

**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)

Email: rlwood@unm.edu
Phone: 277-1117 or 277-3945

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:

Robert M. Emerson, Rachel I. Fretz, Linda L. Shaw. 1995. *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes* (Chicago : University of Chicago Press, ISBN #0226206815).

Joseph A. Maxwell. 2005. *Qualitative Research Design: An interactive approach* 2nd Edition, Volume 41 of Applied Social Research Methods Series (Thousand Oaks/London/New Delhi: Sage Publications ISBN #0-7619-2608-9)

Charles Ragin. 1987. *The Comparative Method*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

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:

- Pair #1. Baiocchi, Gianpaolo. 2005. *Militants and Citizens. The Politics of Participatory Democracy in Porto Alegre*. (Brazil) Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- OR Hart, Stephen (2001). *Cultural Dilemmas of Progressive Politics: Styles of engagement among grassroots activists*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

- Pair #2. Wilkinson, Daniel. 2002. *Silence on the Mountain: Stories of Terror, Betrayal, and Forgetting in Guatemala*. Houghton Mifflin ISBN: 0-618-22139-5
 OR Polletta, Francesca. 2002. *Freedom is an Endless Meeting: Democracy in American Social Movements* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Pair #3. Hondegneu-Sotelo, Pierrette. 2001. *Domestica: Immigrant Workers Cleaning and Caring in the Shadows of Affluence*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
 OR Hovey, Kate. 2005. *Anarchy and Community in the American West: Madrid, NM 1970-2000*. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press.

The methodology books are available at the UNM Bookstore. The ethnographic books may be purchased used via www.bookfinder.com or 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/> 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,

and a), b), and c) above.

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:

Please note: You should strive for something like the schedule outlined below for getting written assignments done, and post them to the course website as you complete them. Assignments #1-5 are due on the date noted above. But assignments #6-10 you need not do on precisely the above timeline, nor in precisely this order. Rather, you should proceed into fieldwork promptly, but in the order that makes most sense for your project. But in any case, assignments #4-10 are all due *together, and in one paper packet* by November 2 at noon at Sociology. The subsequent assignments, #11-14 are due on the dates shown.

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 (say, 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 or meditation service or a public playground). You are not to participate in any way in the conversation or interaction you observe – neither 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

4. Setting description & analysis (due 9/18/2008):

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.

11. Draft IRB proposal (due 11/20/2008):

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).

12. Conceptual focus of paper: (1-2 pages, due 11/20/2008)

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*?

13. Tentative outline: (1-2 pages, due 12/4/2008)

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:

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

10/16	NO CLASS – FALL BREAK		
10/23	Really learning to interview Intensive interviewing Facework Fieldwork: Ethics and politics of fieldwork	*Wood, E.: “Ethical Challenges...” *Punch: “Politics & Ethics in Qualitative Research” * “Tactics in the Interview” Baiochi <i>or</i> Hart – second half Emerson, et al: Ch. 6 & 7	Interview transcript
10/30	Toward analysis	Ragin – first half *Bernhard 17: “Qualitative Data Analysis I: Text Analysis” *Maxwell Ch. 6	Interview transcript
11/6	Human subjects requirements Focus Groups as method: Dis/advantages Planning & conducting Organizing qualitative data	* “Phenomenology & Interpretive Practice” – website (?) *Plattner: “Human Subjects Protection...” Ragin – second half Emerson Ch. 8	Fieldnotes III OR Interview transcript Plus Reflection Interviewer/fieldwork self-critique
11/13	Human subjects proposals & process Analyzing qualitative data Visual ethnography	*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) Hondegneu <i>or</i> Hovey – first half	Pilot analytic memo + Full packet due Assignments #6-10
11/20	Theory and ethnography Writing ethnographic accounts: audience & voice Ethics of fieldwork (II)	* “Generating Theory” – website * Burawoy, Ch. 13 Hondegneu <i>or</i> Hovey – second half *Halse/Honey: “Unravelling Ethics”	IRB proposal draft Conceptual focus of paper
11/27	NO CLASS: Thanksgiving	NO CLASS	
12/4	Struggling from field insights to written ethnography: student-led Ethno writing : portraying subjects	Maybe some TBA Student presentations	Outline of paper
12/11	Researchers’ stances Back to the field: iterations of fieldwork What have we learned? Reflection and self-criticism as methodological necessity	Maybe some TBA Student presentations	Final paper due by 12:00 noon on 12/12/2008, to avoid Incomplete

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:

- Howard Becker. 1996. "The Epistemology of Qualitative Research." In *Ethnography and Human Development: Context and Meaning in Social Inquiry* (The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation Series on Mental Health), edited by Richard A. Shweder, Anne Colby, and Richard Jessor.
- Jeff Goodwin and Ruth Horowitz. 2002. "Introduction: The Methodological Strengths and Dilemmas of Qualitative Sociology." *Qualitative Sociology*. 25(1):33-47. (<http://libweb/>, *E-journals*).
- Michael Burawoy et al. 1991. *Ethnography Unbound*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Michael Burawoy et al. 2000. *Global Ethnography*.
- Paul Atkinson. 1988. "Ethnomethodology: A Critical Review." *Annual Review of Sociology*. 14. 441-65. (http://libweb, *E-journals*).
- Carol Warren et al. (2003) "After the Interview," *Qualitative Sociology*; Andrea Fontana and James Frey (1998), "Interviewing: The Art of Science" in Norman Denzin and Yvonna Lincoln, *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials*.
- Howard Becker (1997), *Tricks of The Trade*.
- Norma Denzin and Yvonna Lincoln (1998), *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials*.
- David Fetterman (1998), *Ethnography*.
- Martyn Hammersley and Paul Atkinson (1995), *Ethnography*.
- Richard Jessor, Ann Colby, and Richard Shweder (1996), *Ethnography and Human Development*.
- Jon Van Mannen (1988), *Tales of the Field*.
- William Foote Whyte (1943), *Streetcorner Society*.
- Robert Weiss, *Learning from Strangers*.
- Stephen L. Schensul, Jean J. Schensul, Margaret D. LeCompte. 1999. Essential ethnographic methods : observations, interviews, and questionnaires. Publisher Walnut Creek, Calif. : AltaMira Press.
- Wuthnow, Robert and Hunter, Bergeson, and Kurzweil. 1991?. *Cultural Analysis: The Work of Peter Berger, Mary Douglas, Michel Foucault, and Jurgen Habermas*. Boston: Routledge and Keegan Paul.

On case studies:

- Stanley Lieberman. 1991. "Small N's and Big Conclusions: An Examination of the Reasoning in Comparative Studies Based on a Small Number of Cases." *Social Forces*. 70(2): 307-20.
- Charles Ragin and Howard Becker (1992), *What Is a Case?*; Roger Gamm, Martyn Hammersley, and Peter Foster (2000), *Case Study Method*.

On coding:

- Anselm Strauss and Juliet Corbin. 1998. "Open Coding." In Basics of Qualitative Research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Judith Kendall. 1999. "Axial Coding and the Grounded Theory Controversy." *Western Journal of Nursing Research*. 21(6): 743 – 57

On interviewing:

- Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*. 2004. Rubin, Herbert J. & Irene Rubin. Sage, ISBN 0761920757, Paper.

Issues in fieldwork: Reliability, replicability, validity, empathetic understanding.

- Jack Katz. 1983. "A Theory of Qualitative Methodology: The Social System in Analytic Fieldwork." In Robert Emerson *Contemporary Field Research*.
<http://kerlins.net/bobbi/research/qualresearch/>
- Paul Atkinson et al. (2001), *Handbook of Ethnography*

On qualitative analysis: Charles C. Ragin. 1999?. *Fuzzy-Set Social Science*.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:

- Patricia A. Marshall. 2003. *Social Thought & Commentary: Human Subjects Protections, Institutional Review Boards, and Cultural Anthropological Research*. Case Western Reserve University. Available at <http://muse.jhu.edu>

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

Huggins, Martha K., Mika Haritos-Fatouros, and Philip G. Zimbardo. 2002. *Violence Workers: Police Tortures and Murderers Reconstruct Brazilian Atrocities*. California.

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.]

Lichterman, Paul. *Search for Political Community* [comparative environmental movements] or *Elusive Togetherness* [on what undermines civic life, and the weaknesses of social capital explanations]. Both strong culturalist accounts of politics.

Combining survey, PO, interviews

Dohan, Daniel. *The Price of Poverty: Money, Work, and Culture in the Mexican American Barrio*. I think Univ of California Press

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)

Jeremy Weinstein. 2006. *Inside Rebellion: The Politics of Insurgent Violence*. Cambridge. Interviews and gathering of relevant documents, newspaper and police data in Uganda, Mozambique and Peru

Excellent use of qualitative data

Laitin, David. *Hegemony and Culture*

Gould, Roger V. 1995. *Insurgent identities: class, community, and protest in Paris from 1848 to the Commune*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Wood, Elisabeth J. 2001. *Insurgent Collective Action and Civil War in El Salvador*. New York and Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Yashar, Deborah. 2005. *Contesting Citizenship in Latin America: The Rise of Indigenous Movements and the Postliberal Challenge*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Baggett, Jerome P. 2001. *Habitat for Humanity: building private homes, building public religion*. Philadelphia, Temple University Press.

Eliasoph, Nina. 1998. *Avoiding Politics. How Americans Produce Apathy in Everyday Life*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Other or hard to classify

Burawoy, Michael. Ed., *Ethnography Unbound*.

Burawoy, Michael. Ed., *Global Ethnography*

Comaroff, Jean and John L. Comaroff. 1991. *Of revelation and revolution*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.. On religion in southern Africa

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*