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Abstract

Previous research has demonstrated that unique names increased in Japan, which shows a rise in uniqueness-seeking and individualism. To increase the validity of the prior findings, it is important to confirm the robustness of their results. Therefore, this study examined another indicator of historical changes in names in Japan. Specifically, I investigated whether the rates of common names decreased in Japan between 2004 and 2018. The dataset used in the previous study was analyzed. The results consistently showed that the rates of common names decreased for both boys and girls for the period. These results were consistent with the previous research, which further increases the validity of the finding that Japanese culture became more individualistic.
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1. Introduction

Ogihara et al. (2015) demonstrated that the rates of common Chinese characters used in baby names increased but the rates of common readings decreased in Japan between 2004 and 2013. Further, they showed that writing variations of names decreased, but reading variations increased for the period. Taken together, these results were interpreted to indicate that parents came to give unique names by assigning more common Chinese characters but reading them uncommonly. Thus, this research shows an increase in uniqueness-seeking and individualism in Japan. This shift toward greater individualism has also been reported in other cultural aspects in Japan (Hamamura, 2012; Ogihara, 2017b; 2018b; 2020b; Taras et al., 2012; for reviews, see Ogihara, 2017a; 2018a).

These results may be difficult to understand especially for non-native Japanese speakers because names and naming practices in Japan are different from those in other cultures. In Japan, three types of characteristics can be used for names: hiragana, katakana, and Chinese characters. Hiragana and katakana are phonograms, which are symbols representing speech sounds without reference to meanings (e.g., alphabet). Thus, writings and readings of hiragana and katakana are fixed. In contrast, Chinese characters are ideograms, which are symbols representing concepts without reference to sounds. Thus, writings and readings of Chinese characters are not fixed. Importantly, people can give any readings to a Chinese character used for baby names. For example, a common writing for a boys’ name “大翔” has at least 18 variations of readings (Ogihara, 2021c). This naming practice makes it possible to give unique names in Japan (for patterns of uncommon names, see Ogihara, 2015; 2021b).
Moreover, Ogihara (2021a) directly examined whether the rates of unique names, rather than common names, increased by analyzing datasets of baby names that includes both writings and readings. This shows that unique names increased in Japan between 2004 and 2018, consistent with the prior study (Ogihara et al., 2015).

It is important to empirically confirm whether these prior findings are valid and robust. Indeed, the reproducibility of science is considered valuable (e.g., Open Science Collaboration, 2012; 2015). Therefore, this study analyzed another indicator of names that had not been investigated in Ogihara (2021a): temporal changes in the rates of common names. Based on the previous findings that unique names increased in Japan (Ogihara, 2021a), it was hypothesized that the rates of common names had decreased in Japan.

2. Method
2.1. Data
I analyzed the data that are open to the public (https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/2WURJ; for details, see Ogihara, 2020a) and have been used in previous research (Ogihara, 2021a; 2021c).

The data were from annual surveys conducted by the Meiji Yasuda Life Insurance Company between 2004 and 2018 (Meiji Yasuda Life Insurance Company, 2020; Ogihara, 2020a). To be more specific, the data were generated from lists of readings in the top 10 most common writings, which are published by Meiji Yasuda. Although the top 10 writings are common, their readings can differ within each writing. Thus, each name is not necessarily common. For instance, a common writing “大翔” has many readings, such as “Hiroto,” “Haruto,” “Yamato,” and “Tsubasa”, but the name that is written as “大翔” and read “Tsubasa” is uncommon (Ogihara, 2021c).

Sample sizes for each year are summarized in Table 1. The average annual sample sizes for the raw data were 251 for boys and 268 for girls. The total sample sizes were 3,762 for boys and 4,017 for girls. The average annual sample sizes for the original surveys were 5,242 for boys and 4,958 for girls. The total sample sizes were 78,623 for boys and 74,372 for girls.

2.2. Indicator
The rates of the top 10 most common names were calculated separately for boys and girls because many prior studies used this rate as the main indicator (e.g., Ogihara et al., 2015; Varnum & Kitayama, 2011). The top 10 most common names were determined by absolute frequencies. For example, they included 大翔 (ひろと: Hiroto) and 蓮 (れん: Ren) for boys’ names and 陽菜 (ひな: Hina) and さくら (Sakura) for girls’ names. Moreover, to confirm whether the results were robust, the rates of the top 5 and 15 most common names were calculated. If the phenomenon of a decrease in common names was robust, then consistent results should be observed, regardless of these indicators.

2.3. Analysis
First, I computed the percentage of each individual name among the total sample size of the original surveys. Then, I calculated the percentage of the top 5, 10, and 15 most common names in each year. In this calculation, when more than 5, 10, or 15 names were included in the common names, the percentage was adjusted (e.g., 11 names in the top 10 most common names due to a duplicated rank).

Next, I calculated two indices: correlation with year (r) and annual change (%). Correlation with year indicates how each percentage of common names increased, decreased, or did not change over time.

1 The smallest number of name variations included in the dataset was 16 (for girls in 2007). Thus, the rate of the top 15 most common names was used as an indicator (for details, see Ogihara, 2020a).
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Present data</strong></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>3,762</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>4,017</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>7,779</td>
<td>519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Original survey</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>4,861</td>
<td>4,292</td>
<td>4,409</td>
<td>4,591</td>
<td>4,621</td>
<td>4,595</td>
<td>4,078</td>
<td>3,648</td>
<td>3,388</td>
<td>5,338</td>
<td>3,481</td>
<td>4,278</td>
<td>8,947</td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td>9,796</td>
<td>78,623</td>
<td>5,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>4,419</td>
<td>4,082</td>
<td>4,167</td>
<td>4,204</td>
<td>4,275</td>
<td>4,254</td>
<td>3,805</td>
<td>3,503</td>
<td>3,222</td>
<td>5,026</td>
<td>3,273</td>
<td>4,122</td>
<td>8,509</td>
<td>8,030</td>
<td>9,481</td>
<td>74,372</td>
<td>4,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9,280</td>
<td>8,374</td>
<td>8,576</td>
<td>8,795</td>
<td>8,896</td>
<td>8,849</td>
<td>7,883</td>
<td>7,151</td>
<td>6,610</td>
<td>10,364</td>
<td>6,754</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td>17,456</td>
<td>16,330</td>
<td>19,277</td>
<td>152,995</td>
<td>10,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Experimental Results
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Annual change indicates the extent to which each percentage of common names varied. For this index, I conducted a simple regression analysis in which the year was an independent variable and the percentage of common name was a dependent variable. In this calculation, a significance test was not conducted. This was because the data points were not considered independent, which is necessary to conduct a significance test. Analyses were conducted both weighing and unweighting the sample sizes of individual years (e.g., Clark et al., 2015; Li et al., 2020; Ogihara, 2019; 2020c; Ogihara et al., 2015; Ogihara & Kusumi, 2020; Park et al., 2016).

3. Results
In all the analyses using the three different indicators (top 5, 10, and 15), the rates of common names decreased for both boys and girls between 2004 and 2018 (Table 2 and Figure 1).
Moreover, these results were consistently found when the sample sizes were not weighted (Table 2 and Figure 2).

4. Discussion
As predicted, the rates of common names decreased for both boys and girls between 2004 and 2018 in Japan, showing an increase in uniqueness-seeking and individualism. These results are consistent with previous research on names (Ogihara, 2021a; Ogihara et al., 2015), confirming that the prior findings are valid and robust. Furthermore, these results are also consistent with prior research on other aspects of Japanese culture (Hamamura, 2012; Ogihara, 2017b; 2018b; Taras et al., 2012; for reviews, see Ogihara, 2017a; 2018a). Therefore, this research contributes to the existing literature by providing further evidence of the rise in uniqueness-seeking and individualism in Japan.

The increase in unique names has also been suggested in other nations such as Germany (Gerhards & Hackenbroch, 2000), the United States (Twenge et al., 2010; 2016), and China (Cai et al., 2018; but also see Ogihara, 2020d). Thus, this phenomenon may be found more broadly.

| Table 2. Historical changes in the percentages of common names |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                | Sex             | Indicator       | Correlation with year (r) | Annual change (%) |
| Weighting sample sizes | Boys            | Top 5           | -.387               | -.024             |
|                    |                 | Top 10          | -.506               | -.052             |
|                    |                 | Top 15          | -.313               | -.037             |
|                    | Girls           | Top 5           | -.376               | -.028             |
|                    |                 | Top 10          | -.281               | -.022             |
|                    |                 | Top 15          | -.306               | -.052             |
| Not weighting sample sizes | Boys            | Top 5           | -.267               | -.019             |
|                    |                 | Top 10          | -.289               | -.044             |
|                    |                 | Top 15          | -.175               | -.023             |
|                    | Girls           | Top 5           | -.288               | -.023             |
|                    |                 | Top 10          | -.218               | -.020             |
|                    |                 | Top 15          | -.229               | -.045             |
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As a limitation, it is unclear why Japanese culture has become more individualistic. There are many factors which influence individualism such as economic affluence (e.g., Grossmann & Varnum, 2015), subsistence style (e.g., Talhelm, 2020), relational mobility (e.g., Yuki & Schug, 2020), and residential

Figure 1. Percentages of common names, 2004–2018 (weighting sample sizes).

Figure 2. Percentages of common names, 2004–2018 (unweighting sample sizes).

As a limitation, it is unclear why Japanese culture has become more individualistic. There are many factors which influence individualism such as economic affluence (e.g., Grossmann & Varnum, 2015), subsistence style (e.g., Talhelm, 2020), relational mobility (e.g., Yuki & Schug, 2020), and residential
mobility (e.g., Choi & Oishi, 2020). Future studies should examine the relationships between these possible factors and the historical changes in individualism in Japan.
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