away, her clinical colleagues in Japan held a memorial service. All three of our children and two of our five grandchildren went to Japan for the service. Many of our Mamachi friends also attended.

Suzanne spent 1988–1989 in Japan on a Fulbright and for two decades after that she went to Japan in the summer to teach social work. While there, she regularly met our Mamachi friends. Several years ago Suzanne decided to write about three of the mothers in the Mamachi families stretching over the five decades she knew them. She completed the book, *The Japanese Family in Transition: From the Professional Housewife Ideal to the Dilemmas of Choice,* shortly before she passed away.

APPENDIX

A Report on the Fieldwork

At the outset of the fieldwork my wife and I were interested in the middle-class family, but not particularly in the salary man. Our interest in the salary-man family emerged gradually during the fieldwork and analysis of data as we were struck by its uniqueness and importance in modern Japan. We had originally gone to Japan to get information on middle-class Japanese families to compare with the results of a study of Irish-American, Italo-American, and old-American families, in which I had participated. Our research problem had two parts: (1) the determination of Japanese family patterns to contrast with these other ethnic groups; (2) the contrast between families of emotionally disturbed and “normal” children. It is the first problem which is reported in the present work. In order to make our research design comparable to the earlier study we decided to find six families with an emotionally disturbed child and six families with “normal” children, and to see these families intensively, at least once a week for a year or more. Furthermore, we hoped to be participant-observers in middle-class Japanese life and to familiarize ourselves with relevant research by Japanese scholars.

Our approach to fieldwork was a result of our graduate training in sociological and psychoanalytic theory, our experience doing clinical and home interviewing under psychiatric supervision, and our participation in interdisciplinary projects. My wife had worked for several years as a psychiatric social worker and had done home interviewing as part of an
interdisciplinary research project. I also had had experience in clinical
work with psychiatric patients and with parents of psychiatric patients.
Consequently our approach to anthropological fieldwork was heavily in-
fluenced by an interest in subtleties of relationships which comes from
intensive personal contacts.

In Japan, we tried as much as possible to develop close relationships
with people in our community. We lived in Japanese-style homes in
Japanese neighborhoods in which we were the only foreigners. To have
intimate contacts with the Japanese we felt it essential to conduct our
work in Japanese. We had some language training before going to Japan,
and most of our first year there was spent in intensive language study. We
had developed contacts in Mamachi during this first year and made a
number of visits there before moving to Mamachi in June 1959, where we
then lived as participant-observers for slightly more than one year. We
conducted our fieldwork in Japanese from the beginning, regardless of
communication problems. However, we tape-recorded many interviews
in order to go over the material later with Japanese assistants to ensure
accurate understanding. Even when our command of Japanese was ele-
mentary, most people made an effort to talk in simple Japanese and to
elaborate when we did not understand. Although the process was some-
times time-consuming, it is our feeling that much was communicated
even when our language ability was minimal. Language difficulties made
it difficult for us to catch subtleties of meaning, but it also caused us to be
more sensitive to nuances of facial expressions, gestures, and tone of
voice. When studying taped interviews with assistants we learned we had
frequently misunderstood words and phrases, or at times even entire sen-
tences, but we rarely had misunderstood a person’s feelings or the general
import of the conversation.

From the beginning, we presented ourselves to Mamachi residents as
social scientists. But in our own minds our model was not the detached
scientist who keeps his feelings out of his work. We felt we could learn
more by participating in the life of the local community than by trying to
remain aloof. We defined ourselves as foreigners interested in forming
friendships and learning about Japanese life. To the extent that we re-
tained scientific detachment, it was not in restricting our participation but
in later analyzing the nature of this participation and what it meant for an
understanding of the studied families.

Some fellow American social scientists have asked us how we can be
certain our informants told us “the truth.” I would prefer to phrase the
question not “Did they tell us the truth?” but “What truth did they tell?”
For example, when I asked one man why he moved to his present resi-
dence, he explained it was convenient to his office and nearby relatives.
His wife told my wife confidentially that they moved because a fortune
teller had told them that their old home was facing the wrong direction
and might bring them had luck. Some people might call the husband’s
answer a cover-up. I prefer to interpret it as one part of the truth, a
reflection of genuine embarrassment about believing a superstition and a
desire to be modern and scientific, especially when talking with a repre-
sentative of the modern West.

We had expected that questions about sex or personal finance would
meet with the greatest resistance, but these topics seemed easier for the
Japanese to discuss than their superstitions or information which might
adversely reflect on their status in the community. When we asked ques-
tions about folk beliefs and superstitions, most denied any interest and
said they no longer believed or practiced superstitions. It was only by
observations of shrines, ceremonies, and by chance remarks that we were
able to find some of this information. For example, when I inquired what
was around a boy’s neck, the mother looked embarrassed and replied that
it was an amulet for luck. She spontaneously continued by explaining that
it was only a toy and that they did not really believe it brought good luck.
Her embarrassment and apologetic tone, as well as the man’s failure to
acknowledge the family’s going to a fortune teller, convinced us that
superstition is more widespread than people verbally indicated. However,
what is considered folk belief varies from country to country, and just as
some Western practices would seem superstitious to Japanese, so they
talked freely about some practices that appeared to us as folk beliefs.
For example, they believe that a number of diseases can be helped by hot
springs, and medical specialists advise wearing a hara-maki (special
cloths to cover the stomach) at night even in the hottest weather to avoid
nebiki (a cold caught while sleeping). However, we are not in any posi-
tion to give a quantitative estimate of the extent of superstition except to
say that it is more common than people report.

Similarly with regard to matters which might adversely affect a fami-
ly’s community reputation, we suspect that a number of things were not
fully reported. No family told of any relative who had been involved in
any kind of crime, but many told of rich and famous relatives. Even the few cases of marital problems and divorce we heard about from normal families were usually told only after we had developed a close relationship. Several families were reluctant to tell us about their ancestors, and while this may reflect a conviction that the past should not be considered important, it is our feeling from other incidental information that these families were not proud of their background. Hence, without making independent investigations about their relatives, which would have been extremely time-consuming, we do not feel we can talk with confidence about certain aspects of their backgrounds or to discard the possibility that some relatives might have more problems and less fame than we heard about.

On the whole, however, we felt that Mamachi residents were as willing to talk about their lives as Americans we had previously interviewed. Americans were also reluctant to talk about their own violations of law or of mental illness in the family. However, the areas of sensitivity were slightly different. Although the Americans felt sufficiently removed from peculiar relatives to talk of them in a completely detached way, the Mamachi residents felt closely identified with relatives and were therefore ashamed of any misconduct. American sensitivities centered on the invasion of privacy (especially sex and family finance) which was not the object of particular sensitivities in Mamachi once a relationship of trust had been established.

There is no simple answer to the question of "What truth?" because it depended on context and situation. To be sure, we watched for the standard clinical cues, the slips of the tongue, the spontaneous expressions of feeling, the latent meanings in the association of one idea with another. In addition to this, we felt it important to see the persons in a variety of situations.

Most people behaved differently when seen by a man than by a woman; they behaved differently when a third person was present than when interviewed alone; they behaved differently in different groups; they behaved differently when first introduced than after further acquaintance. But people we met for the first time early in our stay behaved differently on that meeting from people we met for the first time later during our stay when we knew better how to behave and could relax and talk with them more freely. People behaved differently in formal and in informal situations. Men behaved differently when drinking, when at home, and when in their office. Children behaved differently at home and at school.

We saw people privately and in groups, in their homes and ours. My wife visited tea-ceremony and flower-arrangement groups and attended meetings for mothers of nursery-school children. I saw men in their offices as well as in their homes. We visited the schools, greeted people in the streets. We attended formal parties on special occasions. We saw people when their children were present and when they were absent, and at different hours of the day.

Many of the opportunities to see people in a variety of circumstances was provided by our very intensive contact with the six well families who had specifically agreed to have us visit at least once a week for more than a year. It is perhaps characteristic of Japanese society that we were introduced to these families by the local grade-school principal, who was introduced to us through an acquaintance of a friend of ours. The wives in the six families formed a little club for such varied purposes as discussing problems of coping with us, giving us parties, learning Western cooking from my wife, and teaching her how to cook Japanese delicacies in return. This group of six ladies, which calls itself the "Vogelkai" (the Vogel club), has had several meetings since our return to the United States. But in addition to these families whom we saw on a regular formal basis, we had numerous contacts with many families through our neighborhood, the local school, shopping, places of work, and friends and relatives of people we met in these places.

It is our feeling that an accurate picture of Japanese life comes not through any sudden or semimagical penetration into their inner secrets but through the patient accumulation of observations in a wide variety of situations. Of course, in interviewing, getting a straightforward account of the informant’s experiences is essential, and it is our impression that this is most likely to come from a relationship with the informant based on mutual trust. In any conflict between information-gathering and the development of a good relationship, we gave priority to the development of the latter. If a person seemed reluctant to talk on a subject, we did not press him. If someone wanted us not to see them at a certain time or did not show us certain parts of their house, we did not insist, nor did we attempt tricks or pressure to see what we might not otherwise be shown. We raised questions and expressed an interest in seeing or hearing about virtually everything and tried by winning their confidence to overcome
their reluctance to tell us or show us something. It is our conviction that this basic trust was repaid in the long run by a willingness to relate their feelings freely and honestly. We tried to show by our actions as well as our words that we were deserving of their trust. Early in our research we said that information would be treated confidentially, but this was less convincing than our refusal to pass on gossip when asked questions about other families.

In general, we felt that we received more reliable information when people discussed concrete instances than when they answered on a general level. Hence, in our questions and in our responses to their comments, we indicated an interest in their concrete experiences. Most people responded to our interest in them, and many even seemed to enjoy and look forward to having someone listen to their problems. This kind of relationship also required our willingness to tell about ourselves, and often people responded to our self-revelations with spontaneous revelations about themselves.

At first we underestimated their interest in us, not as social scientists, but as Americans. The first time we entertained friends in Mamachi we were anxious to show how completely we were living Japanese style; only toward the end of the visit did it become clear to us that they had been disappointed not to have a chance to see what an American home was really like. Some of the clearest expressions of their attitudes came from their questions or expressions of surprise about our American habits.

As a whole, we feel we were successful in establishing close personal relationships with Mamachi families and in receiving an opportunity to observe their lives. The fact that we were foreigners trying to understand their culture made it natural for them to explain to us how they did things, what they believed, and what their family and community was like. Some even said they felt freer in talking to us than to their friends and neighbors since we would never be involved in community gossip and evaluation. Some were reluctant to explain the mundane common experiences of their lives, apparently thinking it not worthy of “research” by an American associated with Harvard University—a university with high prestige among educated residents of Mamachi. We feel, however, that we were able to overcome this resistance by our obvious interest in ordinary details. However, the process of developing close relationships was more taxing for Mamachi residents and for us than we had anticipated.

For one thing the process of mutual understanding that goes beyond surface pleasantries and comes to terms with differences in attitudes and patterns of living requires considerable adjustment. Moreover, Mamachi families were extremely generous in entertaining us and extremely patient in answering our questions. They entertained us more elaborately and with greater expense and trouble than we felt comfortable in receiving. We tried to return their kindness by giving presents, by offering return entertainment, and perhaps most of all by giving English conversation lessons to their children. For many, it was the first time they had come into direct contact with Americans. Some eagerly sought out our acquaintance, either to practice English conversation, to find out how Americans handle child-rearing or business problems, to find out how a child or relative of theirs might visit America, or just for the exciting experience of getting to see and know some Americans. In almost every group discussion, when an issue arose, someone would turn to us to find out how it would be handled in America. A few seemed somewhat frightened of us at first and later somewhat relieved that we did not fit their image of Americans, which they had derived from stories of American soldiers in Japan. A few people remained cautious in talking with us, but they were invariably polite in answering our questions. Many found it easier to relate to our three-year-old son, who quickly acquired the Japanese language, than to us, and our son’s presence often softened the stiffness of conversation with other adults. Most people were impressed by our seriousness and willingness to learn the Japanese language, but some, not completely comfortable with the thought that we were studying them, were concerned about presenting what they thought was the good side of Japanese life. Most, however, after getting to know us, spontaneously talked of their own lives and asked questions about ours.

We soon found that if we presented our opinions first, they would find some way to agree with us. If we started a question by saying, “We have been impressed that . . .”, they would usually answer in a way that would support our observations. Only the frankest and closest of friends directly corrected our misunderstandings. We soon realized that we should ask questions in such a way that would give them an opportunity to answer in a variety of ways without causing them embarrassment. We also learned, however, that they were very responsive to our definition of the situation. If we were stiff in asking a question, they were usually stiff in answering,
but if we were jovial and light, though frank, they tended to respond in the same way.

When we went to Mamachi, we had certain general questions about family life to which we hoped to get answers, but we had no formal questionnaire. In addition to the questions which we were seeking to answer, we determined to be sensitive to clues that would indicate strong feelings about problems that we had not anticipated. The process of drawing generalizations was one of following up observations with detailed questioning about the meaning, context, and extent of the practice. We conducted roughly six hundred hours of scheduled visits in people’s homes specifically for the purpose of research. Altogether we accumulated several thousand pages of typed notes based on these interviews. Although we had discussions during these visits, the fact that we were in private homes gave us the opportunity to see a wide variety of situations, many of which arose spontaneously during our visits.

In families of disturbed children, the weekly therapy was conducted by staff members of the National Institute of Mental Health, except for one family where my wife treated the mother. In addition, I conducted one or two lengthy home interviews per family. The well families were visited primarily by my wife and me, but a few brief interviews were conducted by a Japanese assistant; besides, the projective test material was given by Japanese psychologists. Once we had made an observation or learned something of interest, we then followed it up by asking relevant questions of other families with whom we were in contact. The use of intensive interviewing techniques makes it more difficult to count precisely how many people engage in a certain practice, but it makes possible a thorough check on the context and meaning of a practice or attitude when it arises. It does make it necessary to rely on a variety of informants to achieve an estimate of how widespread practices are. On this matter, obviously some people are much able than others. Many wives, for example, had a very limited range of social contacts and did not prove reliable but some wives with a wide range of contacts and acute sensitivity to others’ attitudes were extremely useful for our aim to obtain a picture of the extent to which certain practices are followed. Fortunately, there are many studies based on larger samplings now available in Japan, and it was possible to compare specific items obtained in our work with the results of larger surveys. Although our better informants could not give precise statistics on the extent to which certain practices were observed, on items covered by surveys we were pleased to find a high level of agreement between the results of the surveys and the opinions of our informants.

In addition to questionnaires available from other researchers, we developed some questionnaires of our own to supplement our intensive material on basic information about family relationships and child-rearing practices. Also we used a sentence-completion test, essentially a translation of the one developed by Robert Hess and Gerald Hambel. We felt that it would unduly stiffen our relationships with Mamachi friends if we distributed these questions in Mamachi, but we distributed them to about sixty families in each of seven other communities. These communities included one salary-man neighborhood, one small shopkeeper neighborhood, three agricultural villages, one deep-sea fishing village where fathers were away for eleven months a year, and a nearby off-shore fishing village where fathers returned home every day.

I also interviewed a number of expert informants in various cities throughout Japan. For the most part they were either marriage arrangers (who had investigated various family backgrounds, brought together suitable couples, and obtained parental consent for the wedding) or social scientists. We have also had the opportunity, both while in Japan and after returning to the United States, to consult with Japanese and American scholars interested in the Japanese family. Although we have not used this information directly in the writing of our Mamachi material, it has permitted us to correct some mistaken impressions, to see new dimensions in some of the things we observed, and to alert ourselves to the specific context in which we conducted our interviewing. In general these experts have lent considerable support to our feeling that the patterns we have described in Mamachi are widespread in many parts of Japan.

To spell out in detail how we arrived at each of our conclusions presented in the text would require several thousand pages. The conclusions presented reflect not only a simple recording of facts which we heard and observed but occasional leaps in interpretation. In order to convey our general approach to the problem of getting information and drawing conclusions, I present the following examples:

**The uniqueness of the salary-man pattern.** Of the twelve families which we studied intensively, it happened that six were salary-man families, one was an independent professional family, two were businessman
families, and three were families of white-collar workers in small enterprises. We soon noticed patterns of difference between these groups of families, but our attention to the problem of the salary man first came from the contrasts which the professional family and one of the business families drew between their way of life and the way of life of the salary man. The descriptions they gave were even more detailed than the observations we had made to that point. From that time on, I began exploring the sociological factors that might be associated with these differences. With every salary man, I began exploring the relationship with his family and outside in terms of the relationship with the firm. With all nonsalary men, I began comparing their lives with those of salary men. Through medical colleagues at the National Institute of Mental Health and elsewhere, I could get more detailed information about how friends of theirs had entered private practice. However, I did not decide to focus on the salary man in the write-up of the material until after returning to the United States and analyzing the questionnaire responses of the salary men and the small shopkeepers. There were many consistent differences between shopkeepers and salary men which seemed to sharpen the distinction between the salary man and other occupational groups. We had not had any formal interviewing experience with small shopkeepers, but our daily contacts with them and what we had heard about them were fully consistent with what we learned from the questionnaires. Once I had decided to organize the material around the topic of the salary man, it was then necessary to go through all the interview material which we had collected to trace the implications of this pattern in various social spheres.

The patterning of community relationships. Many of our early observations about the community grew out of our concern with our own relationships with Mamachi residents. For example, we found that we were treated very differently by high-status people in the community than by those of low status. We were concerned as to how to develop smoother and easier relationships, but we noticed that in general high-status people seemed relaxed and were not overly polite. Low-status people were extremely polite and seemed anxious to prove that they came from respectable families. This sensitized us to certain clues to look for in groups of people in higher and lower status. We noticed, for example, that in the meetings of the six well families the higher-status families behaved to the lower-status families more as they had toward us. The reserve, caution, and anxiety felt by the lower-status families toward us were also reflected in their relations toward higher-status families but not toward other lower-status families. We noticed that people of high status were polite but seemed wary about deep involvement. Having received a number of vague requests and presents from people who wanted favors, we sympathetically asked the higher-status families how to deal with such requests, and they replied with a spontaneous and lengthy outpouring of feeling and information reflecting their deep concern with this issue. Once we had made concrete observations, we could use them without mentioning names as a basis for seeking explanations and for eliciting related experiences of other families.

Immediately before moving to Mamachi, I asked various people there how we should go about finding a place to live and whether there were any special problems we should expect in moving. Many people thought it would be somewhat lonely for us, and they continued further by relating some of the feelings they had when they first moved. It is our belief that these spontaneous expressions of feeling provided us with a fuller understanding of the subtleties and strength of their feelings than more formal and rigid interview procedures.

General knowledge of community practices. On some topics people talked about their own experiences but knew little about the activities of their friends. For example, men talked fairly freely to me about their friends' sexual experiences as well as of their own, but women, although willing to talk to my wife about their own experiences, were so poorly informed about other women's activities that they could not be useful informants about wider community patterns. Hence, our information on women's sexual activities is based on only a small number of cases and we would not have had confidence to report our own findings had it not been for the fact that they generally coincided with the findings of Japanese scholars who have conducted much more extensive research into the field of sexual behavior.

Interpretation of material. Some problems do require a leap in interpretation. For example, I have concluded that one important reason why Mamachi residents do not go back to their rural villages is their fear of requests which would be difficult to handle, yet no person in Mamachi specifically gave this as the reason. They said that they should go back more often, but many gave no reason or explained that it was due to having only a short time off from work or congested traffic during the special holidays when they have time off. Although these are undoubted-
ly important considerations, on two occasions we went with Mamachi residents to visit their rural relatives, and both times large numbers of villagers came bringing presents to the Mamachi residents with requests to find homes and be of assistance in the city. Supplementing these observations were the many accounts given us in Mamachi of difficult requests from rural friends or relatives. Since many felt guilty about not going back more to rural villages, and since many expressed concern about requests from rural acquaintances, we felt it was reasonable to relate these two observations even if they did not.

Child-rearing practices. Most parents with whom we had close contact were in their thirties or early forties and their children were already in school. Because they seemed vague on precise details of handling small children, toward the end of our stay my wife made a concerted effort to study the techniques of mothers who had small children. The director of our son's nursery school assisted this study with introductions to ten mothers who each had a child in nursery school and an infant at home. My wife then conducted a two-to-three-hour interview in the homes of each of these mothers which also gave her an opportunity to observe mother-infant interaction. The director of the nursery school supplied us with additional information about the families and about the behavior of the children in the nursery-school setting. We also had opportunities to observe groups of young children playing on the school playground and in the alley in front of our home. Our interpretation of child-rearing practices was heavily influenced by the concrete cases presented to us by Japanese child psychiatrists and child psychologists even though our different cultural perspective sometimes led us to different interpretations of the child's behavior and the mother-child relationship.

Any attempt to understand one's own behavior, or one's friends' behavior, or a stranger's behavior is subject to special hazards resulting from one's inadequate objectivity and lack of adequate understanding. We took as many precautions as we knew to assure a many-sided sympathetic understanding of Mamachi residents, and in analyzing the material we have attempted to consider how our own position and bias might have interfered with our interpretations. We can only hope that our conclusions, though inadequate in giving the full flavor of life in Mamachi, will be of some help in furthering Western understanding of Japanese society.
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2. Cf. John C. Pelzel, "The Small Industrialist in Japan," Explorations in Entrepreneurial History, 1954, 7:79-93. Especially since 1955, however, the economic boom in large companies has assisted the development of certain small industries. Although the number of small enterprises has decreased compared to before World War II, the number has remained relatively constant since the war. Many of these small enterprises have been able to survive by affiliating with a large company, albeit in a subordinate position.
3. Although no precise statistics are available on the growth of the number of salary men, rough estimates can be obtained from the number of white-collar workers who are not self-employed since most white-collar workers (except those in very small enterprises) would be classified as salary men.