Sociology 570 (soon to be 585):
Ethnographic Research Methods in Sociology
Fall 2008 (3 units)
Dr. Richard Wood
University of New Mexico

Class: Thursdays, 4:00-6:30 p.m., SSCI #1061
Office Hours: Wednesdays 11:00 a.m. - 12:00 noon (SSCI#1078) Thursdays 1:30-2:30 p.m. (Hokona-Zuni #401)

Brief description:
Research design, logic, and methods of ethnographic fieldwork in contemporary sociology. Particular attention to linking theory and data; human subjects requirements; data collection (participant-observation, interviewing, focus groups); politics and ethics of field relations. Course assumes that you have your own qualitative research project either underway or getting started, or are ready to begin developing one immediately. Rather than asking you to do research on a specific topic, this course will provide a structure within which to design and pursue your own research project.

Learning qualitative research methods will involve three components: understanding the importance of pre-research steps such as research design and informed consent procedures; learning specific data-gathering methods such as various forms of interviewing, participant-observation, ethnography, and focus groups; and studying exemplary works employing qualitative methods in their analysis.

Prerequisites: Sociology 580 (research methods) and Sociology 500 (social theory) or their equivalents in other disciplines; or permission of instructor
Co-requisite: Student must be ready to initiate own field research (either early pilot study or substantial project, e.g. thesis research) during course; if relevant fieldwork focuses on sites inaccessible during course (e.g. fieldwork in Latin America), student will work with instructor to define relevant work that can be done locally (e.g. initial interviews with local immigrants from your fieldsite or with elite experts).

Description:
The course will cover the techniques for collecting, interpreting, and analyzing ethnographic data. The principal methods to be covered are participant observation, in-depth interviewing, and ethnography, but other methods will also be considered. Throughout the semester, the course will be designed to get students out doing their own fieldwork and reflecting self-critically on that work. If you’re not ready to do fieldwork, participation in the course will make little sense. We will operate on two interrelated dimensions, one focused on the theoretical/analytic aspects of ethnography, the other focused on the practical aspects of ethnography, such as identifying key informants, selecting respondents, collecting field notes, analyzing data, writing, and presenting findings.

Regarding practical aspects of ethnographic research: we will consider questions such as: What is a strong research design? What are the implications of researching human beings? What ethical and political dilemmas come into play? What is a good key informant? What are good techniques for triangulation? How does one write good field notes? When is tape recording advisable (and not)? What is coding? How does one write an ethnographic paper? What is the difference between good and bad ethnographic evidence? How does one give a presentation based on ethnographic data? How many interviews are enough?

Regarding theory: we will consider questions such as the following: How do ethnography and other forms of qualitative research differ from other research strategies? In what sense is such research scientific? (positivist? interpretive? explanatory?) What criteria of evidence and analytic rigor apply on this terrain? How does one link theory and data in ethnographic research? Can one generalize from such data (and if so, in what sense?) Can qualitative research verify hypotheses, or only generate them? Can qualitative research explain social phenomena, or only interpret them? Do ethnographies have a “small-n problem”? In what ways ought ethnographic research be “grounded” or “global”? Is replicability possible in ethnographic or interview-based research? How do ethnographic researchers see to the reliability and validity of their data and findings?
An overarching theme throughout the course will be the integration of theory and evidence in our own research and in the work of others. How does one design research that is both strongly informed by social theory and grounded in good empirical evidence?

Students will quickly discover that this distinction between theory and practice, in qualitative as in any methods, is rather artificial: Answering practical questions about how to collect, analyze, and interpret data entails theoretical commitments that will inevitably affect the final product. Students who expect to learn the practical “tricks” without mastering the theoretical background may or may not pass the course, but will likely become poor ethnographers and interviewers. Anyone with strong social skills, an eye for detail, good note-taking skills, and the ability to describe social settings in writing will find it rather easy to produce a mediocre final paper. Producing high quality work, on the other hand, requires creative and rigorous thinking, patience, and practice. Indeed, ethnographic research and in-depth interviewing share the odd distinction of being quite easy to do poorly and very difficult to do well.

Course structure:
Throughout the course, you will focus on learning how to carry out a qualitative research project and actually doing so. Many readings will focus on the “how to” dimension, and most assignments will get you actually doing qualitative research defined around your own interests. Throughout, we’ll also read some book-length ethnographic studies, both as models of good work and as grist for critical learning. Depending on areas of student interests, subgroups may read separate works and report back to the larger group on the authors' research design, methods, use of theory and evidence, rhetorical strategies, etc. This will lead into a general discussion of these issues in our own research.

Under "research design," we'll talk about such themes as research questions, ethics of inquiry and informed consent ("human subjects requirement"), the various logics of sociological inquiry, empirical evidence, sampling strategies, and comparative strategies.

Under "research methods," we'll talk about the various methods of collecting qualitative data identified above, and the tools for obtaining and recording that data for later use: interview schedules, transcription, field notes, and coding categories. Along the way, you'll develop many of the written materials and research tools you will need for your own project.

Required texts:
Methodology:


Some additional article-length readings, posted to Zimmerman eReserves. Password is “unm570”

Ethnographic studies:
Buy and read THREE of books below, ONE from each PAIR:


The methodology books are available at the UNM Bookstore. The ethnographic books may be purchased used via [www.bookfinder.com](http://www.bookfinder.com) or [www.amazon.com](http://www.amazon.com) or similar internet services. In addition, a variety of articles will be required reading most weeks – go to [http://ereserves.unm.edu/](http://ereserves.unm.edu/) and search under my name, then use password *unm570* – more information in class. All readings must be read and digested prior to class, for class discussion – do not try to “skate” on the readings!

In general, I will facilitate the in-class discussions, but when we read “model ethnographies” one student will be responsible for providing initial framing of the discussion for each book. S/he will first focus on the strengths of the assigned reading; then turn to discuss any weaknesses, considering in both cases at least the following areas: research design, clarity & substance of research question, methods, theoretical framing, integration of theory & evidence, rhetorical strategies & writing style, strength of interpretive & explanatory argument, and extent/limits of generalizability.

Finally, some articles useful for specific topics, but not required reading, will be available in the Departmental Reading Room. These include more exemplary ethnographic studies, discussions of participant-observation with children; elite interviewing; advanced interviewing skills; and interpretation within organizational settings. Please read any you find helpful for your project; in some particular cases, I may require a student to read some of these for a particular project.

**Grading:**

The class will entail a significant amount of writing, most of it at the service of your own research – see list below. Your grade will be determined by:

1. Assignments #4 through #10 (70 points out of 300): 10 points possible on each, scored roughly on basis of: 1-5=inadequate work; 6=minimally adequate work; 8 = solid work; 10=excellent work. You will generally email these assignments to me and to all class members to review. Those received by 5:00 pm on the Tuesday before each class will be discussed in that week’s class session.

2. IRB Proposal (assignment #11: 50 points out of 300) – see below.

3. Final paper (120 points out of 300). You have two options for the final paper: Option 1 (appropriate for most students): Write a summary and critique of the pilot fieldwork you do during the semester and a detailed research proposal on a topic for which field research is appropriate. Option 2 (encouraged for students who are already engaged in field research): Write an article draft based on the field research carried out, structured appropriately for submission to a particular journal you choose. Either should be at least 20 pages in length, and may be longer. The form and content will vary, but in either format, the final paper should include at least: a) a sociologically-organized descriptive overview of the research and what you saw, heard, and learned (i.e. behavioral patterns, cultural structures, typologies, social dynamics, etc.) and b) some analytical observations about what you studied and why it is sociologically significant. It should also include, in an appendix (i.e. not part of main body of article draft or research proposal): c) your ruminations, confessions, and methodological musings on your research experiences, including joys and struggles of qualitative research, anxieties and doubts faced and/or surmounted, thoughts about advantages and disadvantages of different methodological or analytic strategies, learnings, political or ethical challenges, etc. If appropriate, the paper can be done in the form of a thesis or dissertation prospectus – i.e. the proposal that goes to your committee for approval, prior to pursuing the research. In this case, the prospectus should clearly reflect and report upon the preliminary fieldwork done during the semester,
4. Class participation (60 points out of 300): Instructor-evaluated quality (i.e., not quantity, though if you never participate it’s hard to have high quality) of your class participation (including interventions in class discussions and your framing of model ethnographies). Up to a point, of course, speaking more is good—but listening well to others, and responding insightfully, is also an important part of class participation. Key questions to ask: Do your observations and insights push class discussion forward? Clearly reflect adequate preparation of the readings? Treat other students fairly and civilly, even when disagreeing sharply? Show intellectual reflection, empirical attention, and theoretical insight?

Written assignments:

1. Project description: (one page, due 9/4/2008)
   One-paragraph description of the project you intend to pursue for this class, involving qualitative methods of sociological inquiry. Frame it around a one-sentence research question—spend some time crafting this so it is both researchable and adequately captures your research interest. If the primary research cite is inaccessible during this semester (e.g., in Rwanda), propose what kinds of interviewing and/or field research you can do this semester that would help inform your project.

2. "Sight without Sound" write-up: (2-4 pages, due 9/4/2008)
   Observe "at a distance" any scene (social exchanges, encounters, a setting) for a short period—ideally but not necessarily one related to your research project. The point of this exercise is to begin to hone your observational and interpretive skills, your ability to sociologically "read" the visual setting and social dynamics of social life. Choose a setting in which you can see but not hear (or hear so little that it does not much improve your information about the setting)—it might be a highly public and anonymous setting (a political rally); or a somewhat public but non-anonymous setting (kids at a playground); or a fairly private but accessible setting (the pickup or flirtation scene at a local bar). Prepare a write-up of the setting, with two foci: a) a detailed description of what you saw, as concrete and specific as possible, capturing the crucial details but not attempting a photographic depiction; b) a sociological analysis in which you interpret what is going on in the setting; here, some extrapolation and speculation is appropriate, but strive to ground this in what you saw. Do not try to capture "everything" or feel like you have to get it all right—for this assignment, the important goals are honing skills and distinguishing between data, interpretation, and the insights that link them; a segment of the setting and interaction will serve fine for these purposes. Give the write-up an appropriate descriptive title that captures something analytically important about it.

3. "Listening In" write-up: (2-4 pages, due 9/11/2008)
   This assignment reverses #2 above—"it’s about sound without sight." Listen in on a conversation or setting. Ideally, choose a setting in which you can hear but not see (e.g., listening to people behind you on a bus, to office conversation behind a wall, etc.); or a social setting in which you can unobtrusively sit with eyes closed and focus intently on sound and on silences (e.g., a worship service or a public playground). You are not to participate in any way in the conversation or interaction you observe—not verbally nor through any other communicative channel. Write-up: include an overall summary of what you heard plus about a page of as close as you can get to a verbatim reproduction of what you heard. Also, your own interpretation of verbal dynamics, other audio dynamics, and silences there, and any self-observations that seem important, including your effort to separate sound from other observational cues.
Get out into a key setting for your research project. Do observational research that focuses on the characteristics of the setting for your research – physical layout, appearances of people, any symbolism or visual/audio or words that structure the setting in some way. Write a report on the setting that describes its important aspects, begins initial interpretation of how the setting matters, and reports on your initial impressions, the inferences you are making, and any difficulties or excitement that being in the research setting entailed. Think about how you will insert yourself into this setting, and what you will need to consider as you strategize about how to do so.

5. Project proposal: (2-4 pages, plus logic model, due 9/25/2008)
A longer, more analytic, but-still-initial description of your proposed project that reflects considerably more thought about research design and how you will approach the research. Given your research question: where will you do participant-observation? Who will you interview? Why are these the right settings and people? What do we already know about the research topic, and how does this project push the boundaries of what we know? What phenomenon are you hoping to explain or understand, and what kinds of causal dynamics might lie behind that phenomenon? What kind of data will you collect? Include a “logic model” or “flowchart” depicting the initial analytic perspective underlying your proposed project.

6. Fieldnotes (at least two sets):
As you enter your research setting and begin interacting there, keep detailed field notes throughout, some written within the time of interaction and some immediately thereafter. For most projects, some combination of hand-written notes (in a bound field notebook!) and computer-written notes (and backed up systematically!) will be best. Notes should include and distinguish between: observations, interpretations, analytic notes, and theoretical notes (discussed in class). Hand in a print-out of typewritten notes and a photocopy of hand-written notes – never let original field notebook out of your control!

7. Interview transcripts:
Conduct at least one informal interview (first transcript) and one formal, taped interview (second transcript) related to your project. During the informal interview, take hand-written “jottings,” then immediately afterward type up as full an approximate transcript of the interview as you can, clearly distinguishing between paraphrasings, exact quotations, and your interpretations. For the formal interview, tape record the interview if respondent agrees to this (digital recorders best, available for checkout from Soc or from me). and transcribe the full interview. After both interviews, immediately write up in your fieldnotes your initial observations and interpretations from the interview (i.e. not from analytic distance after producing a transcript, but immediately after the interaction). Hand these notes in with transcript. For all transcripts: Include a heading that fully identifies you as interviewer, the project, the interviewee (name or code), his/her role and relevance to the project, date, etc. Include a “footer” or “header” on each page that briefly identifies the transcript. Be sure to paginate the transcript and tell your word processor to “number lines” along the margin in some convenient fashion (In MS-Word: under “file” > “page setup” > “layout” > “line numbers”).

8. Fieldnotes (third set, or an additional formal interview) & Self-reflection:
Same as above (fieldnotes) or below (interview transcript) from an additional experience of field research or additional formal interview. But, in either case, also include a few pages of typewritten reflection, self-criticism, and learnings from your initial fieldwork.

9. Interviewer/fieldworker self-critique: (1 page)
Go back and re-read your two transcripts (at least) fully and self-critically (and self-appreciatively: interviewing is a hard skill!). Write a one-page analysis of what you are doing well, what you need to work on, how you should restructure your interview schedule, etc.

10. Pilot analytic memo to faculty advisor: (1-3 pages)
Pretend I’m your faculty advisor. Write a memo to me, headed by a one-paragraph reminder of your research
question and research design. The body of the memo should detail the state of your project, what insights are emerging from it, what analytic puzzles or problems are emerging, and how you plan to proceed.

A full draft of the “human subjects protocol” to be submitted to the UNM Institutional Review Board, for this project as revised in light of your field experience this semester. Must follow the precise outline form, numbering system, and content specifications of the UNM IRB (see website).

Step back from the data you’ve been collecting and think hard at the conceptual level. Given your research question (which may be evolving; if so, say how): what are you learning from your fieldwork? How is it shaping your thinking? How will you draw on concepts, ideas, and theories from sociology or related disciplines in answering your question? That is, how might you focus your final paper conceptually?

Review all of the above field notes, transcripts (by now, more than 2), analyses, and ideas into a tentative outline of your final paper. Think both conceptually and empirically: how will you draw a convincing initial analysis (maybe not yet an “answer”) of your research question? But think also rhetorically: how will you structure the paper to make it interesting and engaging? Provide enough detail in the outline for other class members to understand where your paper is headed – i.e. not just main topics, but subpoints, etc.

14. Final paper: see above. Due 12:00 noon on Dec. 12, 2008 to avoid an Incomplete grade.
Please deliver a paper copy to the Department of Sociology unless you have made other prior arrangements.

Class Sessions, Topics, Readings, and Assignments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Readings</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/28</td>
<td>Overview &amp; planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/4</td>
<td>Recognizing good qualitative research</td>
<td>* Snyder: “Human Dimension of Comparative Research”</td>
<td>“Sight without Sound” write-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* Goodwin and Horowitz – website</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* Burawoy, Ch. 1 &amp; 2 – website</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* Devers: “How will we know good qualitative research?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HSR34:5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/11</td>
<td>Theory in ethnographic work</td>
<td></td>
<td>“Listening In” write-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditions of ethnography</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* “Elaborating Analytic Ethnography”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* Auyero: “Politics under the Microscope”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emerson, et al: Ch. 1-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maxwell, Chapters 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/18</td>
<td>Research design</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete online training at:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Getting In: Entering your field site</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://research.unm.edu/res/Training.html">http://research.unm.edu/res/Training.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>save certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Setting description &amp; analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maxwell, Chapters 3 &amp; 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emerson et al: Ch. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Fenno: “Appendix: Participant Observation”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Exemplar: Lapoint notes on “Understanding Liberal Religion”</td>
<td>Wilkinson or Polletta – first half</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/25</td>
<td>Positioning in the field:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sampling decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fieldnotes I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Membership roles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing field notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emerson et al: Chapter 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maxwell, Chapters 5 &amp; 7 &amp; Appendix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* “Theoretical Sampling”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Bernhard 13: “Participant Observation”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*RMA 14: “Field Notes...”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wilkinson or Polletta – second half</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2</td>
<td>NO CLASS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/9</td>
<td>Interviewing as one fieldwork skill:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fieldnotes II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unstructured interviews/interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developing the interview schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning to interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fieldwork:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More on field notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alliances, informers, skeptics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic &amp; Assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/16</td>
<td><strong>NO CLASS – FALL BREAK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 10/23 | *Really learning to interview*
  - Intensive interviewing
  - Facework
  - Fieldwork:
    - Ethics and politics of fieldwork
  - Interview transcript

| 10/30 | *Toward analysis*                                                                                                                                             |
|       | Reflecting on “Ethical Challenges....”
|       | *Bernhard 17: “Qualitative Data Analysis I: Text Analysis”
|       | *Maxwell Ch. 6*                                                                                                                                              |

| 10/23 | *Intensive interviewing*
  - Facework
|       | *Really learning to interview*
|       | *“Politics & Ethics in Qualitative Research”
|       | *“Tactics in the Interview”*

| 10/23 | *Fieldwork: Ethics and politics of fieldwork*
|       |  - *Wood, E.: “Ethical Challenges....”*
|       |  - *Punch: “Politics & Ethics in Qualitative Research”*
|       |  - *“Tactics in the Interview”*
|       |  - Baiocchi or Hart – second half
|       |  - Emerson, et al: Ch. 6 & 7

| 10/30 | *Toward analysis*                                                                                                                                             |
|       | Reflecting on “Ethical Challenges....”
|       | *Bernhard 17: “Qualitative Data Analysis I: Text Analysis”
|       | *Maxwell Ch. 6*                                                                                                                                              |

| 11/6  | **Human subjects requirements**
  - Focus Groups as method:
    - Dis/advantages
    - Planning & conducting
  - Organizing qualitative data

| 11/13 | *“Phenomenology & Interpretive Practice” – website (?)*
|       | *Plattner: “Human Subjects Protection...”*
|       | *Ragin – second half*
|       | *Emerson Ch. 8*

| 11/13 | *Human subjects proposals & process*
  - Analyzing qualitative data
  - Visual ethnography

| 11/13 | *Smilde: QCA/Boolean analysis of conversion in Venezuela*
|       | *Belmont Principles*
|       | *IRB information (website, plus ALL materials at http://research.unm.edu/recs/HuSubjects.html (inc. appl. packet)*

| 11/20 | *Generating Theory” – website
|       | *Burbawoy, Ch. 13*

| 11/20 | *Fieldnotes III OR Interview transcript*
|       | *Plus Reflection*

| 11/27 | **NO CLASS: Thanksgiving**                                                                                                                                 |
|       | NO CLASS                                                                                                                                                 |

| 12/4  | **Struggling from field insights to written ethnography: student-led**
  - Ethno writing : portraying subjects

| 12/11 | **Researchers’ stances**
  - Back to the field: iterations of fieldwork
  - What have we learned? Reflection and self-criticism as methodological necessity

| 12/11 | Maybe some TBA
|       | Student presentations

| 12/4  | *Ragin – first half*
|       | *Bernhard 17: “Qualitative Data Analysis I: Text Analysis”
|       | *Maxwell Ch. 6*                                                                                                                                              |

**Note on class discussions:**

Come to class with readings prepared, not just cursorily read. But “prepared” can include skimming sections of readings - indeed, you’ll be best prepared if you read quickly, skim some, return to important sections, and then take time to really think through the readings, including what you think of the works’ research design, clarity & substance of research question, methods, theoretical framing, integration of theory & evidence, rhetorical strategies & writing style, and strength of interpretive & explanatory argument. Then, come ready to learn from others even as you argue for your own point of view, with me and with other students. Simply lose whatever shyness you have about disagreeing publicly; that’s how we all learn, and part of the beauty of academic life. At the same time, academics sometimes adopt a cheap-and-easy critical stance, simply finding weaknesses in others’ work and trashing them. In place of that easy criticism, let’s all work to develop a more authentically critical-and-constructive tone in class: appreciative of what an author does well, critical of what s/he does poorly.

**Students with disabilities:**

Any student who, because of a disability, may require some special arrangements in order to meet course requirements should contact the instructor as soon as possible to make necessary accommodations. It is the responsibility of the student to request accommodation for individual learning needs. UNM will make every attempt to accommodate all qualified students with disabilities. For further information, contact Student Support Services at (505) 277-3506.
Additional Readings: (in no particular order)

General:


On case studies:


On coding:


On interviewing:


On focus groups: Richard Krueger, Focus Groups

On research design:

LeCompte, Margaret Diane. 1999. Designing & conducting ethnographic research (Walnut Creek, Calif: AltaMira Press)

On writing: Howard Becker, Writing for Social Scientists.

On human subjects and Institutional Review Boards:


Some strong ethnographic analyses:
Principally participant observation:
Burawoy, Manufacturing Consent

Anderson, Elijah. A Place on the Corner

Anderson, Elijah. Code of the Street

Scott, James. Weapons of the Weak

Cuneo. The Smoke of Satan [on ultra conservative Catholics]

Geertz. Islam Observed [on contrasting Islam in Morocco and Indonesia]

PO/ interviews
Bourgois, Philippe. In search of respect in El Barrio

Baggett, Jerome. Private Homes, Public Religion [on Habitat for Humanity.]

Dunier, Mitchell. Sidewalk, especially appendix

Dunier, Mitchell. Slim's Table

Auyero, Javier.

Principally interviews
Scott Straus. Forthcoming. The Order of Genocide: Race, Power, and War in Rwanda. Cornell University Press. Interviews with prisoners convicted of genocide, field research in 5 villages, including interviews about local history


Eliasoph, Nina. Avoiding Politics. [on how the apolitical quality of U.S. mass culture is constructed, not a “natural” state]

Nepstead, Sharon. Conviction of the Soul. [on Central American peace movement in U.S.]


Combining survey, PO, interviews

Steven Wilkinson. Votes and Violence. CUP about 2003. On communal violence in India, combines analysis of database he compiled, field research in 1 province, etc.

Multi-sited works
Deborah J. Yashar. 2005. Contesting Citizenship in Latin America. nice example of multi-sited work. draws largely on interviews, some observation of meetings, strong exemplar of qualitative data to good argument, excellent comparative design.

Rich Snyder's book on Mexico (just out in paperback)


Excellent use of qualitative data
Laitin, David. Hegemony and Culture


Other or hard to classify


Burawoy, Michael. Ed., *Global Ethnography*


Orin Starn's book on *rondas campesinas* in Peru

Wendy Wolford's book on MST in Brazil's northeast

Ruth Bejar's *The Vulnerable Stranger*