seemed to be diminished by these views of educational practices (the ideas of naturalistic acting and self-expression, less focus on reflection, and the image of gakkō-geki), while several other factors that I illustrated in Chapter 5 (the notions of Japanese identity, of kyara and of “school caste”) also must shape students’ experiences. As both a researcher and an educator, my question is, then, how could interrupt those forces of territorialization, which limit and regulate young people’s possibilities. How could we invite young people to imagine other possibilities of who they could become? How could we pedagogically support them to become different? In short, how can we utilize a drama space to activate this pedagogical potential?

One way to approach this question is to reframe the view of acting influenced by realism or naturalistic acting. To enhance the students’ possibility to experience self-augmentation, I suggest taking an alternative view on acting, what Smith (1993) calls an “other-oriented” acting approach. In this approach, “actors look for the character outside of themselves and build the character from outside in” (Smith, 1993, p. xxvii, italics in original). Acknowledging the difference between the actor and the character, Smith (1993) in this view regards acting or performance as the act of exploring the gap between self and other, not for seeking to be real. In other words, this approach encourages participants to cross and move along the seemingly rigid boundary between self and other, imagining a wide range of “the other” to engage with and enhancing the potentiality of self-experimentation. With this perspective, the students could be encouraged to act out the roles that seemed to be as distant as possible from what they see themselves. As such, “the other” with which students engage includes “the other” which has
been discursively constructed as different from the self and has never been imagined to be engaged with nor to possibly become.

This way of framing acting in drama pedagogy poses another question: what kinds of difference, then, should youth be engaged with at school? In drama class, the images and relations depicted in play scripts directly influence the range of and kinds of difference that students engage with for becoming. Therefore, the question of what text is chosen and what students are able to write for the drama text in class should be considered as the question of what difference the students are meant to engage with for self-exploration in the space. In this light, what differences are not included also becomes an important point to consider.

A good example of what was not included in the drama texts written by the students over the classes that I encountered in this research was the topic of homosexuality. Sexuality in terms of romantic relationships was repeatedly a main theme in drama classes throughout the fieldwork. For instance, it was depicted in scripts such as *Sketches of Daily Lives, A Midsummer Night’s Dream* and the texts of films on the theme of love in the Applied Theatre Expression class. However, homosexuality was absent from all those texts. Maiko, who openly but privately talked about her homosexual relationship to me in an interview, stated that she wrote about a heterosexual relationship in her drama text when students wrote their own texts on the theme of love in class. When I asked the reason, after a pause, she mentioned that she does not know why but she never thought that she would be allowed to write about a homosexual relationship in a drama script. While heterosexuality is prevalent as a theme of the drama text, homosexuality is engaged with only as a joke as we saw in Rui’s vignette. This omission of homosexuality indicates what sexuality students could and could not engage with to form the self at school.

From a different perspective, an imbalance of identity makers related to nationality and ethnicity/race were also found in drama texts in this research. Such differences depicted in the
drama texts were only those related to the context of the United States, and other stories of people around the world such as in other parts of Asia, Africa, the Middle East or South America were not there for students to put them in relation with. In addition, to advance the discussion on the issue of multicultural co-existence in Japan, more significant omissions to consider were those related to difference within the nation such as zainichi, Ainu and Okinawan. As a drama educator and educational researcher, it is important to critically consider what familiar relations are more likely to be chosen and what relations are unconsciously avoided and hence respectively become or do not become what students can engage with in drama class and beyond at school.

In order to expand students’ horizons through acting practices, setting the aim of educational practices directly for the sake of students’ own growth might be another significant point to consider. In other words, acting should be regarded as a direct learning opportunity for students to deepen their understanding of their own current self and who they want to become, by reflecting upon their relation with the role. One way of approaching drama pedagogy in this way could be achieved by having students choose the role to act by themselves based on their desire for what they want to become. Another way of doing this might be for students to act the person whom students have actually encountered in their lives and had a great deal of impact for them. By reflecting on the person and incident with them, students enhance their understanding of the self and the important relationship for them, while keeping the content of the learning close to the sense of the self.

Thirdly, if we consider the place of drama as the place of self-making, I believe that the part of reflecting on the experiences of acting should be emphasized more as an aspect of learning in drama classes. This would become an important learning opportunity for both the performer and the audience. For the performer, the reflection points could be such as what was
their intention in performing as they did, what were the difficult points to perform and what they could have not acted out even if they had wanted to do so. For the audience, the reflection points could be such as what impression they got from the performance, what images and stories provoked them by seeing the performance, and what they want to know more about with regard to both the stories of the role off stage and the process of trying out of acting. Through these reflections, students are able to reflect on their own affective experiences, that is, what unconsciously emerged through performance.

The important point of such reflection is that identity category does not come first to be reflected upon but rather the actual concrete experiences of acting come first. The main reflection point, then, is what was the experience of embodying “the other” by trying to sense the body rhythms of the role through going deep into the world of the role. By doing this, understanding the role and the self with only pre-existing knowledge is meant to be avoided. The identity categories and their respective related ideas are considered later as a possible factor that prevents the student from engaging with the role deeply. Here, for example, the normalizing process through normative discourses such as sexism, homophobia, transphobia and nationalism might be questioned.

For reflection, critically considering what ideas are taken as granted and being aware of the power relations of the positions between an actor and the role are important perspectives. By mobilizing the position of an actor through the practices of acting, drama space could be the place where new forms of relationship emerge, and the previous meanings of identity categories are posed, shifted and expanded. Seeing the place of drama as political, social and cultural space rather than as “politics-free” space, important questions for an educator to keep in mind are, ultimately, if the power relations are reconstructed or disturbed, whether the possibilities to
become different are limited or expanded during the practices. These pedagogical intentions put new possibilities into motion.
Chapter 9: Conclusion

In this dissertation, I explored how affects flow or get stuck in the process of youth’s “self-making” at a school in a cosmopolitan but relatively economically deprived area of Tokyo, Japan, in the early 21st Century. While young people now live in a more diverse and uncertain world, and Japan as a nation is struggling with “multicultural coexistence,” how could the social space of the nation be more interactive and inclusive? Along with the idea of multiple belongings and social solidarities, I explored the ways, if any, in which young people are involved in a radical repositioning or internal transformation in a productive and affirmative manner as well as what ideas prevent those transformations from emerging. Looking at transformations of Japanese youth, I hoped to address the question of what ideas are regarded as “normative” among Japanese youth. By doing this, I was interested in asking the question of how the empowerment of youth can be possible through playful movements of affect during the process of growing up, liberating them from those ideas that were taken as granted.

Following the notion of Braidotti’s “nomadic subjectivities” (1994), I regarded subjectivity as a process of becoming nomad and analyzed how youth could move across boundaries of identity categories and the normative ideas associated with them. Building upon the analysis of textured bodies, I have examined the aspects of movement as qualitative transformations of the body. Through Deleuze and Guattari’s concepts such as “becoming,” “affect,” “territorialization,” and “deterritorialization,” momentary fluctuating affects were traced. Generating an ethnographic account of the lived experiences of youth, I explored how and where affects flow and get stuck, and how particular discourses related to ideas such as kyara and “school caste,” and discourses on categories such as gender, ethnicity, and nationality, were involved in those processes.
Through analyzing youth’s affective or static experiences, my hope was, ultimately, to pose the question of how educators and educational researchers could create the space in which youth can step out from the limitations of their imagination of who they think they could become. How could we make the space of schooling to be more full of joy, excitement, and fulfillment for youth rather than being compressed by feelings of being trapped and lost? I wondered how we could shift the view of what “the place of learning” (Ellsworth, 2005) could be at school, which is an important place for the process of youth growing up.

Having sought patterns of becoming, what I soon found in the field were repeated patterns of being stuck rather than becoming, and how some factors rigidly worked towards territorializing youth’s bodies at school. Through engaging with students’ experiences in their entirety, I was struck by the fact that the experiences of becoming are only a small portion of the total, indicating the experiences of multiple difficulties at school and living in Japan. Then, I began to map the factors that influenced the territorialization of youth’s bodies.

Diving into the fieldwork, I first looked at the pattern of territorialization of youth around the identity categories of nationality and ethnicity. Students were not considering themselves in relation to those categories and the subject positions of nationality and ethnicity never emerged as a point toward which they experienced becoming. These territorializations were taken as granted and the position as a “Japanese” was preserved without experiencing the full embodiment of different ethnicities and nationalities. What is poignant is the fact that these youths’ experiences occurred even at Akane High School, a school that encourages students to become “international” people and promotes international exchange as its unique strength, while there are several international and immigrant students at school.

The deeply-embedded idea of being “Japanese” was taken as granted not through claiming that identity but through not mentioning it. Unpacking power structures and binary
assumptions between centred and marginalized Japanese people, further examination of what constitutes “Japaneseness” (the theme of special issue of *Intercultural/Transcultural Education*, 2005) and the idea of normativity attached to it is critical. I suggest that these critical examinations and the transformation of the boundaries of “Japanese” will be the solid foundations for enhancing “multicultural co-existence” in Japan, which covers not only the issues of nationality and ethnicity but also other issues such as gender and sexuality. It is important to create the space for Japanese youth to be able to experiment with different notions of nationality and ethnicity, which may open up new imaginative relations that transcend national boundaries. I argue that this new imagination leads to critical examination and transformation of relations within the nation.

Another pattern in the movement of affect that I encountered repeatedly throughout the fieldwork was the girls’ desire for masculinities and the boys’ rejections of femininities. While the girls’ desire for masculinities was often silenced and effectively omitted in the class, the boys’ ways of disengaging with femininities were normalized based on the idea that men and women are innately different, reconstructing the traditional gender hierarchy at school and in the nation. It is important to consider, then, how we can support girls’ desire for gender crossing, which might lead to radical disruptions and resistance to the male domination at school and beyond.

Another dominant factor that worked towards territorialization of youth was the notion of *kyara*. This notion sees a person as a fixed individual, limiting other possibilities of becoming, or imagining to become, someone who is beyond this image of their own *kyara*. By demanding youth find their own *kyara*, the idea prevented them from being plural. It is therefore important to examine how to interrupt the current notion of *kyara*. To do so, one approach might be to
conduct further detailed examination of how the notion of *kyara* influences the capacities of bodies in relation to the difference of hierarchical position.

The idea of “school caste” was another factor that territorialized youth’s bodies at school, fixing them into a certain position of hierarchy. While boundaries between the different castes are rigidly drawn, status is considered as a fixed thing. However, the drama space, which students repeatedly mentioned as a place where “individuality” is respected, could be a potential space where rigidly structured hierarchical positions will be mobilized with different pedagogical intentions. Still, what is important to note is that “non-Japanese” students were not even included within the range of hierarchy of “school caste,” denied access to and full participation in the politics of the school community.

Along with these restricted movements, the students’ experiences showed some possibilities for being reworked through diverse aspirations seen in the assemblages of femininities and masculinities. Looking at the intensity of an event, I realized that the events of youth’s momentary affects at school occur around the identity categories of gender, particularly the respective positions of femininities and masculinities. I considered how young girls and boys were entangled within those respective assemblages at school, focusing on the experiences of four girls and four boys. In each vignette, several identity markers were cast with the intersections of different markers: those of femininities included motherhood, “girlie” girl, “gyaru,” “sporty girl,” and “otaku” femininities while those of masculinities included salaryman, normative cool, “otaku,” hegemonic heterosexual, and homosexual masculinities.

Within overall landscapes of femininities and masculinities, I have considered different constellations of possibilities and constraints in each vignette. While affects are singular events with complex and variable intensities, I would like to articulate the noticeable patterns of becoming (or not becoming). One pattern was being stuck in place like Chika and Inoue-kun
who were positioned at the top of the hierarchy but had no chance to change. While Chika was stuck in the “girlie” femininities, Inoue-kun was stuck in the salaryman masculinities. Rui, who performed the character of the gay hairdresser, was another example of being stuck. Positioned lower in the “school caste” and being picked on, Rui remained unmoved within the assemblages of hegemonic heterosexual masculinities. An important point to consider for these experiences is how each student’s different hierarchical status influences this rigidity and these ways of being “stuck.”

Another pattern was the experience of becoming, such as that of Mika, Makoto, and Yuka, who explained their experiences of engaging with difference vividly and fondly. However, listening to those stories, I also found those experiences happened in a very specific context or with compensation. Makoto and Yuka could only act in that drama class where most of the students were those who identified as or were identified as otaku, and Makoto pulled back when the “sporty type” students joined in. Also, Mika’s becoming was accompanied by some compensation, that is, exclusion by and abjection from the “sporty type” students. These experiences of becoming need to be considered further by asking what could make them keep moving in wider contexts and without any compensation.

The final pattern was ambiguous movement, pulled by many competing and at times contradictory impulses. Vibrating with wider ambivalence between “girlie” femininities and motherhood femininities, Maiko settled back into “motherhood” femininities, while her way of becoming different was blocked. Tomo and Risa tried to crush their own desire of becoming who they want to become in order to be accepted more. Seeing himself as an otaku but trying to hide it, Tomo stayed in the middle zone between normative cool masculinities and “otaku” masculinities, while pulled in both directions. Risa was entangled in a complicated, ambivalent assemblages of femininities, simultaneously both pulling away from “girlie” femininities and
being attracted to them. Appearing to find it difficult to either move forward or to move away from where they were, these students were stuck in place without becoming new beings throughout their experiences. I wonder how we could create the space for them to experiment with wider range of themselves at school.

As for these events of becoming or being stuck, one of the important points to consider is whether or not gender hierarchy, which has been utilized in the construction of national identity as a Japanese, was reconstructed or subverted. This question could be approached by asking if hegemonic masculinities or salaryman masculinities have been reconstructed or disturbed. Here, I point out three factors, which might possibly intervene in the current unequal gender relations. The first one is “herbivorous masculinity” or “feminized masculinity” as an oppositional masculinity. However, the question remains as to whether or not these new forms of Japanese masculinities actually disturb gender hierarchy, how if at all is it actually possible to have masculinity that does not need to make femininity subordinated to it? Another factor for the intervention might be the subversive practices of girls’ alternative, oppositional femininities such as “sporty type” (taiikukai-kei; 体育会系) femininities and the “gyaru” femininities. The last possible one is otaku masculinities and femininities, which might bring on a different constellation within gendered and international relations by making new connections among the otaku community beyond national borders.

I believe that these analyses related with the interrelationship among hegemonic and non-hegemonic femininities and masculinities will prove valuable by investigating their relation with the position of “school caste.” “School caste” relates to different subcultural groups such as “top,” “kogyaru,” “ippan,” “otaku,” and “yankii.” More research of affective circulations is needed in relation with “school caste,” which indicates the different hierarchical ranks of
femininities and masculinities by possibly considering how different hierarchical positions relate to different opportunities of becoming.

In addition, further studies are required exploring how femininities and masculinities are enacted with intersections of other categories such as class, sexuality, nationality, and race/ethnicity. For example, one area to pursue is how students’ experiences of becoming will be different in the context of different economical backgrounds within Japan. The research context in this study was a cosmopolitan, but relatively economically deprived, area of Tokyo. Then, how are the experiences of youth in more economically affluent areas of Tokyo or how are those in rural areas, which are experiencing a decrease in population? Also, in the time of increased human mobility and the spread of diverse media, another area to pursue would be how becoming around Japanese femininities and Japanese masculinities is experienced in relation with other kinds of femininities and masculinities such as those of “White,” “Black,” and “Asian.” I suggest that this view in return would increase understanding of how “Japaneseness” operates among Japanese youth as blocking their ways of becoming.

By way of conclusion, I would like to highlight some contributions of this research as well as its possible limitations. First, I believe that one of the contributions of this study relates to the way of approaching analysis of youth’s experiences. Throughout the analysis, I have offered a Deleuzian approach to understanding the affective aspects of youth’s experiences at school. In doing so, I hope to inspire future research that takes up the Deleuzian framework to shed light on the complexities of youth affective experiences at school, which have not been adequately acknowledged.

By examining these processes in the context of Japan, my hope is to broaden underdeveloped existing debates about the issues of diversity, equity, and liberation at school in Japan. Educational reform in Japan has been conducted in the direction of reducing the rigidity,
uniformity, and exam-centeredness of school, especially responding to the series of school-related “problems” such as violence at school (kōnai bōryoku), bullying (ijime), refusal to attend school (futōkō), and classroom breakdown (gakkyū hōkai). For example, “respect for diversity” has been set as an agenda through stress on “individuality” (kosei) and the rise of a similar value, jibun rashisa (being true to oneself), in the discourses of educational reform during the late 1980s and 1990s (Morita, 1995).

As a more recent case, in the governmental educational document known as “Course of Study” that indicates the national curriculum, “communication competence” is articulated as one of the important competences for youth to acquire at school and it is defined in relation to following the idea of respect for diversity and encouraging students to acknowledge different values and backgrounds. However, while stress on “individuality” and its aligned idea of acknowledging “diversity” has been regarded as ideal (at least within education policies), these words in such policies have been also critiqued as being “flowery.” For example, these policies have been criticized by their alliance with a neoliberal agenda driven by business demands and global economic competitiveness, obscuring systematic inequalities and engendering uneven opportunities and constraints within young lives (Kariya, 2001). It is my hope that youth’s perspectives and affective experiences as lived struggles through the Deleuzian framework in this study will promote further debates on the issue of diversity, equity, and liberation at school, particularly in Japan, going beyond the current situation with the artificial slogan for diversity.

In addition, my hope is that my analysis of youth experiences at school in Japan provided some insights to enhance understanding of other contexts elsewhere in the world, especially in a similar setting, such as in those areas that claim cultural homogeneity. Indeed, however, it is also important to carefully explore the relationship between different contexts and its relevance. In this study, I often conducted my analysis in alliance with existing literature in
the context of the West, (e.g., Canada, UK, USA), where youth experiences at school have been explored further. While it is certain that youth studies in different contexts have points to learn from each other, it is also important to keep in mind that the meanings and implications of the experiences shift depending on the context. For example, the question might be what differences and similarities exist between the “tomboy” or the discourses of “Girl Power” in the Western context and the “sporty type” (taiikukai-kei; 体育会系) and “gyaru” in terms of subversion from normative femininities.

The language and its translation should be another issue for the study conducted by weaving together different contexts. To write in the English language about the context of Japan with concepts or terms developed in both “the West” and Japan, I applied multiple translations from English to Japanese and from Japanese to English at every stage of this research: writing up a proposal; explaining my research in the field; asking the students questions; analyzing data; and writing up this dissertation. Throughout this back and forth, I have struggled with conflicts and dilemmas in making sense of the concepts and ideas in an intelligible way and often lost in the gap between, considering what subtle nuances are lost through the translation. The close examination of this process needs to be integrated more in further research, acknowledging that this relates to the issue of colonizing and decolonizing Western knowledge when applied to a different context.

For another area to contribute, I hope that this research also promotes the discussions of the field of drama/theatre education, especially about the perspective of acting as cultural practices in class. Indeed, role-playing has been taken up as an important learning opportunity in the field of drama/theatre education. However, I suggest that this activity could have much more to offer by setting students’ bodies as the central focus of learning experiences and regarding acting as a cultural practice, specifically that of mimesis. Regarding acting as the act of
mobilizing the position of an actor and of exploring the gap between the self and the other, I shed light on the experiences of youth’s “self-making” in class. I call for more research, which examines acting as a testing ground for actual social relations by looking at how young people transform the self through negotiating and trying out new relations with other bodies in the place of drama.

The important pedagogical question related with these practices is: How could we pedagogically interrupt the territorializations of youth that we have seen in this research and invite them to expand their imagination for diverse possibilities of who they could become? In drama class, youth engage with the wide range of images through imaginative practices and conduct performance in interactive, dynamic social spaces. Through designing class activities to let diverse crossing points emerge, and seriously, persistently, and passionately reflecting on those experiences together, the normalizing process and the normalized ideas of each subject position could be posed and shifted. I hope that this research provided some insights on these ideas of drama pedagogy in order to open up new possibilities and even set some into motion.

In the context of Japan, where drama/theatre education has been more scarcely acknowledged, I believe that these perspectives of drama/theatre education have a lot to offer to the field of education. The major form of theatre at an educational setting in Japan, Gakkō-geki, has not been regarded as a place where the students make their own selves with the dialogue with “the other” in the text, on a stage, and as the audience. Over the past decade, however, theatre as an educational practice has been re-evaluated for its effectiveness as a possible model of “participatory” learning or “active learning” in Japan (Neelands & Watanabe, 2010; J. Watanabe, 2001). The fundamental educational philosophy of those is based on the perspective known as the “new view of academic achievement” (atarashii gakuryokukan), which emphasizes student interest and motivation (kyōmi, kanshin, iyoku).
More recently, drama pedagogy has been specifically applied in practice to develop students’ communicative competence and ability of self-expression (Hirata & Rengyo, 2009), and research on this topic is gradually being conducted (Takao, 2009; Taniguchi, 2012). With an insight that sheds light on the aspects of affective experiences of acting in drama/theatre class, I hope that this dissertation contributes to provide another way of framing the meaning of educational theatre in Japan, especially for enhancing the discussion of the drama class as a place of self-making in a more liberating way.

I also address some methodological considerations. First, I need to remark on the issue of methods for this research. In this study, as a strategy to ask the question of how the mainstream subject positions can be transformed, I looked at the place of drama, which is potentially full of affects and imagination for crossing borders. However, as I showed, the experiences of becoming that were observed were only a small portion of the total. Along with being a pedagogical issue, this might be partially a methodological issue as well, and it needs to be further examined in future research. What more could I have done in terms of asking the specific questions for journal writing and the interviews, selecting the class and the field, and conducting my educational practices, or what could I have done differently? This question must relate to the question of what could be the further strategy to ask the experiences of transformation where the idea of normativity rigidly operates and the belief of cultural homogeneity is still prevalent?

This strategy of looking at the place of drama poses another question. That is, how legitimate is the connection between the experiences of drama and daily lives? I started this research with the assumption that the place of drama can act as a window to shed light on broader experiences at school and beyond. However, how valid is this assumption and how often do the experiences of drama exist only in the place of the drama? In other words, how are
Makoto’s experiences of becoming, for example, different from the idea that he was just a better actor with good acting skills? In the case of Makoto, I could trace the connection of his experiences between drama class and daily life by listening to how he talked about his own relation with “the other,” recognizing the issue of zainichi and of other kinds of discrimination in Japan. Detecting his intention and passion to overcome the difference, I could sense his awareness and openness when compared with other students, with whom these issues did not even come up in the course of the interview. However, this question of applicability still remains and there is a need for further exploration in the future.

I need to indicate the peculiarity and limitation of this study by addressing who the participants were in this study. Soon after I began the fieldwork, I realized that the majority of the participants in this study were those who belonged to the theatre club or identified themselves as otaku. For example, Nijiho stated that students in Foundations of Theatre Expression are “like a gathering of the otaku of the grade.” Also, asking me if I look at other classes for my research, Toshi suggested that I should consider lunchtime for further observation. He stated that lunchtime is good to observe the dynamic of the students of the whole school, implying that it is somehow different from the dynamic of the students in drama classes. Considering this, we need to note that the experiences that I showed in this dissertation are firmly bound up with the experiences of the students positioned in a particular way. I call for further studies, which go beyond the scope of the participants in the drama classes that I observed in this project.

In addition, in comparison with the space of their homeroom, that of drama class was often described as a unique space with different kinds of activities and different hierarchical order of “school caste.” This peculiarity should be an important point to be considered in terms of the idea that drama space is not only the window to shed light on daily lives but could be a
productive space with the potential to transform daily lives. Both of these aspects of drama space and the relation between the spaces needs to be further explored in detail.

Other possible issues to consider are related to the question of how I could have been more responsible for the “cuts” and “connections” when I mapped the relations in the field in which I was always entangled. For mapping the relations, I did not ask students at the beginning with what identity category they identify. Instead, I asked them about themselves in broader way such as “how do you introduce yourself?” and by asking them to describe themselves, including their hobbies, dreams, friendships, and their lives at school and beyond. It was actually my intention not to frame students with predetermined categories since my focus of analysis was about the movement of affect with the assumption that the grid of positions emerge retrospectively. With specific identity categories in mind, I was afraid to fix and limit my way of seeing and engaging with each student.

However, this avoidance possibly led me to fail to catch the possible links that I could have noticed otherwise as well. For example, knowing that Mika used the masculine first person pronouns such as ore and boku, I narrated the story of Mika as a girl, who prefers to be more masculine rather than considering this usage of male language as a practice of transgender identity. With my lack of “affective capacities” to sense this possibility, this might be understood as my participation of heterosexism. Although Mika’s case was one peculiar case and at other times, the grid of identity category emerged in a more distinct way, the linkage that I showed in this study was generated along with my “affective capacities” and my way of being entangled in the field. These should be open for other ways of interpretation.

As such, my hope is that the narratives that I crafted in this dissertation are not regarded as fixed within a closed system, but are read with an openness that inspires reflection. Considering narrative as an opportunity offering us rich insights into how affects are intertwined
in multifarious and complex ways, I have tried to show the analysis of the practices as a singular event in a specific context. However, how to “use theory to think with [the] data (or use data to think with theory)” (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012, p. vii, italics in original) is a continuing process. Affects and related meanings will always stay on the move in the threshold when they encounter new readers. I hope that the vignettes in this dissertation will open up discussion on how the school could be the place to invite the experiences of experimenting with the self and relations toward transformation.

Aiming at making school a place of vitality rather than seeing students become stuck with dulled feelings, my hope is that this study contributes towards posing some questions of how young people could make the self, rupturing territorialized subjectivity and opening up new possibilities. Engaging with young people, however, not only deepened my understanding of how they grow up at a school in Japan, but also brought powerful, transformative experiences for myself. Tracing their delicate, passionate aspirations and real struggles, it was I who became different as an educator and researcher to imagine the future differently with a real lesson. As a Japanese female scholar trained in North America, my experiences of becoming through this journey are now the foundation upon which I ask myself where I am going with these studies and experiences, to whom I speak, and for whose benefit I conduct my research, exploring the various contexts to build relations beyond difference, looking toward a new future.
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Appendices

Appendix A – Consent Form for Administrative

Letter for Administrative Consent

Dear __________________________,

I am writing to ask for your administrative consent, as a representative of (name of high school), in order to conduct my project at (the name of class). This study is titled, *Performing the self: Japanese youth and schooling*. The purpose of this study is to examine how Japanese youth self-construction at school, that is, the process by which young people’s subjectivities are produced as being in relation with both actual and imagined others. This research project will help me fulfill my dissertation requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto.

This project will be conducted between November 2009 to July 2010. Before beginning my research, I will recruit the student participants in the drama classrooms whose classroom teachers have already informally permitted me to conduct my research. I will introduce students my research, explaining my research’s aims and goals, and the kind of activities which will be involved in the research. While distributing informed consent, I will look for voulunteer participants.

The research will include five kinds of methods, 1) participant observation, 2) journal writing, 3) portfolio-collage, 4) interviews with students and teachers; and 5) documents and materials of the school. When conducting participant observation, I will visit the class one or two times each week during the drama class. I will participate in some of the classroom activities whenever possible. Some classroom discussion will be audiotaped. Journal writing will be employed to access the students’ reflective thoughts about themselves and their classroom practices. I will ask the students to free-write reflections to share their thoughts about the classroom experiences at the end of the classroom. As part of classroom activities, students will be invited to create portfolios and make their own collages. Some of the classroom performances will be recorded and be reflected upon. Students will be asked to participate in in-depth interviews one to three times. Interviews will be recorded with a digital recorder with the permission from students and later transcribed by myself. I will examine documents such as the mission statement of the school, policy documents and curriculum. I will also interview teachers in order to get to know their teaching philosophy, the history and development of the drama class, the relation of teachers to the school, and the teachers’ professional trajectory.

The participation is completely voluntary. Participants have the freedom to withdraw at any time for any reason and to decide which activities they are willing to participate. If participants choose to withdraw from the project, they will be asked if they want any data acquired from them to be destroyed. After their withdrawal, they do not need to participate in any activities, which happen only for research purposes such as interview and journal writing. As to the activities, which occur as part of class activities such as group discussion with video and collage, they will be regarded only as students not as research participants, and the data related with them will not be used.
All participants, affiliated institutions, any information provided in this study will be given pseudonyms to ensure their anonymity. Participants will also be given the option of choosing their pseudonyms. Generic descriptors (e.g., gender, sexuality, ethnicity) will be used towards any details that may identify who individuals are. The participant will also be given the opportunity to discuss deleting the particular data if particular disclosures by said participant are too sensitive to be known by anyone aside from myself and my faculty supervisor(s). Myself, my faculty supervisor(s) and the respective participants will be the sole individuals to access the entirety (sans pseudonyms and generic descriptors) of the data. The data will not be shared with the participants’ classroom teachers, unless they disclose that they are in imminent danger of harm.

All data collected from the project including written records and video/audio recordings will be stored on my laptop computer throughout the data collection and analyzing data. Back up files for the data will be also secured at my own house, which cannot be publicly accessed. Thereafter, the data will be in the possession for an indefinite period of time under the responsibility of the principal researcher, and might be re-analyzed for subsequent projects/documents. However, if the participants wish to have the data derived from their participation destroyed, it will be done so.

The school will be provided with a 1 to 2 page report about the research’s findings written in Japanese. If applicable, I will propose a presentation of a research founding to the participants. The research outcomes will be presented as a public document, a dissertation and, can be readily accessed as such at the OISE/UT Library. If you are interested in reading the paper, please inform me and I will send it to you via e-mail.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this research project, please do not hesitate to contact me either by phone or by email. You may also contact my thesis supervisor, Professor Douglas McDougall. Regarding your rights as a participant in this project, you may also contact the University of Toronto Ethics Review Office. If you permit me to conduct this study, please read the consent form, sign and date the second copy, and then return the second copy to me.

Thank you very much for your help.
Yours sincerely,
Investigator
Yuko Kawashima, PhD Candidate, 
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto
ykawashima@oise.utoronto.ca
080-4213-4322

Thesis Supervisor
Professor Douglas McDougall
OISE/UT, 252 Bloor St. West Toronto, ON M5S 1V6 CANADA
dmcdougall@oise.utoronto.ca
1-416-978-0056

University of Toronto Research Ethics Office
McMurrich Building, 3rd floor 12 Queen's Park Crescent West Toronto, ON M5S 1S8 CANADA
Administrative Consent Form

I have read the letter provided to me by Yuko Kawashima concerning the research project, *Performing the self: Japanese youth and schooling*. I acknowledge that the topic of this research has been explained to me and that any questions that I have asked has been answered to my satisfaction. I agree to have the research project at my school.

Name (printed): ___________________________________________________

Signature: __________________________________________________________

Date: _____________________________________________________________

Investigator
Yuko Kawashima, PhD Candidate,
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto
ykawashima@oise.utoronto.ca
080-4213-4322
Letter for Administrative Consent (in Japanese)

研究参加案内

私たちは、現在、トロント大学オンタリオ教育研究所の博士課程に在籍している川島裕子と申します。指導教官であるダグラス・マクドーガル教授の指導の下、教育学研究に従事しています。この度、博士論文執筆に際しまして、貴校「授業名」の授業にて、授業を受講している学生を対象に研究を実施させていただきたいと思っております。それにつきまして（高校名）長であられる（校長名）様に研究活動の許可を頂きたく思います。私の研究は「揺れ動く身体と自己の境界形成：日本の若者と学校教育」（仮）と題されるものです。研究目的は、日本の若者の学校における自己形成、中でも、実際の、また想像上の他者との関係性の中で、どのように若者の主観性が形成されるかという過程を分析することです。

本研究は 2009 年 11 月から 2010 年 7 月までを予定しています。研究実施につきまして、本研究への参加に同意してくださっている先生方のドラマの授業にて、学生の参加者を募ります。研究の詳細を記した同意書を配らせていただき、学生に本研究の趣旨や活動内容を説明いたします。同意が取れた後からが、公式な研究への参加となります。

本研究は、5 種類の方法 1) 授業観察、2) ジャーナルライティング、3) ポートフォリオーコラージュ、4) 学生と教師へのインタビュー、5) 文献分析、を用いたものです。

授業観察期間の間、ドラマの授業やそれに関わる活動の見学に週に一度から二度、教室を訪問する予定であります。可能な範囲で授業活動への参加を考えています。授業内の議論を音声録音することがあります。ジャーナルライティングは、自身や授業活動についての学生の内省的な思いを知るために用いられます。それらは各授業の最後に行なわれます。授業活動の一環として、学生はポートフォリオやコラージュ作りを行ないます。授業内のパフォーマンスは、時々ビデオ録画され、振り返りの材料として用いられます。学生は、一回から三回のインタビューに招待されます。学校の教育目標、カリキュラム等の文書を分析いたします。また、教師の教授哲学、ドラマの授業の発展について先生方にインタビューを行ないます。インタビューは、参加者の同意を得た上で音声録音され、後に書き起こされます。

学生は、本研究への参加義務はなく、本研究に関わる活動への参加をいつ、どのような理由であっても拒否することができます。途中で参加を辞退する場合、以前に収集されたデータの削除を望むかどうか伺います。辞退後は、研究目的のみで行なわれるインタビューやジャーナルライティングに参加する必要はありません。ビデオやコラージュを用いたグループディスカッションへの参加は、研究参加者としてではなく生徒としての参加になり、彼らに関するデータは研究に使用されません。
参加者の氏名や学校名等の本研究で提供する情報は、匿名性を確保するため、全て変更されて提示されます。研究参加者は、自分の仮名を選択することができます。参加者を特定しうる詳細な情報は、性別や民族性などの一般的な描写が用いられます。匿名や一般的説明を用いないデータは、私と指導教官が唯一接触する人物です。私と指導教官以外の人には知られない敏感なデータについては、削除するかどうかを研究参加者と話し合う場を設けます。データは、研究参加者が緊急性のある危険な状態にある場合をのぞき、教師に公表されません。

本研究によって収集されたビデオ、音声録画、書面状のデータは、データ収集と分析期間中、私のラップトップ型のパソコンにより保管されます。予備用のデータファイルは、私と互換されない私の家で保管されます。その後、データは、研究者の責任のもと無期限に研究者が所有し、付随するプロジェクトや文書のために再分析される可能性があります。しかしながら、研究者参加者がデータの破損を望む場合は、それに従います。

研究結果は、1から2ページの日本語で書かれたレポートとして貴校にお送りする予定です。研究結果を参加者へ直接発表することも可能です。研究結果は、博士論文という公的な書類として提出され、OISE/UTの図書館等から閲覧することができます。ご興味がおありの場合は、教えていただければe-mailにて送らせていただきます。研究結果は、学術学会での研究発表や、学術雑誌への論文投稿に用いられる予定でいます。

本研究に関して質問やお気づきの点がありましたら、私、もしくは指導教官である、Douglas McDougall教授まで、電話かe-mailにて連絡ください。研究参加者としての権利に関しては、トロント大学倫理委員会へ問い合わせいただくことも可能です。本研究を、貴校で行なうことを承諾していただけるようでしたら、添付の同意書に日付とご署名をいただき、私まで返却してください。それでは、どうぞよろしくお願いいたします。

研究者
川島裕子 博士課程
トロント大学オンタリオ教育研究所
ykawashima@oise.utoronto.ca
080-4213-4322
指導教官
Douglas McDougall （ダグラス・マクドーガル）教授
OISE/UT, 252 Bloor St. West Toronto, ON M5S 1V6 CANADA
dmdougall@oise.utoronto.ca
1-416-978-0056

University of Toronto Research Ethics Office（トロント大学倫理委員会）
McMurrich Building, 3rd floor 12 Queen's Park Crescent West Toronto, ON M5S 1S8 CANADA
ethics.review@utoronto.ca
1-416-946-3273
ファックス: 1-416-946-5763
私は、研究プロジェクト「揺れ動く身体と自己の境界形成：日本の若者と学校教育」に関する川島裕子によって書かれた研究案内書を読みました。研究題目や研究方法は十分に説明され、特に疑問な点はありません。私は、本校でこの研究プロジェクトが実施されることに同意します。

氏名: ___________________________________________________

ご署名: _________________________________________________

日付: ________________________________

研究者
川島裕子 博士課程
トロント大学オンタリオ教育研究所
ykawashima@oise.utoronto.ca
080-4213-4322
Appendix B – Consent Form for Teacher

Information Letter for Teacher

Dear ____________________,

I am writing to ask for your consent in order to conduct my project at your class, (the name of class). This study is titled, *Performing the self: Japanese youth and schooling*. The purpose of this study is to examine how Japanese youth self-construction at school, that is, the process by which young people’s subjectivities are produced as being in relation with both actual and imagined others. This research project will help me fulfill my dissertation requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto.

This project will be conducted between November 2009 to July 2010. Before beginning my research, I will recruit the student participants in your classrooms. I will introduce students my research, explaining my research’s aims and goals, and the kind of activities, which involve in the research. While distributing informed consent, I will ask volunteer for participations.

The research will include five kinds of methods, 1) participant observation, 2) journal writing, 3) portfolio-collage, 4) interviews with students and teachers; and 5) documents and materials of the school. During conducting participant observations, I will visit your class one or two times each week. I will participate in some of the classroom activities whenever possible. Some classroom discussion will be audiotaped. Journal writing will be employed to access the students’ reflective thoughts about themselves and their classroom practices. I will ask your students to free-write reflections to share their thoughts about the classroom experiences at the end of the classroom. As part of class activities, your students will be invited to create portfolios and make their own collages. Some of the classroom performances will be recorded and be reflected upon. Your students will be asked to participate in in-depth interviews one to three times. I will examine documents such as the mission statement of the school, policy documents and curriculum. I will also interview you in order to get to know your teaching philosophy, the history and development of the drama class, your relation to the school, and your professional trajectory. Interviews will be recorded with a digital recorder with the permission from you and later transcribed by myself.

The participation is completely voluntary. You and your students have the freedom to withdraw at any time for any reason and to decide which activities they are willing to participate in. If you and your students choose to withdraw from the project, you and your students will be asked if any data acquired from them should be destroyed.

All participants, affiliated institutions, any information provided in this study will be given pseudonyms to ensure their anonymity. Participants will also be given the option of choosing their pseudonyms. Generic descriptors (e.g., gender, sexuality, ethnicity) will be used towards any details that may identify who individuals are. The participant will also be given the opportunity to discuss deleting the particular data if particular disclosures by said participant are too sensitive to be known by anyone aside from myself and my faculty supervisor(s). Myself, my faculty supervisor(s) and the respective participants will be the sole individuals to access the entirety (sans pseudonyms and generic descriptors) of the data. The data will not be shared with
the participants’ classroom teachers, unless they disclose that they are in imminent danger of harm.

All data collected from the project including written records and video/audio recordings will be stored on my laptop computer throughout the data collection and analyzing data. Backup files for the data will be also secured at my own house, which cannot be publicly accessed. Thereafter, the data will be in the possession for an indefinite period of time under the responsibility of the principal researcher, and might be re-analyzed for subsequent projects/documents. However, if the participants wish to have the data derived from their participation destroyed, it will be done so.

The school will be provided with a 1 to 2 page report about the research’s findings written in Japanese. If applicable, I will propose a presentation of a research founding to the participants. The research outcomes will be presented as a public document, a dissertation and, can be readily accessed as such at the OISE/UT Library. If you are interested in reading the paper, please inform me and I will send it to you via e-mail.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this research project, please do not hesitate to contact me either by phone or by email. You may also contact my thesis supervisor, Professor Douglas McDougall. Regarding your rights as a participant in this project, you may also contact the University of Toronto Ethics Review Office. If you permit me to conduct this study, please read the consent form, sign and date the second copy, and then return the second copy to me.

Thank you very much for your help.
Yours sincerely,

Investigator
Yuko Kawashima, PhD Candidate,
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto
ykawashima@oise.utoronto.ca
080-4213-4322

Thesis Supervisor
Professor Douglas McDougall
OISE/UT, 252 Bloor St. West Toronto, ON M5S 1V6 CANADA
dmdougall@oise.utoronto.ca
1-416-978-0056

University of Toronto Research Ethics Office
McMurrich Building, 3rd floor 12 Queen's Park Crescent West Toronto, ON M5S 1S8 CANADA
ethics.review@utoronto.ca
1-416-946-3273
Fax: 416-946-5763
Teacher Consent Form

I have read the letter provided to me by Yuko Kawashima concerning the research project, *Performing the self: Japanese youth and schooling*. I acknowledge that the topic of this research has been explained to me and that any questions that I might have been answered to my satisfaction. I agree to participate in the research project.

Name (printed): ___________________________________________________

Signature: _______________________________________________________

Date: ___________________________________________________________

Investigator
Yuko Kawashima, PhD Candidate,
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto
ykawashima@oise.utoronto.ca
080-4213-4322
Information Letter for Teacher (in Japanese)

研究参加案内

私は、現在、トロント大学オンタリオ教育研究所の博士課程に在籍している、川島裕子と申します。指導教官であるダグラス・マクドーガル教授の指導の下、教育学研究に従事しています。この度、博士論文執筆に際しまして、「授業名」の授業にて、授業を受講している学生を対象に研究を実施させていただきたく思っております。私の研究は「揺れ動く身体と自己の境界形成：日本の若者と学校教育」（仮）と題されるものです。研究目的は、日本の若者の学校における自己形成、中でも、実際の、また想像上の他者との関係性の中で、どのように若者の主観性が形成されるかという過程を分析することです。

本研究は2009年11月から2010年7月までを予定しています。研究実施につきまして、「授業名」の授業にて学生の参加者を募ります。研究の詳細を記した同意書を配らせていただき、学生に本研究の趣旨や活動内容を説明いたします。同意が取れた後からが、公式な研究への参加となります。

本研究は、5種類の方法1)授業観察、2)ジャーナルライティング、3)ポートフォリオーコラージュ、4)学生と教師へのインタビュー、5)文献分析、を用いたものです。

授業観察期間の間、ドラマの授業やそれに関わる活動の見学に週に一度から二度、教室を訪問する予定でいます。可能な範囲で授業活動への参加を考えています。授業内の議論を音声録音することがあります。ジャーナルライティングは、自身や授業活動についての学生の内省的な思いを知るために用いられます。それらは各授業の最後に行なわれます。授業活動の一環として、学生はポートフォリオやコラージュ作りを行ないます。授業内のパフォーマンスは、時々ビデオ録画され、振り返りの材料として用いられます。学生は、一回から三回のインタビューに招待されます。学校の教育目標、カリキュラム等の文書を分析いたします。また、教師の教授哲学、ドラマの授業の発展についてインタビューへの参加をお願いいたします。インタビューは、参加者の同意を得た上で音声録音され、後に書き起こされます。

研究参加者は、本研究への参加義務はなく、本研究に関わる活動への参加をいつ、どのような理由であっても拒否することができます。途中で参加を辞退する場合、以前に収集されたデータの削除を望むかどうか伺います。

参加者の氏名や学校名等の本研究で提供する情報は、匿名性を確保するため、全て変更されて提示されます。研究参加者は、自分の仮名を選択することができます。参加者を特定しうる詳細な情報は、性別や民族性などの一般的な描写が用いられます。匿名や一般的な説明を用いないデータは、私と指導教官が唯一接触する人物です。私と指導教官以外の人に知られることに抵抗がある敏感なデータについては、削除するかど
うかを研究参加者と話し合う場を設けます。データは、研究参加者が緊急性のある危険な状態にある場合をのぞき、教師に公表されません。

本研究によって収集されたビデオ、音声録画、書面状のデータは、データ収集と分析期間中、私のラップトップ型のパソコンにより保管されます。予備用のデータファイルは、公的に接触されない私の家にて保管されます。その後、データは、研究者の責任のもと無期限に研究者が所有し、付随するプロジェクトや文書のために再分析される可能性があります。しかしながら、研究者参加者がデータの破損を望む場合は、それに従います。

研究結果は、1から2ページの日本語で書かれたレポートとして貴校にお送りする予定です。研究結果を参加者へ直接発表することも可能です。研究結果は、博士論文という公的な書類として提出され、OISE/UTの図書館等から閲覧することができます。ご興味がおありの場合は、教えていただければe-mailにて送らせていただきます。研究結果は、学術学会での研究発表や、学術雑誌への論文投稿に用いられる予定でいます。

本研究に関して質問やお気づきの点がありましたら、私、もしくは指導教官である、Douglas McDougall教授まで、電話かe-mailにて連絡ください。研究参加者としての権利に関しては、トロント大学倫理委員会へ問い合わせていただくことも可能です。本研究への参加を承諾していただけるようでしたら、添付の同意書に日付とご署名をいただき、私まで返却してください。それでは、どうぞよろしくお願いいたします。

研究者
川島裕子 博士課程
トロント大学オンタリオ教育研究所
ykawashima@oise.utoronto.ca
080-4213-4322

指導教官
Douglas McDougall （ダグラス マクドーガル）教授
OISE/UT, 252 Bloor St. West Toronto, ON M5S 1V6 CANADA
dmcdougall@oise.utoronto.ca
1-416-978-0056

University of Toronto Research Ethics Office（トロント大学倫理委員会）
McMurrich Building, 3rd floor 12 Queen's Park Crescent West Toronto, ON M5S 1S8 CANADA
ethics.review@utoronto.ca
1-416-946-3273
ファックス: 1-416-946-5763
研究同意書

私は、研究プロジェクト「揺れ動く身体と自己の境界形成：日本の若者と学校教育」に関する川島裕子によって書かれた研究案内書を読みました。研究題目や研究方法は十分に説明され、特に疑問な点はありません。私は、この研究プロジェクトに参加することに同意します。

氏名: ___________________________________________________

ご署名: _________________________________________________

日付: _____________________________________________

研究者
川島裕子 博士課程
トロント大学オンタリオ教育研究所
ykawashima@oise.utoronto.ca
080-4213-4322
## Appendix C – List of Classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class name</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Teacher name</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expression</td>
<td>Third term</td>
<td>Myself</td>
<td>Jan., 2010 – Mar., 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Theatre Expression</td>
<td>First term</td>
<td>Ms. Sayaka</td>
<td>Apr., 2010 – Jul., 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second term</td>
<td>Ms. Furuta</td>
<td>Sep., 2010 – Dec., 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations of Theatre</td>
<td>First term</td>
<td>Matsuda-sensei</td>
<td>Apr., 2010 – Jul., 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Takako</td>
<td>Apr., 2010 – Dec., 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix D – Students in Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Foundations of Theatre Expression</th>
<th>Applied Theatre Expression</th>
<th>Foundations of Theatre Theory</th>
<th>Applied Theatre Theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second term</td>
<td>Third term</td>
<td>First term</td>
<td>Second term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomo</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chika</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toshi</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rui</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risa</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mika</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makoto</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuji</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maiko</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nijihio</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuka</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inoue-kun</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okawa-kun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kishi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kocchan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yosshi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fumiya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kokoro-chan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiromi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayoko</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōkubo-kun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaname</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumadakun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kisshi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomofumi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamiya-kun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miyuki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aiko</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harumi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E – Consent Form for Students

Information Letter for the Students

Dear _______________________,

This research is to examine how Japanese youth self-construct themselves at school, that is, the process by which young people’s subjectivities are produced as beings in relation with both actual and imagined others, and to what extent does the school, particularly the drama classroom support young people’s complex ways of becoming. This study is titled, Performing the self: Japanese youth and schooling. This research project will fulfill dissertation requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto.

This project will be conducted between November 2009 to July 2010. I would like to invite you to participate in my project. If you agree to participate in this project, you will be involved in two kinds of activities in addition to classroom activities: 1) journal writing, 2) interviews. For journal writing, I will ask you to reflect your thoughts about yourself and your classroom practices. I will ask you to write reflections about the classroom experiences at the end of the class. You will also be asked to participate in in-depth interviews one to three times. Interviews will be recorded with a digital recorder with the permission from you and later transcribed by myself. Some classroom discussion will be audiotaped.

The participation is completely voluntary. You have the freedom to withdraw at any time for any reason and to decide which activities they are willing to participate. If you choose to withdraw from the project, you will be asked if any data acquired wants me to be destroyed. I will not use your name or anything else that might identify you in the written work. The finding of this research will be disseminated through publications and conference presentations. If you are interested in knowing the result, you will be provided with a 1 to 2 page report about the research’s findings written in Japanese.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this research project, please do not hesitate to contact me either by phone or by email. You may also contact my thesis supervisor, Professor Douglas McDougall. Regarding your rights as a participant in this project, you may also contact the University of Toronto Ethics Review Office. If you agree to my conducting this study, please read the consent form, sign and date the second copy, and then return the second copy to me.

Thank you very much for your help.
Yours sincerely,

Investigator
Yuko Kawashima, PhD Candidate,
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto
ykawashima@oise.utoronto.ca
080-4213-4322

Thesis Supervisor
Professor Douglas McDougall  
OISE/UT, 252 Bloor St. West Toronto, ON M5S 1V6 CANADA  
dmcdougall@oise.utoronto.ca  
1-416-978-0056 

University of Toronto Research Ethics Office  
McMurrich Building, 3rd floor 12 Queen's Park Crescent West Toronto, ON M5S 1S8  
CANADA  
ethics.review@utoronto.ca  
1-416-946-3273  
Fax: 416-946-5763
Student Consent Form

I have read the letter provided to me by Yuko Kawashima, concerning the research project, *Performing the self: Japanese youth and schooling*. I acknowledge that the topic of this research has been explained to me and that any questions that I might have are answered to my satisfaction. I agree to participate in the research project.

Name (printed): ________________________________________________

Signature: ____________________________________________________

Date: _______________________________________________________

Investigator
Yuko Kawashima, PhD Candidate,
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto
ykawashima@oise.utoronto.ca
080-4213-4322
Information Letter for the Students (in Japanese)

研究参加案内

私の研究は、日本の若者の学校における自己形成、特に、実際のまた想像上の他者との関係性の中で、どのように若者が主観性を形成するかという過程を分析することを目的としたものです。私の研究は「揺れ動く身体と自己の境界形成：日本の若者と学校教育」（仮）と題されるものです。この研究は、トロント大学オンタリオ教育研究所に提出する博士論文執筆のための研究です。

現在、この研究へのできるだけ多くの参加者を探しています。本研究は2009年11月から2010年7月までを予定しています。この研究に参加すると、授業活動以外に2種類の活動1)ジャーナルライティング、2)インタビューへの参加が依頼されます。ジャーナルライティングでは、自分自身や授業活動についての振り返りを行ないます。それらは各授業の最後に行なわれます。また、一回から三回のインタビューへの参加に招待されます。インタビューは、同意を得た上で音声録音され、後に書き起こされます。授業内の議論を音声録音することがあります。

研究参加者は、本研究への参加義務はなく、本研究に関わる活動への参加をいつ、どのような理由であっても拒否することができます。途中で参加を辞退する場合、以前に収集されたデータの削除を望むかどうか伺います。参加者の氏名や学校名等の本研究で提供する情報は、匿名性を確保するため、全て変更されて提示されます。研究参加者は、自分の仮名を選択することができます。研究結果は、学会発表や、学術雑誌への論文投稿に用いられる予定です。研究結果は、希望者に1から2ページの日本語のレポートをお送りする予定です。

本研究に関して質問や気づいた点があった場合は、もしくは指導教官であるDouglas McDougall教授まで、電話かe-mailにて連絡ください。研究参加者としての権利に関しては、トロント大学倫理委員会への問い合わせも可能です。本研究への参加に同意してもらえる場合は、添付の同意書に日付とご署名をして、私まで返却してください。それでは、どうぞよろしくお願いいたします。

研究者
川島裕子 博士課程
トロント大学オンタリオ教育研究所
ykawashima@oise.utoronto.ca
080-4213-4322

指導教官
Douglas McDougall（ダグラス マクドーガル）教授
OISE/UT, 252 Bloor St. West Toronto, ON M5S 1V6 CANADA
dmcdougall@oise.utoronto.ca
1-416-978-0056
University of Toronto Research Ethics Office (トロント大学倫理委員会)
McMurrich Building, 3rd floor 12 Queen's Park Crescent West Toronto, ON M5S 1S8
CANADA ethics.review@utoronto.ca
1-416-946-3273
ファックス: 1-416-946-5763
私は、研究プロジェクト「揺れ動く身体と自己の境界形成: 日本の若者と学校教育」に関する川島裕子によって書かれた研究案内書を読みました。研究題目や研究方法は十分に説明され、特に疑問な点はありません。私は、この研究プロジェクトに参加することに同意します。

氏名: ___________________________________________________

ご署名: _________________________________________________

日付: ________________________________________________

研究者
川島裕子 博士課程
トロント大学オンタリオ教育研究所
ykawashima@oise.utoronto.ca
080-4213-4322
Appendix F – Consent Form for Parents

Information Letter for the Parents

Dear __________________________,

I am writing to ask for your agreement to allow your son/daughter to participate in my research project. This study is titled *Performing the self: Japanese youth and schooling*. The purpose of this study is to examine how Japanese youth construct themselves at school, that is, the process by which young people’s subjectivities are produced as beings in relation with both actual and imagined others, and to what extent does the school, particularly the drama classroom support young people’s complex ways of becoming. This research project will fulfill dissertation requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto.

This project will be conducted between November 2009 to July 2010. Three kinds of activities are involved: 1) participant observation, 2) journal writing, 3) interviews with students. With the permission from your son/daughter, I will audio-record interviews and some of classroom activities, and videotape some of classroom performances. The participation is completely voluntary. Your son/daughter has the freedom to withdraw at any time for any reason and to decide which activities they are willing to participate. All participants, affiliated institutions, any information provided in this study will be given pseudonyms to ensure their anonymity. The finding of this research will be disseminated through publications and conference presentations.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this research project, please do not hesitate to contact me either by phone or by email. You may also contact my thesis supervisor, Professor Douglas McDougall. Regarding your rights as a participant in this project, you may also contact the University of Toronto Ethics Review Office. If you agree to have your son/daughter participate in my study, please sign and date the second copy of the attached consent form, and return it to me.

Thank you very much for your help.
Yours sincerely,

Investigator
Yuko Kawashima, PhD Candidate,
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto
ykawashima@oise.utoronto.ca
080-4213-4322

Thesis Supervisor
Professor Douglas McDougall
OISE/UT, 252 Bloor St. West Toronto, ON M5S 1V6 CANADA
dmcdougall@oise.utoronto.ca
1-416-978-0056

University of Toronto Research Ethics Office
Parental Consent Form

I have read the letter provided to me by Yuko Kawashima, concerning the research project, *Performing the self: Japanese youth and schooling*. I understood the conditions under which my son/daughter will participate in this study and allow my son/daughter (Name: __________________________________________________) to participate in this study.

Name (printed): ______________________________________________________

Signature: ___________________________________________________________

Date: ______________________________________________________________

Investigator
Yuko Kawashima, PhD Candidate,
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto
ykawashima@oise.utoronto.ca
080-4213-4322
情報信表

保護者各位

私は、現在、トロント大学オンタリオ教育研究所の博士課程に在籍している、川島裕子と申します。指導教官であるダグラス・マクドーガル教授の指導の下、教育学研究に従事しています。この度、博士論文執筆に際しまして、「授業名」の授業にて、授業を受講している学生を対象に研究を実施させていただきたく思っております。それにつきまして、生徒さんの保護者の皆様から、お子さんを私の研究に参加させて頂くことの許可を頂きたく思っています。私の研究は、日本の若者の学校における自己形成、特に、実際のまた想像上の他者との関係性の中で、どのように若者が主観性を形成するかという過程を分析することを目的としたものです。私の研究は「揺れ動く身体と自己の境界形成：日本の若者と学校教育」（仮）と題されるものです。

本研究は2009年11月から2010年7月までを予定しています。本研究は、3種類の方法1）授業観察、2）ジャーナルライティング、3）インタビューを用いたものです。インタビューは、同意を得た上で音声録音され、後に書き起こされます。授業内の議論を音声録音することがあります。研究参加者は、本研究への参加義務はなく、本研究に関する活動への参加をいつ、どのような理由であっても拒否することができます。参加者の氏名や学校名等の本研究で提供する情報は、匿名性を確保するため、全て変更されて提示されます。研究結果は、学術学会での研究発表や、学術雑誌への論文投稿に用いられる予定です。

本研究に関して質問やお気づきの点がありましたら、私はもしくは指導教官である、Douglas McDougall教授まで、電話かe-mailにて連絡ください。研究参加者としての権利に関しては、トロント大学倫理委員会へ問い合わせいただくことも可能です。お子さんを私の研究に参加させて頂くことの許可をしていただけるようでしたら、添付の同意書に日付とご署名をいただき、私まで返却してください。それでは、どうぞよろしくお願いいたします。

研究者
川島裕子 博士課程
トロント大学オンタリオ教育研究所
yakawashima@oise.utoronto.ca
080-4213-4322

指導教官
Douglas McDougall （ダグラス・マクドーガル）教授
OISE/UT, 252 Bloor St. West Toronto, ON M5S 1V6 CANADA
dmcdougall@oise.utoronto.ca
1-416-978-0056
University of Toronto Research Ethics Office (トロント大学倫理委員会)
McMurrich Building, 3rd floor 12 Queen's Park Crescent West Toronto, ON M5S 1S8
CANADA ethics.review@utoronto.ca
1-416-946-3273
ファックス: 1-416-946-5763
私は、研究プロジェクト「揺れ動く身体と自己の境界形成：日本の若者と学校教育」に関する川島裕子によって書かれた研究案内書を読みました。私は、私の娘・息子が参加する条件を理解し、私の娘・息子（名前：____________________）がこの研究プロジェクトに参加することに同意します。

氏名: __________________________________________________

ご署名: _________________________________________________

日付: _________________________________________________

研究者
川島裕子 博士課程
トロント大学オンタリオ教育研究所
ykwashima@oise.utoronto.ca
080-4213-4322
Appendix G – Journal Writing Protocol

Journal Writing Invitation Letter

Exchange Diary/Journal Writing

To everyone who participate in the class of Foundations of Theatre Expression

Hello. I am Yuko Kawashima who has joined your class. Nice to meet you.

The purpose for exchange diary/journal writing is to directly listen to what you think and feel in some more depth. By the way, this is not mandatory nor affects your grade. If you participate, I will write back to you as the name “exchange” indicates. Also, I will return your notebook to you at the end. Therefore, it might be good to keep as a record of you.

I would love to hear your stories as much as possible in the journal writing. That is, I am happy to read about the detailed situations or stories such as when, where, who, what was happening and what you were feeling, rather than an answer of one word or one sentence such as yes or no.

The way of writing is free. Other than writing sentences, you might want to express your thoughts through drawings, poetry or songs. You also might want to introduce them with pictures or magazine clippings. If you choose media other than narratives, I beg you to explain in sentences what you wanted to say as well!

This journal writing is a part of my research. That is, the premise is that someone is going to read the result as a part of a thesis. I will not use a real name and use pseudonym in order for you not to be identified. If you start to think that, although you wrote something in your journal, you do not want me to use some part of it, please let me know. I will not use that part.

With the exception of a special emergency (for example, you are own danger!), I will not disclose the content of your journal writing to anyone including teachers. If it becomes necessary to disclose it, I will get your permission first. Please ask me anything anytime if you have any questions, such as the procedure.

My contact information is
Yuko Kawashima
y_chuandao@yahoo.co.jp
080-4213-4322

Thank you for your assistance.
交換日記／ジャーナルライティング

「劇表現」授業に参加しているみんなへ

こんにちは。みんなの授業にお邪魔している、川島裕子です。よろしくお願いします。

交換日記／ジャーナルライティングは、みんなの考えていることや感じていることを直接じっくりと聞くことを目的としています。ちなみに、これは強制ではないし、成績にも影響しません。ただし、参加してくれる分だけ、「交換」日記という名の通り、私も返事を書きます。ちなみに、このノートは最終的には、みんなにプレゼントします。自分を記録するものとして使うのもいいかも？

ジャーナルライティングでは、できるだけ多くのみんなの物語を聞きたいです。つまり、はい、いいえのように、一言や一文で終わってしまう回答よりも、いつ、どこで、だれが、何をして、そのとき何が起きしていて、自分は何を感じていた、というような具体的な状況や話しが聞けたら嬉しいです。

書き方は自由。文章を書くこと以外にも、絵や詩、歌などを使って表現することも可能です。写真や雑誌の切り抜きなどを使って紹介してくれるのも可能。ただし、文章以外のものを用いる時は、何を言いたかったのか文書での説明もできるだけお願いします！

このジャーナルライティングは、あくまでも、研究活動の一環です。つまり、将来的には、論文として他の人が読むことが前提です。その際にはもちろん実名は出さないし、どこの誰のことか具体的に分からないように偽名を使います。それでも、もし途中で、ジャーナルには書いたけど論文には使わなくて欲しくないということができたら私に伝えて下さい。そこは研究に使いません。

特別な緊急事態（例えば、みんなの身が危険にさらされているなど！）以外、ジャーナルライティングの内容は、先生方を含め誰にも公表しません。仮に公表する必要が出て来た場合でも、まずみんなに許可をとります。その他、やり方等で質問があればいつでも聞いて下さい。

私の連絡先は
川島裕子
y_chuandao@yahoo.co.jp
080-4213-4322

それでは、よろしくお願いします。
Journal Writing Guide

The second term of Foundations of Theatre Expression

Journal Writing I
1. Today’s class (Please write anything that comes to mind.)
   A. What you were thinking and the points that you noticed while you were acting (reading)
   B. The point(s) that made you think about being careful with when you were acting (reading)
   C. The point(s) about which you feel a sense of incongruity when acting (reading), if any
   D. The point(s) at which you changed your way of acting (reading) from the last time, if any.

2. Self introduction (free answer)
I would like to ask you to introduce yourself for me to get to know you since this is the first time. Please introduce yourself as much as you like and in any way you like. For example (you might want to include the following points or not as suits you. I will be even happier if you can tell me detailed episodes related to each point):
   I am ____________;
   What the drama class means for me is ______________;
   The most fun time of my life/at my school now and the reason for that is ___________;
   The toughest thing in my life/at my school now and the reason for that is ____________;
   What I like/my hobbies and the reason why is ____________;
   My favorite place and the reason why is ____________;
   What I do during the weekend;
   My future dream;
   What is important for me and the reason why;
   I am often said by everyone to be _______________________
      but, in actuality, I am_________________________.

Journal Writing II
1. Today’s class (Please write what occurs to you among the following, using thought, intuition, emotion, body)
   A. What you noticed when acting the role and description of the moment
   B. The point(s) you have to be careful about during your acting and description of the moment(s)
   C. The point(s) at which you feel a sense of incongruity when acting (reading) and description of the moment(s)
   D. The point(s) at which you tried to change the way of acting from the last time and description of the event of the moment(s)
   E. The point(s) at which you felt especially good, things went well for you and description of the moment(s)
   F. What you learned about the role today
   G. What you learned about yourself/the self who acted the role today

2. Character development
Please reflect on each role you will act looking towards the final performance next week. If you act several roles, please explain them separately.

A. I play _____ [name of role] ___ in ________ [name of play script] (describe the role you act).

Imagining the role, please introduce it with the reference to the following:

Personality
Age
Appearance (build, clothing, belongings)
Behavior
Friendship
Family relations
Hobbies
Other characteristics

B. Strategy for acting
What you need to be careful with when acting the role (for example, the way of saying the lines, the tone of voice) and the goal for performing next time

3. My role(s)
A. The role that I especially like/feel is fun to act/feel is easy to act, among the roles I act, is ____________________. It is because ________________________________.

B. The role that I feel was bad/difficult to act, among the roles I act, is _________________. It is because ________________________________.

C. The role that I feel the closest to, among the roles I act, is ____________________. It is because ________________________________.

D. The role, which I do not find many commonalities with, among the roles I act, is ___________________. It is because ________________________________.

E. I actually wanted to act ___ (name of role) in __ (name of play script), although I was not chosen to play it. It is because ________________________________.

F. Although it was good since I was not chosen, I was thinking that I do not want to act ___ (name of role) in __ (name of play script). It is because ________________________________.

Journal Writing III
1. Today’s class
A. The point(s) you were bothered about, noticed today
B. The highlight of today’s class for you
C. My experience of acting the role today (something that occurred to me or I felt)
D. The point(s) at which you felt a sense of incongruity when acting
E. What you learned about yourself today

2. My play script (Reflecting on the classes so far)
A. The world and story that you tried to depict in your play script
B. The opinion, as a playwright, about the world you created that your classmates acted out
C. The point(s) at which I felt disappointment since the world which I originally tried to depict had changed while the performance was being created together (if any)
D. The point(s) at which I felt good about although the world which I originally tried to
depict had changed while the performance was being created together (if any)
ジャーナルライティング1

（1） 今日の授業（頭に浮かんで来たことを何でも自由に書いてね。）
A. 役を演じていて（朗読していて）思ったこと、気がついた点
B. 演じる時（朗読する時）に、特に気をつけた点
C. 演じてみて（朗読していて）違和感があった点、もしあれば
D. 前回と演じ方（朗読の仕方）を変えてみた点、もしあれば

（2）自己紹介（自由回答）
今日は、まず第一回目なので、みんなのことを知るために、自己紹介をお願いしたいと思います。好きだだけ、好きなように自分のことを紹介して下さい。
例えば（以下のこと들을含めてもいいし、含まなくてもいいです。それぞれにまつわる具体的なエピソードを教えてくれると嬉しいです）。

私は、

自分のにとって演劇の授業は、
今、人生/学校で一番楽しい時間とその理由は、
今、人生/学校で一番たいへんなこととその理由は、
好きなこと/趣味と、それを好きな理由は、
好きな場所とその理由は、
週末していることは、
将来の夢は、
自分の大切ななものとその理由は、

私はよくみんなから、__________________と言われます。
でも実際は、__________________です。

ジャーナルライティング2

（1） 今日の授業（思考、直感、感情、身体などあらゆる5感を使いながら以下のことを思い当たることを記述して下さい。）
A. 役を演じていて何か気がついたこととその瞬間の描写
B. 演じている時に、特に気をつけた点とその瞬間の描写
C. 演じてみて違和感があった点とその瞬間の描写
D. 前回と演じ方を変えてみようとした点とその瞬間の出来事の描写
E. 特によかった点、うまくいった点とその瞬間の描写
F. 今日役について学んだこと
G. 今日自分/演じている自分について学んだこと
（2）役作り
来週の発表に向けて、自分が演じるそれぞれの役について、もう一度振り返ってみて下さい。いくつかの役を演じるときは、別々に説明をお願いします。
A. ____作品名____の____役名____（自分が演じる役を記入）
自分の役について想像して、以下のことを参考にしながら、どんな人か紹介して下さい。
   性格
   年齢
   見た目（体格、服装、持ち物）
   振る舞い
   友達関係
   家族関係
   趣味
   その他の特徴
B. 演じるためのストラテジー
この役を演じるために、自分の中で気をつける事（例えば、セリフのいい方、声のトーン）と、次回への演技の目標

（3）私/僕の役
A. 自分が演じる役の中で、特に気に入っている役/演じるのが楽しい役/演じやすい役は__________です。なぜなら、_________________________だから。
B. 自分が演じる役の中で、ちょっと苦手な役/演じるのが難しい役は__________です。なぜなら、_________________________だから。
C. 自分が演じる役の中で、一番自己に近いと思う役は、_______________です。なぜなら、_________________________だから。
D. 自分が演じる役の中で、自分と共通点がありません役は、__________です。なぜなら、_________________________だから。
E. 自分は選ばれてなかったけど、本当は（作品名）____の____（役名）____がやってみたかった。なぜなら、_________________________だから。
F. 選ばれてなかったからよかったけど、（作品名）____の____（役名）____は、演じたくないと思っていた。なぜなら、_________________________だから。（もしあれば）

ジャーナルライティング3
（1）今日の授業
A. 今日の授業中に気になったこと、気がついたこと
B. 今日の授業について、自分の中でのハイライト
C. 今日の役を演じている時の自分の体験（何か浮かんで来たこと、感じたこと）
D. 演じてみて違和感があった点
E. 今日、自分について学んだこと

(2) 自分の台本  （今までの授業を振り返って）
A. 自分の台本で描こうとした世界、物語について
B. クラスメートが演じた自分の世界について、脚本家としての感想
C. みんなで作品を作っていく中で、自分が最初に描こうとした世界と変わってしまって、実は残念に思っている点（もしあれば）
D. みんなで作品を作っていく中で、自分が最初に描こうとした世界と変わったが、最終的にはよかったなと思う点（もしあれば）
Appendix H – Reflection Paper Protocol

The second term of Foundations of Theatre Expression

Reflection Paper I
1. Please tell me your opinion on your final performance (in detail - not just “it was fun”/“it was painful”).
2. How were your body and mind and what were you thinking when you were in the [backstage] preparation room?
3. How were your body and mind in front of the audience? What were you thinking? Also, while you were acting, what were you feeling, paying attention to and thinking about? Please tell us [teachers and me] the details.
4. How was the style of reading a play for you? For example, “It was boring” etc. Please tell us the reasons as well. What do you think was different, and in what way, when compared with the play(s) that you performed by moving your body?
5. What kind of change was brought about through the action of performing and speaking in front of people? Why do you think so? Please tell us your reasons even if you felt there was no change.
6. Reflecting on the works of Sketches of Daily Life overall, what did you think and notice? What kind of meaning did you find in these works (if any)?
7. What is this drama class for you? What kind of meaning do you think that the classes have?
8. What is “expression” for you? What is it?

Reflection Paper II
1. Please tell us what you felt, thought and noticed, as well as what you were reminded of feeling on the day, by watching the DVD of the final performance. Also, please tell us what opinion you think you would have had on your work (including the style of the performance), if you had been in the audience.
2. Tell us what you felt throughout class today overall and what has left an impression on you.
3. How much of the content of classes in terms of number of events including games can you remember since April? (circle one of them)
   A. 1 to 3  B. 4 to 10  C. 11 to 16  D. More than 17
4. Please tell us what you found interesting and/or made an impression among them.
5. Reflecting on the classes over seven months, what did you think and notice? Please tell us what you got out of them. If there was nothing, please tell us the reason.

The third term of Foundations of Theatre Expression

Reflection Paper I
1. Please tell us what you felt, thought and noticed by watching videos such as on YouTube.
2. Please tell us what you felt, thought and noticed about drama script overall and your role in it. Also, please tell us what you felt, thought and noticed about the role you have been assigned.
3. Please tell us what you felt and have left impression on you among the overall class today.
4. Please tell us your goal in the third term of class. Please tell us if there is something you want to try.
Reflection Paper II
1. Please tell us what you felt, thought and noticed during the group discussion.
2. Please tell us what you felt, thought and noticed by doing the translation of the play script. Also, please tell us what you thought and felt about the play script and the role through doing the translation.

Reflection Paper III
1. Please tell us what you thought, noticed and felt by reading the drama script. Please write in as much detail as possible.
2. Please tell us what you noticed while reading the drama script. Please write in as much detail as possible.

Reflection Paper IV
1. Please tell us the image you had in mind of how you are going to act beforehand. Also, please tell us what you were feeling right before the performance.
2. Please tell us what you were feeling inside during the performance, especially about the conflict(s) and puzzling moment(s).
3. Please tell us what you felt about others’ opinions, especially about the conflicts and puzzling moment(s). Please tell us what struck you most among those opinions.
4. Please tell us the point(s) that you felt were different from your ordinary self after presenting a performance.
5. Please tell us what surprised you and what you noticed afresh after the presentation.

The second term of Applied Theatre Expression

Reflection Paper I
1. Please tell us if there was anything before you acted about what you were thinking and feeling on how you will act. Please tell us especially if there was anything you tried to change in your way of acting from the last time and you needed to be careful about.
2. Please tell us what you were feeling and thinking during acting and on the stage. Please especially tell us if there was anything about which you felt was incongruous.
3. What do you think about your performance today? Please tell us if there is anything that you think was good and anything that you want to change/do over. Also, please tell us your goal for acting the next time.

Reflection Paper II
1. Which role did you request to act during casting? What was your reason for that?
2. Please tell us what you felt and thought when casting was announced.
3. Please tell us if there is any role that you want to act or you never want to act other than the role you are acting. What is the reason for that?
4. What do you think about your performance today? Do you think that you achieved your goal for acting that you set last week? Please tell us if there is anything that you think was
especially good or you want to change/do over. Also, please tell us what you were feeling and thinking during acting and on the stage. Finally, please tell us your goal for acting the next time.

Reflection Paper III
1. Please tell us if there is anything that you were thinking about with regard to your acting before today’s presentation. What was(were) the point(s) you especially thought you need to be careful about?
2. What do you think about your acting today? Please tell us if there is anything that you especially feel good about or regret. Also, please tell us what you were feeling and thinking during acting and on the stage.
3. How was acting in front of audience different from usual? Was there anything you especially paid attention to?
4. Reflecting on the second term of the class, please tell us your thoughts on acting the role(s).
5. Reflecting on the second term of the class, what has left an impression on you the most?

Applied Theatre Theory

Reflection Paper I
Please write each in about 100 characters [roughly equivalent to 50 words in English].
1. Please tell us what you thought and felt when you wrote on the theme of “love”.
2. Please write the “love” that you are currently thinking that you want to depict.

劇表基礎 2 学期

レフレクション I
1. 本番の感想を改めて教えて下さい。（「楽しかった」「苦痛だった」だけでなく、具体的に）
2. 準備室で控えているとき、あなたの体や心はどんな状態でしたか？どんなことを考えていましたか？
3. 観客を前にした（している）時、自分の体や心はどんな状態でしたか？何を考えましたか？または演じている時、どんなことを感じ、注意し、考えていましたか？具体的に教えて下さい。
4. 今回の朗読劇のスタイルはどうでしたか？たとえばつまらなかった等。理由もあわせて教えて下さい。実際に身体を動かして行った場合と比べて、何が違うと思いますか？
5. 人前で声を発して演じるという行為は、あなたにとってどんな変化をもたらしましたか？それはなぜだと思いますか？なかった場合もその理由をあわせて教えて下さい。
6. この「日常のデッサン」の作業を大きく振り返って、どんなことを考え、気が付きましたか？あなたの作業はどんな意味があったと考えますか。（強いて言えば構成）
7. 演劇の授業とは、あなたにとってどんなものですか？どんな意味があると考えますか？
8. 「表現」はあなたにとってなんですか？どんなものですか？

レフレクション II
1. 本番の VTR を観て感じたこと、考えたこと、気が付いたこと、発表当日の自分について新しく思い出したことなど、改めて教えて下さい。また、あなたが観客だったとしたら、自分の作品（上演スタイルも含めて）にどんな感想を抱いたと思うか教えてください。
2. 今日の授業全体で感じたこと、印象に残ったことを教えてください。
3. 4月からの授業の内容を、ゲームも含めて、いくつ思い出せますか？（あてはまるものに○）
   A. 1 個から 3 個   B. 4 個から 10 個   C. 11 個から 16 個   D. 17 個以上
4. そのなかで面白かったもの、印象深かった内容を教えてください。
5. この約7ヶ月間の授業を振り返って、あなたはどんなことを考え、どんなことに気付きましたか？あなたの収穫を教えてください。収穫のない場合、その理由を教えてください。

劇表基礎 3 学期
レフレクション I
1. YouTube等の映像を観て感じたこと、考えたこと、気がついたことを教えて下さい。
2. 戯曲全体や戯曲の役について感じたこと、考えたこと、気がついたことを教えて下さい。また、配役された役について感じたこと、考えたことを教えて下さい。
3. 今日の授業全体で感じたこと、印象に残ったことを教えて下さい。
4. 3学期の授業について、自分なりの目標を教えて下さい。また、挑戦してみたいことがあれば教えて下さい。

レフレクション II
1. グループディスカッションをして感じたこと、考えたこと、気がついたことを教えて下さい。
2. 翻訳をしてみて感じたこと、考えたこと、気がついたことを教えて下さい。また、翻訳をして、戯曲や役について何か考えたり、感じたりしたことがあれば教えて下さい。

レフレクション III
1. 台本を読んでいて思ったこと、気がついたこと、感じたことを教えて下さい。できるだけ、具体的にお願いします。
2. 2、台本を読んでいている時に、気をつけた点を教えて下さい。できるだけ、具体的にお願いします。

レフレクション IV
1. 演技をする前、どのように演じるかについて頭の中に浮かんでいたイメージを教えて下さい。また、演技をする前、何を感じていたか教えて下さい。
2. 発表中に自分の内面で感じていたこと、特に葛藤や戸惑いについて教えて下さい。
3. 他の人の意見を聞いて感じたこと、特に葛藤や戸惑いについて教えて下さい。また、気に留まった意見について教えて下さい。
4. 発表をして、いつもの自分と違うと感じた点を教えて下さい。
5. 発表をして、何か驚いたことや新しく気がついたことがあれば教えて下さい。

劇表応用 2学期

レフレクション I
1. 演じる前にどのように演じるかについて考えていたことや感じていたことがあれば教えて下さい。特に前回の演じ方と変えようとした点や気をつけようとした点があれば教えて下さい。
2. 演技中や舞台の上で感じていたことや考えていたことを教えて下さい。演じてみて特に違和感を感じた点があれば教えて下さい。
3. 今日の自分の演技についてどう思いますか？よかったと思う点や直したいと思う点があれば教えて下さい。また、次回の演技の目標を教えて下さい。

レフレクションII
1. 配役を決める際に自分が希望した役はどの役でしたか。また、その理由は何でしたか。
2. 配役が発表された際に感じたことや考えたことを教えて下さい。
3. 自分が演じている役以外で演じてみたいと思う役、あるいは絶対に演じたくないと思う役があれば教えて下さい。また、その理由は何ですか。
4. 今日の自分の演技についてどう思いますか？先週の自分の演技の目標を達成できたと思いますか？特によかったと思う点や直したいと思う点があれば教えて下さい。また、演技中や舞台の上で感じていたことや考えていたことを教えて下さい。最後に、次回の演技の目標を教えて下さい。

レフレクションIII
1. 今日の発表の前に自分の演技について考えていたことがあれば教えて下さい。特に気をつけようとした点は何ですか。
2. 今日の自分の演技についてどう思いますか？特によかったと思う点や反省する点があれば教えて下さい。また、演技中や舞台の上で感じていたことや考えていたことを教えて下さい。
3. いつもと違う観客の前で演じてみてどうでしたか。特に気になったことはありましたか。
4. 2学期の授業を振り返り、自分の役を演じた感想を教えて下さい。
5. 2学期の授業を振り返り、一番印象に残っていることは何ですか。

演劇論応用

レフレクションI
それぞれ100字を目安に書いて下さい。
1. 「恋愛」をテーマに書くにあたって考えたこと、感じたことを教えて下さい。
2. 現段階で自分が描きたいと思っている「恋愛」について教えて下さい。
## Appendix I – Student Interview Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; interview session</th>
<th>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; interview session</th>
<th>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; interview session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>Tomo</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chika</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toshi</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rui</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Risa</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mika</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Makoto</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shuji</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maiko</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nijihó</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>Yuka</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inoue-kun</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Okawa-kun</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>Kishi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kocchan</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yosshi</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fumiya</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kokoro-chan</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hiromi</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sayoko</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saki</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ōkubo-kun</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kaname</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kumada-kun</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kisshi</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aki</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tomofumi</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4</td>
<td>Miki</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kamiya-kun</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miyuki</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aiko</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harumi</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 5</td>
<td>Maiko, Risa, Yuka</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yosshi, Kocchan</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saki, Sayoko, Chika</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix J – Interview Protocol

Interview I

- What kind of students do you think are taking drama class?
- What do you want to become in the future?

Second term

- Is there any role that you are happy to act or not? Is there any role that you are happy to be assigned or not? Why is it? Which part did you dislike? Which part made you happy?
- What did you want to depict in the drama script? Is there any role you wanted to act other than the roles you acted?

Third term

- How did you choose your role?

Interview II

Self-introduction

- Why did you decide to take drama class?
- Why do you think the students in drama class are taking drama classes?
- What kinds of students are taking drama classes?
- Why did you choose to come to Akane High School?
- When is the most fun time at school/in your life and what is the reason?
- When is the toughest time at school/in your life and what is the reason?
- What is your hobbies
- What are your future dream, the job you want to pursue and your future course?
- Is there anything that you are often told by others but you do not actually think so?

Poem

- How did you choose your poem? With what reasons?
- Where did you find the poem you chose and whose poem is it?
- Did you try to write own poem? Why did you do so/not do so?
- What kind of experience was it to read the poem written or chosen by another student
- Do you find any difference between reading your own poem and reading another’s?
- The point(s) that you were conscious about and paid attention to while reading the poem.
- The point(s) that you felt, thought and noticed through reading the poem.
- The point(s) that you felt incongruence by reading the poem.
- The point(s) that you changed the way of reading the poem.
- The point(s) that you felt were good and went well.
- What you learned (about yourself and/or the content of the poem) by reading the poem
- Please tell me the image in your head before and during reading the poem.
- The point(s) that you felt were different from your usual self when presenting the poem.

To those who read a poem written or chosen by another student

- Whose poem did you choose? Why?
- (Could you guess whose poem it was before reading it out?) What did you think when you found out whose poem it is?
Difference of audience
• Is there anything different between reading the poem in drama class and in homeroom?

Class overall
• The most fun thing
• Tough thing/hard thing/the thing you did not like
• What has left an impression on you
• What you think you studied and learned

Interview III
Applied Theatre Expression
• What especially were the fun and difficult things throughout the second term of Applied Theatre Expression?
• What were the fun and difficult things throughout the year of Applied Theatre Expression?

Applied Theatre Theory
Students who shot the film
• How was the experience of shooting and creating the film?
Actors
• How was your acting experience?
• What was your opinion after watching each piece in the end?
Applied Theatre Theory overall
• What were the fun and difficult things for you in the second term?
• What were the fun and difficult things for you throughout the year?

To those who take drama classes for two years
• Reflecting on the two years, what do you think about drama classes?
インタビュー I

1学期

・どんな学生が演劇の授業をとっていると思いますか？
・将来何になりたいと思っていますか？

2学期

・この役なら嬉しいけれど、この役なら嬉しいかというのがありますか？配役されてうれしい役とそうでない役がありますか？どうしてですか？どんなところが嫌でしたか？どんなところが嬉しかったですか？あるいは、配役をされなかったけど、演じてみたかった役はありますか？
・台本で、何について描きたかったですか？

3学期

・どうやって自分の役を選びましたか？

インタビュー II

自己紹介

・どうして演劇の授業をとることにしたのですか。
・演劇の授業を取っている学生はどうして演劇の授業をとっていると思いますか？
・どんな学生が演劇の授業をとっていると思いますか？
・どうして茜高校にくることを選んだのですか？
・学校で／生活の中で、一番楽しい時間とその理由は？
・学校で／生活の中で、一番大変なこととその理由は？
・趣味は何ですか？
・将来の夢、つきたい仕事、進路は何ですか？
・よく他人から言われることで、実際は自分ではそう思っていないことはありますか？

詩

・どうやって自分の詩を選んびましたか？どういう理由からですか？
・どこで見つけましたか、誰のものですか？
・自分で書きしましたが？なんでそうした／そうしなかったのですか？
・他人の書いた詩を読むことは、どのような体験ですか？
・自分で作った詩を読んだ時と何か違ったと思いますか？他の人が選んだ詩を読むのと自分が選んだのを読むのは、何が読んだときの経験に違いがあると思いますか？
・読んでいる時、意識したところ、気をつけた点。
・読んでみて感じたこと、考えたこと、気がついた点。
・読み方を変えてみた点。
• 読んでみて良かった点／うまくいった点。
• 読んでみて（自分について／詩の内容について）学んだこと。
• 読む前、読む時に頭の中に浮かんでいたイメージを教えて下さい。
• 発表をして、いつも自己と違うと感じた点について。
他の生徒の詩を朗読した人対象
• 誰のを選びましたか？どうしてですか？
• （読む前に詩の詩か想像つきましたか？）誰の詩か分かった時、どう思いまし
たか？
観客の違い
• この演劇の授業で読むのと、ホームルームのクラスで読むのと何か違うと思い
ますか？
授業全体
• 一番楽しかったこと
• 大変だったこと／つらかったこと／嫌だと思ったこと
• 印象に残っていること
• 勉強になったな、学んだなと思うこと
インタビューIII
劇表現応用
• 劇表２学期で特に楽しかったこと、大変だったことは何ですか？
• 劇表１年を通して、楽しかったこと、大変だったことは何ですか？
演劇論応用
　撮影を担当した生徒
• 撮影してみて／作ってみてどうでしたか？
役者
• 演じてみてどうでしたか？
• 最後にそれぞれの作品を見た感想は？
演劇論応用
• ２学期で、楽しかったこと、大変だったことは？
• １年を通して、楽しかったこと、大変だったことは？
２年間演劇の授業をとっている学生
• ２年間振り返ってみて、演劇の授業についてどう思いますか？
Appendix K – Drama Scripts (in Japanese)

Performance Title:
平成21年度　茜高校　劇表現基礎　発表
パズルピース　〜今日もまた、うねうね〜

はじめに　劇表現基礎担当

本日はお忙しい中御来場、誠にありがとうございます。
今年度も「日常生活のデッサン」という課題で生徒たちが書きあげた作品を上演しますが、諸事情により今回は朗読スタイルです。
この初の企てが、はたして吉と出るか凶と出るか。
そもそもベースが「日常生活」なうえに、派手な演出効果は無し。美術も無し。それに加えて朗読で役者は立ったまんま、とくれば、これはもう地味な発表会にならざるをえないのではないか。
しかしそれは、各作品も、各人の個性や世界観を見事に反映していて、なんとも魅力的ではないか。一人わずか三分という厳しい上演時間の制約があるなかで、よく描けたものではないか。何より彼らはキラキラしているのではないか。
というわけで。
生徒諸君、健闘を祈る。

タイトル
1．朝戦争　　玉ネギ三世
2．占い　　エスマヤ
3．ゆりかもめ　　グミ苺
4．最高の思い出と春　　神崎刹那
5．闇の中の私　　カレーOF　ククレ
6．あるある　　天乃銘
7．好み　　ましふく
8．美容院　　すまやぎこいうち
9．何か、あせる　　ERIX
10．ありふれた夏　　こぼり
11．ありふれた夏　　ニート山田
12．カレーとGとシーマンと　　ぷちこ
13．Green Summer

朝戦争　　玉ネギ三世

母がキッチンで朝食を作っている。
兄が髪をくしゃくしゃしながらリビングに入ってくる。

兄　　おはよう。

母　　土真斗おはよう。もう少しで朝ごはんできるからね。

言葉の途中で足音がする。妹がドアから入ってくる。

妹　　おはよう！

母　　多羅子おはよう。

兄が皿をキッチンに取っていく。
その間にふすまを開け、静かに現れる父。食卓の椅子に座る。
兄　うわあ！（皿を落としそうになる。）
父　（不思議そうな顔で）何だよ、土真斗。
兄　だって親父っていつも知らないうちに・・・
母　（キッチンから顔を出して）土真斗どうしたの。
兄　まだいきなり親父が・・・
母　あら頭唐氏さん、帰ってきたなんなら言ってくればよかったのに。
父　帰ったらみんな寝てたからさ。
兄　じゃあおはようくらい・・・
姉　おはよう。

姉が目をこすりながら入ってくる。

母　あら、お姉ちゃんおはよう。ちょっと朝ごはん出来たわよ。

父と兄、皿を配る。妹はサラダを皿にのせて大げさに食べ始める。

姉　シカトかい！
兄・父　おはよう。
姉　あ、居候だ。
父　いや、芋子のお父上ですが。
姉　そういえばそうだった。つってか多羅子、シカトするなよ。だいたい野菜嫌いのあんたがサラダの皿持って・・・そんなにあたしが嫌いか？なんかしたか？
妹　（にらみながら詰め寄り）嫌いとかじゃなくて・・・
姉　嫌いとかじゃなくて・・・？
妹　こないだ貸したCD返してよ！漫畫も！
姉　あ・・・（わざとらしく）準備するついでに持ってくるね。

姉は母にウインクをして、こっそりパンを一枚持ってリビングを出ていく。

兄　あれは返してもらえないな。
妹　なんで？

玄関ドアが閉まる音。姉が家を出る。

妹　あ・・・。

兄が妹を見ながらパンをかじる。

妹　ああぁ！
兄　ほら
妹　今日友達に貸してあげる約束したのに・・・
兄　あれ？芋子って今日から修学旅行じゃ・・・
母　そうよ。
妹　えぇ！！（発狂）
兄　落ち着けって。まあ帰ってくるのは早くて三日後だな。
妹　ええええ～！（さらに発狂）
父　行ってきます。
母　行ってらっしゃい。
兄　ごちそうさま。俺も行くわ、行ってきます～。
母　行ってらっしゃい。
妹　ええええ～！！なんでなんでなんでなんで！！！
相変わらずな妹に向かってあきれた様子で。

母
早く食べちゃいなさい。

（おわり）

占い

とし

午前8時 JRの電車の中、男2人がドアの端の手すりに掴まりながら話している。2人ともやや眠そう。男1、時計を見ながら。

男1
あと2つか。

男2
そうだね。・・・今日、家でる前に久々にニュースの占い見たんだけど。

男1
最後にやるやつ?

男2
うん、星座のやつなんだけど、てんびん座1位だった。

男1
てんびん座だったっけ。

男2
うん。異性と話すといいことがあるんだって。

男1
ふーん。かに座は?

男2
・・・7位ぐらいかな。

男1
微妙だね。

男2
うん。たしか、やけ食い注意とか言ってた。

男1
ふーん。

男2
（ペンを見ながら）いいことっていうて何があるのかなぁ。

男1
・・・気になる人のメルアドがもらえるんじゃ。

男2
あーいいねそれ。

男1
お、誰かいんの?

男2
・・・いないや。

男1
だめじゃん。

男2
そうだね。

男1がドアの上にある音声なしのTVに目をやる。

男1
お、血液型占いやってる。

男2
（TVを見て）ホントだ。おれO型だわ。

男1
おれも。

男2
一緒か。

男1
うん。

占いをのんびり聴める。

男2
・・・あ、4位だ。「失敗が続くかも、今日はいっそこと休んだ方が吉。」

男1
電車でそれって今更だな。

男2
だよね。でもこの場合、どっちを信じればいいのだろう。

男1
都合の良い方でいいんじゃない。

男2
そうだね。

電車が停まりドアが開く。
大勢の人が入り満員になる。
男2人は両端に押しつけられ、窮屈になる。

男1
（やや声を抑えて）あと1つか。

男2
（男1にあわせて）そうだね。

ドアが閉まり、電車が走る。

ゆりかもめ

朝。モノレールの中。
女二人が扉付近で壁に寄りかかって立って会話をしている。

ミク
いや・・・けど、ちゃんと待ち合わせ時間に来るとは思わなかった。

ユウ
失礼な。私は約束守るよー。で、何駅で降りるんだっけ。

ミク
いやいやいや！調べてこいよ、一応！っていうか何回か来たことあるでしょ！？

ユウ
うん・・・でもほら、忘れるっていうか、私方向オンチで。

ミク
そんなに大丈夫か、今後も人波すごいと思うよ。はぐれたら三度と会えなくなるよ？

ユウ
携帯あるし、どうせ回るスペース一辺なんだから、大丈夫大丈夫！

ミク
うわー・・・不安。

ユウ
あと何駅ぐらいで降りる？次？

ミク
んー。あと、２駅かな。（窓から見える景色を見ながら）うーわー見えてみ、外。すごい直射日光だぜ？ってちょっと、目の焦点あってないんだけど、平気・・・？

ユウ
（ここぞとばかりに良い笑顔で）倒れたらおぶってね。

ミク
おま・・・っ、こないだ私が倒れたら、放置するとか言っておいて！

ユウ
まあまあ。

ミク
が携帯で時間を確認していると、ユウは遠い目でつぶやく。

ユウ
なんで私は、わざわざモノレールに乗って、片道一時間以上の場所に向かっているのだろう。

ミク
（自嘲気味に）いまさらだな。次だよ、降りるの。

ユウ
いや・・・だって今日夕方からバイトが・・・。

ミク
よりにもよって！

ユウ
だから申し訳ないんだけど・・・１２時ぐらいに帰りたい。

ミク
うん、別に私も今日はバイトあるからそのつもりだけど。

ユウ
そうなんだ。でも昨日行こうって決めたんだから、しようがないよね。

ミク
まあね。お互いバイトあるのにね。もう、ここまで来たんだから、あきらめて幸せな気分に・・・

車内アナ
まもなく〜国際展示場正門前〜（繰り返す）

ミク
あ、着いた。

ユウ
着いたー？

二人は少し小走りで降る。
そして、人ごみに紛れて行った。

最高の思い出と春

グミ莓
大勢の人がいる中、CDを買うための列に苺は並んでいる。頭でも眠い。少し時間がたってから、自分の番になる。苺は、山積みになった二種類のCDを指差す。

苺 すみません。コレとコレ二つずつください。
スタッフ はい。（後がつまっているので少し急ぎ気味で）千五百円です。

苺はCDを受け取ると、なるべく指紋を付けないように持ちなおす。

苺 すみません。

スタッフが苺に気付き振り向く。
苺は持っているウィダーと手紙を差し出す。

苺 コレ、ビートまりおさんに差し入れなんですねけど・・・。
スタッフ まりおさん（ビートまりおの肩を叩く）差し入れでーす。
まりお 本当？

ダンボールから新しいCDを出していたビートまりおは、スタッフに呼ばれると作業をやめる。苺に気付き、近づいてくる。

まりお ありがとう。
苺 コレ差し入れと手紙です。よかったら読んでください。

まりお ありがとう。
苺 ありがたく。
まりお ゼリー系は助かるよ。ありがと。
苺 ありがとうございます。忙しい中すみません。頑張ってください。
まりお うん。ありがと。ホントありがとうございます。

その場を離れて再び作業を始めるビートまりお。
苺は事を済ませるとすぐにその場を離れようとする。
しかし立ち止まり、ビートまりをおもう一度見る。

（おわり）

闇の中の私

神崎刹那

教室。神崎は本を読んでいる。その後で桃木と牧野が話している。
一冊の本を読み終わった時、二人突然話しかけてくる。

桃木・牧野 ねえねえ！！神崎さん！

うるさいそに睨む神崎。桃木と牧野は一瞬たじろぐ。

神崎 ・・・なんです？

闇の中の私

神崎刹那

教室。神崎は本を読んでいる。その後で桃木と牧野が話している。
一冊の本を読み終わった時、二人突然話しかけてくる。

桃木・牧野 ねえねえ！！神崎さん！

うるさいそに睨む神崎。桃木と牧野は一瞬たじろぐ。

神崎 ・・・なんです？

闇の中の私

神崎刹那

教室。神崎は本を読んでいる。その後で桃木と牧野が話している。
一冊の本を読み終わった時、二人突然話しかけてくる。

桃木・牧野 ねえねえ！！神崎さん！

うるさいそに睨む神崎。桃木と牧野は一瞬たじろぐ。

神崎 ・・・なんです？
あ、あのさ、神崎さんは好きな人とかいないの？

神崎
（鞄から本を取り出し）そんなもの私には必要ないです。

牧野
えー！？じゃ、じゃあ好きなタイプとかは！？

神崎
・・・金持ちですかね。この世の中、金が全てですから。

桃木
（大げさに驚き）えー！？愛とかは！？

神崎
そんなものあって何の得になるんです？愛なんかあったところで生活出来ませんよ。

桃木
買えますよ。今この世の中、友達も金で買えますから。

牧野
それでって・・・本当の友達じゃあ・・・

神崎
友達じゃないですよ？それでも欲しい人は買うんじゃないですか？恋愛もそれと同じで
す。

牧野
じゃあ、神崎さんは恋人いないの？

神崎
いりませんよ。邪魔になるだけですから。束縛は嫌いなんです。

牧野
そんなぁ・・・

桃木
恋人いれば毎日楽しいし幸せなのに・・・

ねえ？と桃木、牧野顔を見合わせる。

不気味に笑う神崎
（不気味に笑い）私の幸せは貴女方の絶望なんですよ。故に貴女方の幸せは私の絶望とな
る。こんな滑稽なことないでしょう？

牧野
それって・・・本当の友達じゃあ・・・

神崎
じゃあ、神崎さんは恋人いないの？

神崎
いりませんよ。邪魔になるだけですから。束縛は嫌いなんです。

牧野
そんなぁ・・・

桃木
恋人いれば毎日楽しいし幸せなのに・・・

不気味に笑う神崎
（不気味に笑い）私の幸せは貴女方の絶望なんですよ。故に貴女方の幸せは私の絶望とな
る。こんな滑稽なことないでしょう？

桃木
神崎さん、間違ってるよ・・・。

牧野
あ、でもさ、神崎さんそういうキャラだし、恋に興味がないのも仕方ないんじゃない？

桃木
確かのそうだよねぇー！！（ケラケラ笑い出した時チャイムが鳴り）げっ・・・やば
っ・・・つぎ英語じゃんっ・・・！

牧野
行こう！あいつ遅れるとぐだぐだうっさいし・・・！！！

桃木
かったるいけど行こう！

牧野
行こう！あいつ遅れるとぐだぐだうっさいし・・・！！！

（おわり）

あるある

カレーOF ククレ

場所は昼休みの学校。
弁当も食べ終わり、男子二人、恒と克己がくっちゃべっている。
恒、机にくたっとのびる。

恒
あー・・・彼女欲しい・・・。

克己
彼女から棒だね。どうした？

恒
だって欲しいじゃん。

克己
・・・昨日何見た？

恒
（うれしように顔を上げて）あいのり！

克己
はあ・・・あのな、恒は毎回テレビに影響されすぎだと思んだ。うん。

恒
んー・・・（しばらく考え込んで）どこが？

克己
自覚ないのか！ほら、この前ワンピース見て「海が俺を呼んでいる」と言ってた、カクレ
ンジャー見て「忍者になるにはどこに行けばいい？」と真剣に先生に聞きに行ったんだ！
恒
夢があっていいじゃないか。
克己
高校生にもなってそんな事言えるのが、ある意味尊敬するって・・・。
恒
ありがとう。（笑う）
克己
いや、ほめてねーよ。
恒
（驚いて）え、マジですか。
克己
（驚いて）真に受けてたのかよ？
恒
あ、そういれば明日、ひま？
克己
んー・・・ひまっちゃあひままだな、バイトもねーし。
恒
じゃあさ、映画鑑賞しようぜ映画鑑賞、TSUTAYAで何か借りてき。
克己
いいね、久しぶりに恒家行くー。なんでどんなの見るんだ？
恒
今まで見たことのないジャンル・・・スプラッタ系かな。
克己
・・・あ、明日用事あったんだ、ごめんなー。
恒
えー。なんだよちょっとがねーな。
克己
おう、また今度だ。

ぶーぶー言ってる恒に気付かれないように、さりげなく安堵の息を漏らす克己。ふと時計を見て。

克己
あ、やっべ、五時間目まであとあと3分じゃん！次体育だぞ！
恒
え、まじかよ！やっべ！

恒、ごそごそ慌てながら自分のバックをあさる。

克己
早く行くぞ！
恒
おうっ！！って、あ・・・。
克己
どうした？
恒
（憂いを帯びた表情で）克己、ジャージ余ってるか・・・？
克己
上だけなら持ってるが・・・まさか・・・。

恒、ゆっくりと椅子に腰かける。その表情には、ある種何かをふっ切った者にしか醸し出せない雰囲気があった。

恒
体育着・・・（英語風に）ベッドの上だ・・・。
克己
（英語風に）アンビリーバボー。

（おわり）

好み
天乃銘

放課後の教室。
夏彦と藤治が楽しそうに話している。

藤治
あー・・・腹減ったあー。
夏彦
それ、さっきも言ってたじゃねえか。
藤治
悪いか！人間いつでも腹は減るもんなんだよっ。
夏彦
（机の上に座りながら）そりゃそうだけどな・・・

教室のドアが勢いよく開く。
昭子、千晴が口論しながら教室に入ってくる。

千晴
だーかーらー何でかけちゃうの！！！
昭子
普通は何かしらかけるわよ！
藤治
何の話？
千晴 あ、聞いてよー！昭子だったら目玉焼きに醤油かけちゃうのー！
昭子 何にもかけないほうがおかしいわよ！ねえ？
藤治 そりゃ変だよ！味しないってそれなの。調味料と言ったらマヨネーズだろう！マヨネーズ。

藤治、カバンの中から業務用のマヨネーズを取り出す。

千晴 うげえ・・・聞くだけで吐き気がする。（吐きそうな仕草をする）
昭子 ・・・ありえない。卵に卵かけるとか何考えてんのよ。
藤治 うるさいな。マヨネーズは神の調味料なんだぞ！
千晴 （両腕を上げて）神聖なる白米にマヨネーズなんて冒涜だー！白米はそのまままで戴くのが常識！
昭子 いや・・・だからそういうのもどうかと思うんだけど。
夏彦 ・・別にいいだろう。好みなんて人によって違うんだから。何が正しいとか間違っているとか、区別をつける方がおかしいんじゃないの？（昭子を見る）

昭子、気まずそうに黙りこむ。
少し間。

昭子 じゃ、じゃあアンタは何かけるのよ。
夏彦 俺に振るなよ。
昭子 人に偉そうなこと言っといて自分は逃げる気？
夏彦 そういう話じゃねえや。
千晴 実はすごく変なのかかるのが好きなんじゃないの？
藤治 たとえば・・・砂糖とか？
千晴 そうそう！あとはジャムとか黒酢とか。
昭子 やだー！ジャムなんかつけたら気持ち悪いじゃない！いくら何でもそれはないでしょ！ねえ夏・・・（言いかけて止まる）

夏彦、軽く目をそらして黙りこむ。
昭子、千晴、藤治、夏彦を見て顔を見合わせる。
再び夏彦を見る。

昭子 ねえ、アンタ。
藤治 まさか、
千晴 味覚オンチ・・・？
夏彦 ・・・悪かったな。

３人気まずそうに黙りこむ。

千晴 ・・・ま、まあ人間味覚じゃないよ。
藤治 う、うん。味覚ってあとで変わるしね・・・
夏彦 それでフォローしてるつもりかアホ。

３人から離れたところに立つ昭子。

昭子 み、味覚がなよ。そんなことで諦めるあたしじゃないんだから・・・！
千晴 昭子—・・・どうしたの？
昭子 （びっくり驚いてあせる）ななな、何でもないわよ別に！（おわり）

美容院 ましふく
よく行く美容院。リサは長年切っていない髪をおもいきっておもいきって切りに来た。店員今日はどのようにしますか？リサカットとトリートメントを・・・店員かしこまりました。どのように、どのくらいカットしますか？リサ前髪をばっさりと後ろもばっさりと切っちゃって下さい。店員えーもっとたいですね。リサいんです。この髪型あきちゃったし、イメチェンするんで。店員わかりました。でも長いのもいいとおもいますけど・・・。店員はリサの髪の毛をさわりながら切る準備にとりかかること。リサは、店員にいろいろ言われ心が動いている。店員では、前髪から切っていきますね。リサはい。それと・・・やっぱり後ろは、あまり切らないで、7、8センチぐらいにします。前髪はばっさりで。店員かしこまりました。やっぱりそうですよねー。こんなに伸ばしたの切っちゃうのはもったいないですよ。ここまで伸ばすの大変ですもんね。リサまあ大変でした。でも短くしてイメチェンもいいかなって思っていたけど・・・いざとなったらできません、もったいないで。店員そういうお客様、多いですよー。もう伸びないってくらいになったら、切りにきて下さいね。話しながら作業は終わり・・・店員前髪、短いのは似合いますねー。やっぱ後ろは長いほうが絶対いいですよ。リサそうですか？よかったです、ありがとうございます。リサは会計を終えて外へ出る。店員ありがとうございます。またお待ちしております。外を歩くリサ、ショーウインドウに映った自分を見て。リサやっぱり短くすればよかったです。何か、あせるすまやぎこいうち平日の朝。四畳半の狭い部屋で野郎二人がファミコンをしている。野郎二人は、ニコのマイク機能で野郎一の邪魔をしている。野郎一あのさぁ、ひとがドラクエ３やってんのにマイクで邪魔するって、どゆこと？野郎二え？あぁ面白いじゃん。最近のゲームにゃないよ。野郎一いや、そういう問題じゃ・・・。野郎二つかさぁ、朝っぱらから呼んできて一人プレイってどうなんだ？野郎一え？あっ、ごめん。じゃあ～テニスやる？野郎二マジ？あんの？やるやる。野郎一がファミコンの横にあるゲームソフト、テニスを手に取り起動させようとガチャガチャ格闘する。野郎二は怒そう。
野郎一　フーフー・・・フーフー・・・あれ、付かないかも。
野郎二　貸してみ。

野郎二は受け取ると、接続端子の部分を舐める。

野郎一　それさぁ、金属の部分錆びんだよねぇ〜。
野郎二　お前だってフーフーしてたじゃん。
野郎一　いやさ、量が違うじゃん。
野郎二　あぁ〜もうウッサイなぁ、付くモンも付かな・・・っついた。・・・付けたから俺２P〜。
野郎一　いや、意味分からん。・・・どうする？ダブルス？
野郎二　いや、勝負しよ。
野郎一　ん。

テニスに熱中する二人。野郎一是野郎二から一セット取る。

野郎二　お前なんかずるくね？五ゲームとか飽き millennia。
野郎一　したの誰だ。てかさぁ、さっきから同じ負け方してんじゃん。
野郎二　・・・リアルだったらぜってー勝てる。
野郎一　ホンとかよ。
野郎二　は？フリーターの方がニートより体力あっから。
野郎一　ニートじゃねぇし。大学生だし。
野郎二　・・・ああもう！勝てね〜。

野郎二は後ろに倒れる。そのときコントローラーが引っ張られゲームがバグる。

二人　あっ・・・。
野郎一　はぁ。
野郎二　あ〜あっ。

野郎二は倒れたださま天井見ている。
野郎一是煙草を吸い始める。

野郎二　タバコ・・・いつから？
野郎一　最近。
野郎二　あれか？タバコ吸ってる俺カッコイイってやつか？
野郎一　違うよ、ちょっとね。
野郎二　ちょっと・・・か。・・・俺たちいつまでこんなことしてんだか。
野郎一　ファミコン？・・・さぁ、でも悪くないよな。
野郎二　・・・う・・・ん・・・うしっ今日はバイトさぼるかな。酒飲もうぜ酒。あんだろ？
野郎一　え？（少しキョトンとした後、微笑んで）・・・冷蔵庫にビール入ってる。
野郎二　へへ、ラッキッキー。

（おわり）

ありふれた夏

ERIX

居間で母が本を読んでいる。CABIN (MILD) を呑んでいる。
TV はついているが見ていない。
そこで息子が帰ってくる。

息子　ただいま。
お帰り。

息子 ・・・暑い！なんで窓閉めてんの！？

母 いや〜、そんな暑くない・・・。

息子 暑いよ！てゆーか、窓閉めたまま喫煙吸うな！何回も言ってるでしょ。

などと言いつつ息子は窓を開け、定位置に置いてあるマンガを読み始める。

母 ズボンだけでも着替えなさい。

息子 いいよ、すこししたらまた出ろし。

母 あぁ、そうだっけか。

間。

息子 ああー忘れてた。

息子が時計を見て TV の CH を変えて、ドラマを見始める。

長い間。

息子 ねえ、貴族の方が身分高いのにこんなことして大丈夫なのかね。

母 この時代の貴族は貧乏貴族だから。本当に権力があるのは天皇の親戚とか側近とかだから、他の貴族は立場的にかなり弱いよ。っていうか、そんな事考えたらキリ無いよ、黄門様。

息子 それもそうだね〜。

と言ってまた見始める。間。黄門様、終わる。

息子 さーてと。終わったそろそろ行け。

と言いつつ用意をして出ていく。

息子 と言ってくんねー。

母 はいはい。

母はずっと本を読み続けている。

春よ来い

こぼり

静かなリビング。姉が椅子にだらしく座りテレビを見ている。
外から帰ってきた弟が疲れたように靴を下ろし椅子に座る。

姉 塾？

弟 塾。

弟、テレビのリモコンを取り、チャンネルを変える。

姉 え、ちょっと！

弟 どうせ再放送だろう！つか ROOKIES とか古いから。

姉 城田が出てくるかいかいの。

弟 あっそ。

そっけなくそう言うと、弟はテーブルの上にあったコップを姉の前にわざとらしく音を立てて置く。
姉、コップと弟を交互に見る。
姉

やだよ。

少し間。

弟

お茶。

姉

やだ。

弟

城田。

姉、席を立つとちょっと嬉しそうに、軽く跳ねるような足取りで、部屋の隅にある冷蔵庫へ向かい、
お茶を入れる。
弟が小さくため息をつきチャンネルをROOKIESに戻す。

姉

お前が譲るなんて珍しいじゃん。

弟

今日は巨人が勝つから。

姉

んー・・・そっか。

姉はそう言うと、テーブルの上に置かれていたプリントを手に取り、顔をしかめる。

弟

・・・何それ

姉

あー・・・学校の三者面談のプリント。お母さんに言ったら（冷淡な母の言い方をマネして）『私は親ではありませんので』ださ。

弟

いつものことじゃん。

姉

（ちょっと笑いながら棒読みっぽく）ですねー。・・・（小声）本当、笑えないって
の・・・（テンション高く）っと！城田登場まであともうちょっとやだ！

そこに大きなため息とともに父が帰宅。
リビングに入ってくるなりリモコンで野球のチャンネルに変われる。

弟

あ。

父

お、巨人勝ってんじゃん。なんだよ、今日の解説堀内かよ・・・。

椅子に座り観戦する父。
母がリビングに入ってくる。

母

あら、ゆうたんお帰りー。

娘と母の視線が合う。ほんの数秒、間。

母

・・・どうかしましたか。
娘

・・・（淡々と）いえ、なんでもありません。失礼しました。

娘、母と目を見合わせずにリビングを出る。
母はリモコンを取るとテレビの電源を消す。

父

ちょっと！

母

うるさい。

父は不機嫌そうにネクタイを外しながらリビングを出る。

弟

・・・いつものこと・・・じゃん。

弟もいなくなる。
リビングには誰もいない。
「カレーとGとシーマンと」
ニート山田

自宅、リビング。
チャイムの音が鳴る。

兄
なおきかな？

兄は玄関へ。

弟
はーい。

弟
なおきー。

兄
ドアノブ、ガチャガチャやんな。今開けるから。

弟
・・・！カレーにおい！！

兄
うん。ご飯の仕度するから手洗ってきて。

弟は手洗い場へ行き、すぐに戻ってくる。ソファーに座り、テレビを見始める。

兄、食器を用意しながら弟を見て。

弟
いや、だから伝えよ。

弟
つかれた。

弟
そんなわけないじゃん。何言ってんの？

兄
・・・テレビ禁止。

兄、TVを消す。

弟
あー見てたのに。

弟
いただきます。

弟
よそってこよー。

弟、キッチンへ。そして大盛りのカレーを両手で運んでくる。

弟
いただきます。（食べながら）ねえ、お母さんいつ帰ってくる？

兄
さあ？七時くらいじゃない？ごちそうさまでした。

兄は、食器を持ってキッチンへ。

兄
ぎゅるぁぁぁぁぁぁ！

兄、高速移動でリビングへ。

弟
え？何？

弟
あ、あふ、ふいろう！！！！

弟
え？何？・・・あ、ゴキブリ？

兄、高速で首を上下に振る。

弟
え、うわやだ・・・。

弟
お、お前行ってこいし。

弟
やだ。
兄

はらこれ。ヤツがどこかに隠れる前に！

弟

ファブリーズって効くの？

兄

いいから、無いよりマシ！

二人キッチンへ。弟が先頭、兄は弟の肩にしがみついている。

弟

いらない？

兄

・・・隠れたっぽいな・・・。

二人は落胆した様子で戻ってくる。

弟

いなくない？

兄

しょうがない！そのうち忘れるよ！・・・そうだ、シーンヤろう！シーンがすべてを忘れてくれるよ！

弟は食器を片付けにキッチンへ。

兄は妙にニコニコしながら一昔前に流行った、人の顔をした魚を育てるゲームを取り出し、専用のコントローラーのマイクをフーフーする。「シーンおはよう」「シーンかわいい」とTV画面に向かって話しかける兄。

それを見つめる弟。

弟

・・・たったん、それ楽しい？

弟に冷めた目で見られ、兄は一気にテンションを落とす。

兄

いや、そうでもない。はは、ははは。

（おわり）

Green  Summer

ぷちこ

家のリビング。夏希が漫画を読んでいるところに母がやってくる。

母

夏希〜。

夏希

なに？（顔を上げない）

母

翔ちゃんの家、お店閉めちゃったみたいなのよ。

夏希

え、ウソ！なんで！？（顔を上げる）

母

分からないけど、今お母さんからメールあったんだよ。驚いちゃった。

夏希

え、なんで閉めちゃったのかな？

母

う～ん、今は飲食店とか経営するの難しいからねえ。

夏希

不況・・・ってやつ？

母

だと思う。一応どうしたのか聞いてみるけど。

夏希

あのお店、みんなでよく集まってたのに・・・あっ、この事みんな知ってんのかな。

母

親にメール一斉に飛ばしたみたいだから、幼なじみの子は知ってるんじゃない？

夏希

でもあの店閉まったら今度からどこで集まればいいんだよ。

母

保育園から続いてるもんねえ。翔ちゃんにメールしたら？

夏希

うん、する。

夏希はそばにあった携帯をひらく。

夏希

なんて送ればいいんだろ？

母

お父さんの具合聞いてみたら。

夏希

お父さん？
母 だってお店やってたの翔ちゃんのお父さんなんだから。何かあったのかかもしれないじゃないか、お父さんに。
夏希 えー、なんか聞きづらくない？
母 まぁねえ・・・。付き合い長いんだし、大丈夫だとは思うけど。
夏希 とりあえず送ってみるー。（メールを送る）
母 でもまあ早い決断だったかもね。
夏希 何が？
母 翔ちゃんと。経営難になっていますね круг из-за этого.店を休める方が後々大変じゃないでしょ。
夏希 でもさぁ、お店やめたわけじゃん。これからどうすんだろ。
母 普通の会社勤めに戻るでしょう。もともと飲食店やる前はそうだったんだし。
夏希 そっか。

夏希の携帯が鳴る。

夏希 あ、返事来た。
母 なんて？
夏希 やっぱ最近お客さんがなくて上手くいかなかったららしい。でもお父さんは大丈夫みたい。
母（ホッとしたように）ああよかった～家族に何かあったわけじゃないのね。
夏希 うん。でもなんかあの店の海鮮料理食べたできてきた！分かってたらもう一回行ったのに。
母 あんた魚介類あまり食べないじゃない・・・。（言いながら去る）
夏希（母に向かって）あのお店は別！

夏希は、なんとなくまた携帯をいじり出す。少しの間。

夏希 「また、どっかで集まろうね」・・・と。（送信）

（おわり）