Nora Kottmann | Cornelia Reiher [eds.]

# Studying Japan

## Handbook of Research Designs, Fieldwork and Methods

Nomos

Nora Kottmann | Cornelia Reiher [eds.]

# Studying Japan

## Handbook of Research Designs, Fieldwork and Methods

Nomos

**The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek** lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at http://dnb.d-nb.de

ISBN 978-3-8487-5085-6 (Print)
978-3-8452-9287-8 (ePDF)

**British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data**
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN 978-3-8487-5085-6 (Print)
978-3-8452-9287-8 (ePDF)

**Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data**
Kottmann, Nora | Reiher, Cornelia
Studying Japan
Handbook of Research Designs, Fieldwork and Methods
Nora Kottmann | Cornelia Reiher (eds.)
501 pp.
Includes bibliographic references and index.

ISBN 978-3-8487-5085-6 (Print)
978-3-8452-9287-8 (ePDF)

Onlineversion
Nomos eLibrary

1st Edition 2020

# Table of contents

# List of figures

## List of tables

# Foreword

'Anything goes, as long as it is relevant and convincing.' This guidance by my supervisor sounded like an invitation to confidently rely on my curiosity and creativity when doing research for my PhD back in the late 1980s. But I soon learned to translate the statement into 'Anything goes, as long as it complies with the rules.' The rules set by the academic community defined what was relevant and convincing. Methods form an integral part of this. They are the tools and rules of the trade of scholars: as tools they enhance our abilities to explore, test and verify, as rules they constrain what is acceptable.

German Japanese Studies mostly differs from the more traditional Japanology with regard to its focus on subjects beyond culture, literature and language. When the new academic community started to establish itself at German-speaking universities in the 1980s, it had no genuine methodology. Instead it borrowed from the so-called *Methodenfächer* (method subjects) like Sociology, Political Science or Economics. But how could methods developed by disciplines that favour theories which are abstract from time and space be usefully applied to academic enquiry interested in phenomena that are defined by specific time-space constellations, like the family in post-war Japan or Japanese firms in the 1990s?

Anthropology provides a solution as it offers a methodology which explicitly honours time-space contingencies, and some of the best research on Japan, like Ronald Dore's classic *British factory—Japanese factory* (1973), has been achieved by applying anthropological methods. However, not all issues in the realm of management, the economy, politics and society lend themselves to anthropological methods. So, scholars in the field of Japanese Studies continue to be confronted with the tension between research interests about phenomena specific to Japan and research methods not primarily concerned with specifics.

The handbook *Studying Japan* does not resolve this tension, but it does provide a pragmatic way of coping with it. And it does so in a comprehensive and systematic manner. By making the various methods of the Social Sciences accessible and by offering guidance on how to apply these tools and rules during the different stages of a research project, this handbook will prove highly valuable for those who study, teach and do research on Japan. Given its pluralistic approach, the handbook does not proclaim that there is only one right way to conduct research. It has no intention of being the *Bible of Japanese Studies*, but it certainly has the potential to become *The book of recipes* on how to make one's research both relevant and convincing.

The editors deserve both thanks and respect for taking up the challenge of embarking on this project as well as for what they already accomplished with the conference in 2019 and now with the timely publication of this handbook. The German Institute for Japanese Studies (DIJ) in Tokyo is very happy and proud to have been part of this endeavour.

Franz Waldenberger
Director, German Institute for Japanese Studies
Tokyo, July 2020

# Chapter 7
# How to interview people: Qualitative interviews

*Nora Kottmann and Cornelia Reiher*

## 1. Introduction

Scholars researching Japan from across the Social Science spectrum rely on qualitative interviews with a variety of actors to learn about their lifeworlds, experiences, practices and perspectives on a range of issues. These include, for example, residents in a specific neighbourhood, local government officials, parents, married and divorced couples and farmers (see this chapter, Alexy, Ch. 7.3; Brumann, Ch. 7.1; Yamaguchi, Ch. 7.2). In this chapter, we examine what qualitative interviews are and what insights researchers can gain from interviews in general, as well as from interviews both in and outside of Japan. We detail decisions a researcher should make before conducting interviews to ensure the data produced addresses the research question. We then introduce different types of interviews, elicit the process of selecting and contacting interviewees and give practical advice on preparing for the actual interviews. This is followed by in-depth discussion on the practice of interviewing: specifically language issues, the process of interviewing, dealing with (non-)verbal expressions, negotiating interviewer–interviewee relations and recording. The chapter concludes with reflections on interview follow-ups, particularly in regard to the transcription of interviews, and how and why to stay in touch with informants.

## 2. Qualitative interviews

Qualitative interviews range from the ‘traditional’ question and answer type to more open-ended and spontaneous ‘conversations’. Interviews are probably the most frequently used tool in qualitative research (Keddi/Stich 2008, p. 2) and are utilised in the Humanities and Social Sciences to enable the researcher to ‘elicit views and opinions from the participants’ (Creswell 2014, p. 190), to learn about the interviewees’ experiences (Rubin/Rubin 2005, p. 2) and to obtain descriptions of their lifeworlds in order to understand how an interviewee interprets the meaning of phenomena they describe (Brinkmann 2014, pp. 277, 286–289). In contrast to surveying through questionnaires, interviewing people directly enables researchers to ask questions, listen to stories and respond to unexpected issues and opinions immediately. In addition, when meeting informants in their homes or coffee shops, or when following them through their paddy fields, researchers can catch a glimpse of the environments the informants live in.

Although differences in the definition of the qualitative interview types exist across disciplines, most scholars agree on three basic strategies to produce verbal data: asking individuals more or less fixed questions, listening to stories and talking with couples or groups (Flick 2006, p. 149). Depending on a researcher's discipline, the boundaries between interviews and 'normal' conversations can be blurred. In Anthropology, for example, 'questioning and/or just listening take place within everyday conversation' (O'Reilly 2005, p. 116; see this chapter, Alexy, Ch. 7.3). This approach stands in contrast to more formalised interview settings where researchers and informants might meet for the first (and sometimes only) time in order to ask and answer questions for a fixed period of time.

Qualitative interviews, regardless of their specific definition, always involve explicit rules concerning their content, duration and setting. These rules and practices may differ according to disciplinary conventions, but foremost according to the research topic, context and interviewees. This also applies to ethical rules 'concerning consent for the interview, for recording and for preserving the subject's anonymity and the confidentiality of the respondent' (Hammond/Wellington 2013, p. 91; see Slater et al., Ch. 16.2). Because of the plurality of approaches to interviews, it is important to familiarise oneself with how interviews are conceptualised within one's discipline, as well as best practices for how they are to be conducted, documented and analysed.

| Key issues |
| --- |
| Qualitative interviews are a method to find out how people characterise and view their lives, to identify what they find important and to understand their perceptions and interpretations of the topic a researcher is interested in. Therefore, it is people's perspectives and not 'objective facts' researchers can find out. |

## 3. Choosing the 'right' type of interview and questions

Once a researcher decides on interviews as a suitable tool to answer her research question(s), two intertwined decisions must be made: **how to interview, and how and what to ask**. There exist different interview types that can be distinguished between based on 1. their degree of structure, 2. the number of interviewees (individuals, couples or groups) and 3. the interview method (face-to-face, via phone or online). Deciding which interview type to use is primarily dependent on whether the data 'made' through interviews will be used as evidence to answer the research question (Hammond/Wellington 2013, p. 92). Other factors that influence the choice of interview type include the researchers' abilities with regard to the local language, her personal as well as professional experience, available funding, time and staff, structural circumstances such as access to informants, geographical distance, and the abilities and needs of the interviewees in terms of health or privacy.

The most obvious distinction between interview types is in their structure (see this chapter, Yamaguchi, Ch. 7.2). Interviews are commonly divided into **structured**, **unstructured** and **semi-structured** types. In reality, however, this distinction is more of 'a continuum ranging from relatively structured to relatively unstructured formats' (Brinkmann 2014, p. 285). Although in the literature on research methods, the various interview types appear as neatly separated, in practice their use is more intertwined (Helfferich 2004, p. 11). Generally speaking, **unstructured interviews,** such as narrative (often biographical), episodic or ethnographic interviews, strongly focus on subjective meanings or the interviewee's perspective and system of relevance. They often evolve around a 'generative narrative question' as in the case of narrative or episodic interviews (Flick 2006, pp. 173–188) or often develop spontaneously out of a 'normal' conversation in the field.

In contrast, more **structured interviews** mainly aim to refute or confirm a hypothesis and centre around questions the researcher has decided on before the interview(s) (Brinkmann 2014, p. 286). Most researchers in qualitative Social Science research use **semi-structured interviews** (ibid.). Their intent is to identify individual views, but they are based on a (loose) interview guide a researcher *can* use for orientation. Sticking to the guide is not, however, obligatory, and the researcher can ask various additional questions or include a new topic whenever she feels it is appropriate to do so. Mixing different degrees of openness in interviews can be necessary for collecting different kinds of information (demographic information *and* individual perceptions) or when researchers need to flexibly adjust their (theoretical) plans to the actual interview situation or the 'flow' of the conversation (Rubin/Rubin 2006, p. 35). The level of structure of an interview can change anytime during the interview process. While unstructured interviews are particularly helpful in exploratory phases of a research project, a more structured interview format is often better suited to later phases of a project, to follow up on specific issues or to test a hypothesis that derived from earlier exploratory and unstructured interviews (Froschauer/Lueger 2003, p. 35).

**Different interview forms:** focused interview, semi-standardised interview, problem-centred interview, expert interview, ethnographic interview, narrative interview, episodic interview, couple interview, group interview, group discussion, focus group[1]

Questions asked during interviews may differ significantly based on the interview approach. However, regardless of the interview type, researchers should produce 'a set of questions that are meaningful for the interviewee' (Hammond/Wellington 2013, p. 92) and ask the **'right' questions** in order to get answers that help her to answer the research question. In semi- and unstructured interviews, the questions should 'invite interviewees to give descriptions' (Brinkmann 2014, p. 287), as interviewees are expected to answer 'as freely and as extensively as they wish' (Flick 2011, p. 112). Hammond/Wellington (2013, p. 92) stress careful use of language, such as avoiding jargon, striving for clarity in phrasing and asking open-ended questions that relate to the expertise of the informants. Flick (2011, p. 113) suggests that questions should 'allow room for the specific, personal views of the interviewees' and should not influence them. Questions that refer to abstract theoretical concepts like 'globalisation' or 'hypergamy' or questions that imply a certain understanding of a term or concept like, for example, 'love' should also be avoided.

1 For differently structured overviews on interview forms, corresponding questions and possible research goals, see Cresswell 2014; Flick 2006; Rubin/Rubin 2006. For detailed information on couple interviews, see Yoshida, Ch. 5.

| Key issues |
|---|
| Consider whether the data produced through a specific interview type is best suited to your research topic and will help you answer your research question. Take available resources and practical issues like access to the field or the needs of informants into account. Mixing different interview formats in one interview or across interviews might be helpful or even necessary. |

## 4. Selecting and finding interviewees

The research question and topic are key factors in deciding on appropriate interviewees, just as they are in determining the optimal interview format. When selecting interview partners, a researcher should keep in mind the practical considerations discussed in section 3, but also consciously reflect on sampling strategies and determining what expertise interviewees need in order to produce meaningful data. **Sampling** refers to the process of selecting whom you will interview (*case sampling*) (Flick 2006, p. 122). In order to produce reliable and valid research, it is important to reflect on the criteria according to which you have selected the interviewees and make this process transparent to the audience. For some research projects, it might be useful to choose the interviewees before going to the field (*a priori sampling*) based on certain criteria: for example, age, occupation or gender (*statistical sampling*, Flick 2006, p. 123). In other projects, sampling can occur during the process of collecting and interpreting interview (and other) data (*theoretical sampling,* Flick 2006, pp. 125–131). Theoretical sampling is derived from *grounded theory* (Glaser/Strauss 2005; see Meagher, Ch. 12), but has become widely accepted in qualitative research. The gradual selection of cases and material is based on criteria concerning content and relevance rather than representativeness (Flick 2006, p. 128).

The ideal informant is 'experienced and knowledgeable' and contributes 'a variety of perspectives' (Rubin/Rubin 2006, p. 64) on the researcher's topic of interest. When you are selecting interviewees, it is best to think of all informants as experts in their respective lifeworlds, experiences and opinions. Different types of expertise exist, however. These experts derive their status from being part of a certain group (*intra-systematic knowledge*), from possessing knowledge of several systems in a larger field (*intra-field expertise*) or from external expertise (*theoretical knowledge*). Examples of such experts are scholars or journalists, who are often targeted for 'expert interviews' (Froschauer/Lueger 2003, pp. 37–38).

In Japan, social networks, introductions and trust relations are crucial in order to identify and connect with informants who are willing to be interviewed (Bestor et al. 2003a, p. 14). Foreign researchers in Japan often obtain access by affiliating with a Japanese host institution (McLaughlin 2010). Although in some cases researchers prefer not to mention their affiliation (Steinhoff 2003), Japanese supervisors and colleagues can introduce researchers to potential informants and thus become important **gatekeepers**. Some scholars rely on snowball sampling to access 'informants through contact information that is provided by other informants' (Noy 2008, p. 330). But being introduced to informants by only one gatekeeper can result in a biased perspective on the research topic. Thus, to find interviewees, creative and plural modes of access via different gatekeepers are crucial (McLaughlin 2010, p. 8–9), as are reflecting on the influence of gatekeepers and sampling strategies on the findings of research projects (see Gagné, Ch. 6.1).

**Contacting people** to make an appointment for interviews with or without the help of gatekeepers might demand the use of different media. While in some cases an email with an introductory letter from a scholar's home or host institution and an outline of their research is necessary to set up a connection, in other cases all that is required to gain access is a phone call or a visit to the person's shop or farm. Sometimes social media can be the most efficient tool with which to arrange an interview. In her research on local culture in post-disaster Tōhoku, Julia Gerster (2018) arranged almost all her interviews via Facebook and Line. How to best contact interviewees after you identify them as knowledgeable depends on the people one would like to interview and demands creativity, patience and often involves a lot of trial and error.

| Key issues |
| --- |
| In order to decide whom to interview, you should consider different kinds of sampling methods and reflect on the kind of knowledge the 'ideal interviewee' should possess to answer your research question. Try plural modes of access to interviewees and don't rely on only one gatekeeper. Different media can be helpful when contacting informants to arrange interviews. |

## 5. Preparing interviews: Location, timing and things to bring

Once a researcher has (roughly) decided how and whom to interview, the appropriate preparation is crucial. The first step is to find a **location** to conduct the interview. Interviews can take place at people's homes, favourite restaurants, cheap fast-food chains, parks, coffee shops or workplaces. When possible, it is preferable to leave the decision about the location to the interviewees so they can choose a place that is convenient and comfortable for them. This has the added benefits of both giving researchers an insight into the life of the respondents, especially if they are invited into their home or one of their favourite local hangouts, as well as freeing the researcher from having to search for an appropriate location, which can prove rather difficult in a city like Tokyo. Sometimes researchers have to select locations themselves. Public spaces like coffee shops can be a good choice, even for interviews on sensitive topics. If the interviews are going to be recorded, it is crucial to consider all the sources of environmental noise and seek ways to limit it as much as possible. Nothing is more disheartening than discovering that hours of audio are ruined due to background noise (as we both know from experience). Once the meeting place for the interview is set, it is best to visit the location and confirm its opening hours.

When a face-to-face interview is not possible, there are other good options, such as sending **questionnaires** or conducting **phone or online interviews** (Flick 2006, pp. 254–260). These techniques of producing verbal, written, audio and/or video data enable the researcher to carry out 'both asynchronous and synchronous online interviews' (Hammond/Wellington 2013, p. 92) and to widen the scope of her research. (Written) online interviewing can be less intrusive, can produce more reflective answers, and can help people feel more comfortable (ibid.). However, the responses might be less spontaneous and the relationship between the researcher and the interlocutor less familiar (Flick 2006, pp. 256–260).

It is also important to **take sufficient time** to conduct interviews and, if possible, to have a coffee or dinner with the interlocutor afterwards (see this chapter, Alexy, Ch. 7.3).[2] The length of an interview depends on the interviewee's available time, the topic, the number of people involved, the type of interview and the overall atmosphere. We have conducted interviews ranging from thirty minutes up to around four hours and experienced interviews to last longer when invited to individuals' homes, as interviewees showed us personal belongings and even invited us for dinner. Nora usually writes in a first email to possible interviewees that the interview will take 'approximately one hour' because a longer time span seems to be a deterrent, especially to working people. Before the interview starts, she also asks the interviewee again how much time she has in order to adjust the interview guide (if there is one), to plan the interview and to frame the situation.

Finally, there are several **things the researcher should bring to the interview**. Apart from items like a recording device that help the researcher with organisational matters, we recommend bringing name cards (*meishi*) and a gift (McLaughlin 2010). Gifts create a pleasant atmosphere and show gratitude for the interviewees' help and efforts. They don't need to be expensive and can be something from the researchers' home country or some sweets bought in Japan. We recommend always bringing extra gifts in case one is met by more people than expected or gifts are presented to the researcher.

| Key issues |
| --- |
| Ask the interviewee where she wants to meet for the interview. In case they leave the decision up to you, suggest convenient locations and bear topics like privacy, noise or opening hours in mind, and always check the location beforehand. Take enough time, but also think about the interviewee's needs and constraints. Always bring name cards (*meishi*) and a small gift. Bring more than you think you will need. |

## 6. Deciding on the language

When you are conducting interviews in Japan or with Japanese interlocutors outside of Japan, language is of paramount importance. Usually researchers contact their interviewees in advance via email or phone in the language the interview will most likely be conducted in. In cases where contacts were established through a third person, the **question of language** has to be explicitly discussed. Ideally, interviews should be conducted in the language informants feel most comfortable with, so they can express their opinions and feelings. In most cases, this is Japanese. Therefore, 'advanced reading and comprehension skills are a prerequisite to doing research in Japan' (Smith 2003, p. 161). However, researchers should not fear conducting interviews in Japanese due to anxiety about their language skills as 'doing fieldwork is in itself a powerful language-learning opportunity' (Bestor et al. 2003a, p. 9).

2 For a different opinion on this topic, see Yoshida, Ch. 5.

## 7.1 The empire of interviews: Asking my way through Japan

*Christoph Brumann*

Quite a few Japanese have told me that their culture does not encourage self-expression, but in my ethnographic research in the country, I have never managed to confirm this stereotype. On the contrary, and in a play on Roland Barthes (1970), I consider Japan the empire of interviews: many Japanese are familiar with this kind of interaction, even if only from the mass media, and are sufficiently polite, patient and curious to try and subject themselves to the exercise even when it is for the first time in their lives. Interviews can therefore be a valuable tool for social research in Japan. In the following, I will reflect on my experiences with this method, hoping that this will provide ideas and encouragement for the reader's own practice.

As a social anthropologist, I have used interviews in all my ethnographic research projects, be it on Japanese utopian communes and their histories and current conditions (Brumann 1996), the gift-giving practices of my former landlord in Tokyo (Brumann 2000), the conflicts about heritage conservation and urban development in Kyoto (Brumann 2012) and the decision processes of the World Heritage Committee (Brumann 2021), where my broad set of interlocutors included Japanese nationals. In 2016, I also used interviews for a yet unpublished study of Buddhist temples in Kyoto. The first Kyoto study in particular included over a hundred formal interviews, and I must have spent months of my life asking Japanese individuals questions and listening to their answers. Most of the time, I enjoyed myself—when interesting people open up about a topic one is interested in, this can be a stimulating experience.

I am a dilettante in the sense that beyond some reading in methods handbooks, I have never been formally taught how to do interviews, proceeding in a more or less intuitive way most of the time. This is certainly easier with the 'open-ended', narrative type of interviews I conducted most often: in these cases, I had no rigid questionnaire to be ticked off but only a laundry list of items to be covered, often on just one or two pages. These could include fairly precise questions but also more vaguely delineated topics. Such an open methodology has the advantage of allowing for discoveries: often enough, my interlocutors revealed facts, views and connections I had not expected. Beyond this, open-ended interviews are good for exploring worlds of thought and feelings and the chains of reasoning and association in people's minds.

Interviews are better suited to retrieving stories than to checking isolated facts. Quite often, the people I met were involved in some sort of structured activity I was interested in, representing a specific cause or the organisation set up to pursue it (such as, for example, an NGO engaged in saving traditional houses). This meant that upon meeting them for the first time, I was regularly presented with a stack of brochures, leaflets and press clippings that would often explain basic facts and positions at least as well as the most structured conversation. Where possible, this might speak for a brief previous meeting in order to obtain and process such information, so that precious interview time can be reserved for what cannot be gathered otherwise. Interviews are particularly good for uncovering the informal side of formal facts: a can-did conversation can reveal quite a bit about what official self-presentation really means or what it actively tries to hide, which is important in a society where appearances count.

## Interview strategies

Interviews are contingent social interactions, and I think that it is prudent not to see them as opening a tap out of which pre-formed pieces of information then flow freely. Rather, an interview is a not very closely controlled experiment in which a researcher and those researched co-produce something that, at least to some degree, is unique to the encounter and might not have arisen under different circumstances. Obviously, social scientific research pursues general insights and therefore aims to control this effect, rather than embellish it (different from, say, a late-night show host questioning a celebrity guest). Yet still, it is advisable to face the fact of co-creation, rather than to ignore or conceal it (see Gagné, Ch. 16.2; Klien, Ch. 8.1).

This means that the personality of the interviewer and their way of conveying empathy and understanding have a bearing. The ability to think (and feel) along is important to keep an interviewee interested and engaged. There are a lot of verbal and non-verbal ways to signal that one is following what an interviewee says. Beyond this, I talk quite a bit myself in my interviews, such as by summarising an important or surprising point and making comments, just as I would in an everyday conversation. This no doubt increases my impact on what happens, but I tend to think that it helps to maintain the intellectual and emotional flow, and since not influencing what the interlocutor utters is impossible (see above), I prefer such a dialogic approach to reading out a question and then falling silent, come what may. What I still have to learn, however, is to resist the temptation to finish sentences in the interviewees' stead, such as when they are groping for words or prefer not to express the obvious—I am sure that this has cost me a number of interesting quotes, and tolerating a moment of silence until the interviewees finish a sentence in their own words can have its advantages.

When asked for an interview, quite a few people will offer one hour even when they often end up talking longer than initially intended. After one and a half hours or two, concentration often starts to drop on one or both sides, but I have also had rewarding interviews of double that length. It may then be preferable to meet more than once, however, and in my Kyoto research, I interviewed some individuals half a dozen times or more. Staggering the encounters in this way also allows the prior ones to be digested and new questions to be built on the insights gained.

Interviews do not prescribe a one-on-one format, and it was sometimes the interlocutors themselves who preferred to meet me together with their married partner, their colleagues or another researcher intent on questioning them. I myself brought the person who had provided the contact or my own colleague in a number of cases. In Kyoto, I did a whole series of interviews with a circle of elderly female friends who regaled me with their reminiscences of the social mores of their youth. Here, the control I exerted over the encounter diminished greatly—the animated conversation took leaps and bounds, making systematic coverage of any given topic difficult, but the joint excavation of memories brought up things that each lady might not have thought of on her own. Group interviews can also ease the stress of simultaneously listening, taking notes and thinking about the next question, given that the flow of conversation depends less on one's own input.

For some projects, systematic comparison across a number of interviews is a possibility, and I did interview series with all the members of a citizens' group I observed in Kyoto or most households in the neighbourhood where I had followed the Gion festival (Brumann 2012, pp. 15–45, 156–208). This might require a different approach to interview questions. In my case, many of my questions were identical and a comparison was intended. For strict comparability, however, a written questionnaire is often the better choice, as it exposes all individuals to the questions in the same way. Integrating a not too arduous survey in an interview can lighten the mood, and I used one in a number of my interviews (see Holthus/Manzenreiter, Ch. 5.3; Yoshida, Ch. 5). For example, I included a test where I asked Kyotoites to sort photos of buildings according to their personal likes and dislikes (Brumann 2012, pp. 211–219). This yielded both a numerical data set and the live comments the interviewees made when fulfilling the task.

In the course of long-term fieldwork, interviews often grow out of prior social encounters and are followed by further ones. This usually makes for more relevant and suitable questions and more trust. Interviews can become intimate occasions—encouraged by the flattering interest in their personality and views, quite a few interlocutors end up revealing more than they initially intended, and mutual understanding makes people feel closer. This can increase trust and support in subsequent encounters, and the choice of interview partners might reflect this hope, not only what they might have to say in the specific interview.

## Recording and ethics

Strategising should not involve deception, however. Research ethics require disclosing one's own identity and purpose at the outset, and in line with common anthropological practice, I assure my interlocutors that they will remain anonymous in my writings. Sharing the contents or recordings of an interview with others requires explicit consent. Depending on the topic, individuals may not be worried about being named or even insist on it. Such demands should be treated with circumspection but, where possible, with the interviewee's wishes as a guideline.

If interviewees agree—and a number of times, I was overly cautious in asking—audio recording an interview is an option. Some interlocutors refused to be recorded and others became perceptibly nervous, but most Japanese I met did not mind and seemed not to adjust their candidness greatly. I share Ellis S. Krauss's observation (2003, pp. 182–183) that the device is often completely forgotten—it sometimes came back to mind only when I stopped the recording in the end, prompting the occasional sceptical remark and my reconfirmation of confidentiality. I usually offer to send my interlocutors the sound file of the interview, which some of them accept.

A recording is, of course, a more faithful rendition than taking notes and allows for repeated listening, including also of passages one failed to grasp initially. When the precise wording of longer passages is not an issue, however—and in much research, it is not—one can also jot down notes (in my own case, often in a mix of Japanese and my native language German). To avoid long pauses, it is advisable to be brief here, writing just enough to jog one's memory when typing or dictating a full version of what was being said. Time should be set aside for

# Index