How do cultural anthropologists conduct research?

What does fieldwork involve?

What are some urgent issues in cultural anthropology research today?
This chapter is about how cultural anthropologists do research to learn about people’s shared and learned behavior and beliefs. The first section discusses how methods in cultural anthropology have evolved since the late nineteenth century. The second section covers the steps involved in a research project. The chapter concludes by addressing two urgent topics in cultural anthropology research.
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Changing Research Methods

Methods in cultural anthropology today are different in several ways from those used during the nineteenth century. Most cultural anthropologists now gather data by doing fieldwork, going to the field, which is wherever people and cultures are, to learn about culture through direct observation. They also use a variety of specialized research techniques depending on their particular goals.

From the Armchair to the Field

The term armchair anthropology refers to how early cultural anthropologists conducted research by sitting at home in their library and reading reports about other cultures written by travelers, missionaries, and explorers. These early thinkers never visited the places they wrote about and had no direct experience with the people whose customs they discussed.

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, anthropologists hired by European colonial governments moved a step closer to learning directly about people of other cultures. They traveled to their home country’s colonies in Africa and Asia, where they lived near, but not with, the people they were studying. This approach is called verandah anthropology because, typically, the anthropologist would send out for “natives” to come to his verandah (verandah anthropologists, like armchair anthropologists, were men).

In the United States during the mid-nineteenth century, Lewis Henry Morgan took steps toward learning about people and their culture through direct observation and interactions with more than just a few individuals out of context. A lawyer, Morgan lived in Rochester, New York, near the Iroquois territory. He became well acquainted with many of the Iroquois and gained insights into their everyday lives (Tooker 1992). Morgan showed that Iroquois behavior and beliefs make sense if an outsider spends time learning about them, in context and through direct interactions and experience. His writings changed the prevailing Euro-American perception of the Iroquois, and other Native American tribes, as “dangerous savages.”

Ethnographic research in the early twentieth century often involved photography. This Andaman girl wears the skull of her deceased sister. Indigenous people of the Andaman Islands revere the bones of their dead relatives and would not want them to be taken away, studied, or displayed in a museum.

Participant Observation

Another major turning point occurred in the early twentieth century, during World War I, laying the foundation for the cornerstone method in cultural anthropology: fieldwork combined with participant observation. Participant observation is a research method for learning about culture that involves living in a culture for an extended period while gathering data.

The “father” of participant observation is Bronislaw Malinowski. He is credited with inventing a new approach to learning about culture while he was in the Trobriand Islands in the South Pacific during World War I (see Culturama, p. 32). For two years, he resided in a tent alongside the local people, participating in their activities and living, as much as possible, as one of them. He also learned to understand and speak their language.

With these innovative approaches that are now standard features of field research in cultural anthropology (Figure 2.1), Malinowski was able to learn about Trobriand culture in context, rather than through secondhand reports. By learning the local language, he could talk with the people without the use of interpreters and thus gain a much more accurate understanding of their culture.

fieldwork research in the field, which is any place where people and culture are found.
participant observation basic fieldwork method in cultural anthropology that involves living in a culture for a long time while gathering data.
multisited research fieldwork conducted in more than one location in order to understand the culture of dispersed members of the culture or relationships among different levels of culture.

• Living with the people for an extended period of time
• Participating in and observing people’s everyday life
• Learning the local language

FIGURE 2.1 Three Elements of Field Methods in Cultural Anthropology.
Through the mid-twentieth century, a primary goal of cultural anthropologists was to record as much as possible of a people's language, songs, rituals, and social life because many cultures were disappearing. At this time, most cultural anthropologists did fieldwork in small, relatively isolated cultures, and they thought they could study everything about such cultures, following the principle of holism (defined in Chapter 1). Typically, the anthropologist (a White man) would go off with his notebooks to collect data on a standardized list of topics, including economics, family life, politics, religion, language, art and crafts, and more. If he was married, his wife might help out by providing information on women's lives.

Today, few if any such seemingly isolated cultures remain due to globalization and mass communication including the Internet. Cultural anthropologists have devised new research methods so that they can study larger-scale cultures, global–local connections, and cultural change. One methodological innovation of the late twentieth century helps to address these new issues: multisited research, which is fieldwork conducted on a topic in more than one location (Marcus 1995). Although especially helpful in studying migrant populations in both their place of origin and their new location, multisited research is useful for studying many topics.

Lanita Jacobs-Huey conducted multisited fieldwork in order to learn about the language and culture of hair styles among African American women (2002). She chose a range of sites throughout the United States and in London, England, in order to explore the many facets of the far-from-simple topic of hair: beauty salons, regional and international hair ex- pos and training seminars, Bible study meetings of a nonprofit group of Christian cosmetologists, stand-up comedy clubs, a computer-mediated discussion about the politics of Black hair, and a cosmetology school in Charleston, South Carolina. Doing Fieldwork in Cultural Anthropology

Fieldwork in cultural anthropology can be exciting, frustrating, scary, boring, and sometimes dangerous. One thing is true: It transforms the lives of everyone involved. This section explores the stages of a fieldwork research project, starting with the initial planning and ending with the analysis and presentation of the findings.

Beginning the Fieldwork Process

Before going to the field, the prospective researcher must select a research topic and prepare for the fieldwork itself. These steps are critical to the success of the project.

PROJECT SELECTION Finding a topic for a research project is a basic first step. The topic should be important and feasible. Cultural anthropologists often find a topic to research by carrying out a literature review, which is the formal term for reading what others have already written about the sub-ject and assessing its strengths and gaps. For example, cultural anthropologists realized during the 1970s that anthropologi-cal research to date had ignored women and girls, and this is how feminist anthropology began (Miller 1993).

Important events and trends often inspire a research project. The HIV/AIDS epidemic and its rapid spread con-tinue to prompt much research as do other new health threats. The plight of many international migrants and refugees pro-vides a pressing topic for study. Conflicts in Afghanistan, Iraq, Sudan, and other places spur cultural anthropologists to ask what causes such conflicts and how post-conflict reconstruc-tion can be most effectively accomplished (Lubkemann 2005). Climate change and environmental issues have become im-portant in recent years, and cultural anthropologists are busy

As you read this chapter, consider the similarities and differences between research methods in cultural anthropology and research in other disciplines.
Cultural anthropologist Susan Squires is one of the brains behind the General Mills breakfast food Go-Gurt®. During its first year of production in 1991, Go-Gurt generated sales of $37 million. Squires, who earned a Ph.D. in cultural anthropology from Boston University, is a pioneer in consumer anthropology, or the use of anthropological research methods to identify what people do and say in their everyday lives in order to inform product development and design.

In contrast to traditional anthropological methods that involve long-term participant observation, consumer research relies on short-term, drop-in visits, often of a small sample of people who are representative of a larger population. Typically, an anthropologist and a designer work as a team in the field.

Research into the development of Go-Gurt took Squires and an industrial designer into the homes of middle-class families in suburban California to observe their breakfast behavior and food choices. On their first day of research, they arrived at a residence at 6:30 a.m., laden with video cameras and other equipment, prepared to have breakfast with a family they had never met. They repeated this process with more families at breakfast time and were able to build up a picture of habits and preferences.

General Mills had learned from focus group interviews that mothers want their families to eat whole-grain breakfast foods. Squires, in contrast, found that a major factor shaping breakfast food choice was the need to leave home early for work or school. Breakfast time is often a rushed affair, cut short by the need to get in the car or meet the bus. At the same time, she learned that parents want their children to eat healthy food for breakfast while children are frequently uninterested in eating anything so early in the morning.

Squires realized that the ideal breakfast food for such busy families should be portable, healthy, fun, and come in a disposable container. The answer: yogurt packaged so that it can be eaten by squeezing it out of the package, bypassing the need for a spoon. One mother said that her daughter thinks she is eating a popsicle when she has Go-Gurt for breakfast.

The work of Susan Squires demonstrates how cultural anthropology can benefit business and the everyday lives of consumers. Two assets of consumer anthropology are its attention to people’s behavior and preferences in everyday life and its ability to describe cultural variation and similarities that can translate to effective product design.

A middle-class family breakfast in California. Recent studies claim that multitasking involving telephone conversations and being on the Internet distracts from the quality of social relationships and the ability to concentrate. Whether or not such claims are true, a media-saturated lifestyle does affect eating in terms of the kind of food consumed and social interaction at mealtime.

documenting how local groups are affected by drought, declining animal and fish populations, and rising temperatures.

Some cultural anthropologists examine a particular item or commodity within its cultural context, such as sugar (Mintz 1985), cars (D. Miller 2001), beef (Caplan 2000), money (R. Foster 2002), shea butter (Chalfin 2004), wedding dresses (Foster and Johnson 2003), coca (Allen 2002), or cocaine (Taussig 2004). The item provides a window for understanding the social relations surrounding its production, use, and trade, and what it means in terms of people’s identities.

Another advance in methods is related to the need for applied research to produce knowledge with usable results for governments, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and businesses (see Anthropology Works). Rather than spending a year or more in the field, they rely on expert knowledge of the culture, a teamwork approach, and shortcut methods, or
rapid-research methods, to provide information within a few weeks. Admittedly such research lacks the depth and nuance of traditional extended fieldwork, but it has the advantage of providing “good enough” insights for practical applications.

Another idea for a research project is a restudy, or fieldwork conducted in a previously researched community. Many previous studies offer a foundation on which later studies can build, providing insights into changes that have occurred or offering a new angle. One of Bronislaw Malinowski’s major contributions to anthropology is his classic study, Argonauts of the Western Pacific (1961 [1922]) and its detailed examination of the Trobriand Island kula, a trading network linking many islands through which men maintain long-standing partnerships involving the exchange of everyday goods, such as food, as well as highly valued necklaces and armlets (see Culturama). More than half a century later, Annette Weiner traveled to the Trobriand Islands to study wood carving. She settled in a village near the place Malinowski had done his research and immediately began making startling observations: “On my first day in the village, I saw women performing a mortuary [death] ceremony in which they distributed thousands of bundles of strips of dried banana leaves and hundreds of beautifully decorated fibrous skirts” (1976:xvii). Weiner was intrigued and decided to change her research project to investigate women’s exchange patterns. Power and prestige derive from both men’s and women’s exchange networks. Reading Malinowski alone informs us about the former, but in isolation from half of the islands’ population: women. Weiner’s book Women of Value, Men of Renown (1976) provides an account of women’s trading and prestige activities as well as how they are linked to those of men. Building on the work of her predecessor, Weiner shows how a full understanding of one domain requires knowledge of the other.

**PREPARING FOR THE FIELD** After defining the research topic, it is important to secure funding to carry out the research. Academic anthropologists can apply for grants from a variety of sources, governmental and nongovernmental. Several sources of funding are also available for advanced graduate students. Undergraduate students have a more difficult time finding grants to support fieldwork, but some succeed.

Related to the funding question is whether it is appropriate for an anthropologist to conduct research while employed in the research setting. Employment provides financial support for the research, but it raises some problems. A basic dilemma, discussed later in the chapter, is the ethical principle that anthropologists cannot do “undercover” research. If you are working in a factory, for example, while studying what goes on in the factory, you must get people’s permission for your study, something that is not always easy. More positively, a work role can help gain people’s trust and respect. A British graduate student worked as a bartender in a tourist town in Ireland (Kaul 2004). This position placed him at the center of the village, and people respected him as a hard-working person, thus greatly adding to his ability to learn about the local culture, at least as revealed from a bartender’s perspective.

If the project involves international travel, the host government may require a visa and an application for permission to conduct research. These formalities may take a long time and may even be impossible to obtain. The government of India, for example, restricts research by foreigners, especially research related to “sensitive” topics such as tribal people, border areas, and family planning. China’s restrictions against foreign anthropologists doing fieldwork have been eased since the 1980s, but it is still not easy to get permission to do fieldwork and participant observation.

Many countries require that researchers follow official guidelines for the protection of human subjects. In the United States, universities and other institutions that support or conduct research with living people must establish **institutional review boards (IRBs)** to monitor research to make sure that it conforms to ethical principles. IRB guidelines follow a medical model related to the need to protect people who participate as “subjects” in medical research. Normally, IRBs require informed consent, in writing, from the research participants. **Informed consent** is an aspect of research ethics requiring that the researcher inform the research participants of the intent, scope, and possible effects of the study and seek their agreement to be in the study. Obtaining written consent from research participants is reasonable and feasible in many anthropological research projects. Written consent, however, is often not reasonable or feasible, especially in oral-based cultures where most people are not literate. Fortunately, IRBs are gaining more experience with the contexts in which cultural anthropologists do research. Some universities’ IRBs have eased the administrative requirements for an anthropologist to conduct research while employed in the research setting. Employment provides financial support for the research participants. Undergraduate students have a more difficult time finding grants to support fieldwork, but some succeed.

**kula** a trading network, linking many of the Trobriand Islands, in which men have long-standing partnerships for the exchange of everyday goods, such as food, as well as highly valued necklaces and armlets.

**informed consent** an aspect of fieldwork ethics requiring that the researcher inform the research participants of the intent, scope, and possible effects of the proposed study and seek their consent to be in the study.
The Trobriand Islanders of Papua New Guinea

The Trobriand Islands are named after eighteenth-century French explorer Denis de Trobriand. They include 22 flat coral atolls east of the island of New Guinea. The indigenous Trobriand population lives on four main islands. Kiriwina is by far the most populated, with about 28,000 people (digim’Rina, personal communication 2006). The Papua New Guinea (PNG) district office and an airstrip are located on Kiriwina at Losuia.

The islands were first colonized by Great Britain and then ceded to Australia in 1904 (Weiner 1988). The British attempted to stop local warfare and to change many other aspects of Trobriand culture. Christian missionaries introduced the game of cricket as a substitute for warfare (see Chapter 11 for further discussion). In 1943, Allied troops landed as part of their Pacific operations. In 1975, the islands became part of the state of Papua New Guinea (PNG).

Island-to-island cultural differences exist. Even within one island, people may speak different dialects, although everyone speaks a version of the language called Kilivila (Weiner 1988). The Trobrianders grow much of their own food, including root crops such as yams, sweet potatoes, and taro; beans and squash; and bananas, breadfruit, coconuts, and betel nuts. Pigs are the main animal raised for food and as prestige items. In the latter part of the twentieth century, Trobrianders were increasingly dependent on money sent to them by relatives working elsewhere in PNG. Current development projects are encouraging people to plant more fruit trees, such as mango (digim’Rina 2005).

Kinship emphasizes the female line, and mothers and daughters form the core of household groups along with males related by blood. A woman’s husband, and her child’s father, lives with her female relatives by blood, and not with his wife and children. Fathers, even though just visitors, spend as much time caring for their children as mothers do (Weiner 1988). Fathers of political status give their children, both boys and girls, highly valued shell earrings and necklaces to wear. Mothers give daughters prized red skirts.

Trobriand children attend Western-style schools on the islands, and many go to mainland PNG and beyond for further studies.

Today, elders worry that young people do nothing but dream about “money” and fail to care for the heritage of their ancestors. Another concern is that commercial overfishing is endangering the coral reefs.

Thanks to Linus S. digim’Rina, University of Papua New Guinea, and Robert Foster, University of Rochester, for reviewing this material.

(CENTER) A Trobriand girl wears a valued skirt at a dance in honor of the ancestors on Kiriwina Island. She and other female participants coat their skin with coconut oil and herbs and wear decorative flowers.

(LEFT) Trobriand men’s coveted trade goods include this shell necklace and armlet.

(MAP 2.1) Trobriand Islands of Papua New Guinea. Also known as the Kiriwina Islands, these islands are an archipelago of coral atolls lying off the eastern coast of the island of New Guinea.
will waive the requirement for written informed consent, allowing oral informed consent instead. IRB guidelines do change, so check your institution’s website for the latest policy.

Depending on the project’s location, preparation for the field may involve buying specialized equipment, such as a tent, warm clothing, waterproof clothing, and sturdy boots. Health preparations may require immunization against contagious diseases such as yellow fever. For research in a remote area, a well-stocked medical kit and basic first-aid training are essential. Research equipment and supplies are another important aspect of preparation. Cameras, video recorders, tape recorders, and laptop computers are now basic field equipment.

If a researcher is unfamiliar with the local language, intensive language training before going to the field is critical. Even with language training in advance, cultural anthropologists often find that they cannot communicate in the local version of the language they studied in a classroom. Therefore, many fieldworkers rely on help from a local interpreter throughout their study or at least in its early stages.

**Working in the Field**

A basic first step in establishing a fieldwork project is to decide on the particular location or locations for the research. The second is to find a place to live.

**SITE SELECTION** A research site is the place where the research takes place. The researcher often has a basic idea of the area where the fieldwork will occur—for example, a shantytown in Brazil, a village in Scotland, or a factory in Malaysia. But it is often impossible to know in advance exactly where the project will be located. Selecting a research site depends on many factors. It may be necessary to find a large village if the project involves class differences in work patterns, or a clinic if the study concerns health-care behavior. It may be difficult to find a village, neighborhood, or institution in which the people welcome the researcher and the project. Often, housing shortages mean that even the most welcoming community cannot provide space for an anthropologist.

**GAINING RAPPORT** Rapport is a trusting relationship between the researcher and the study population. In the early stages of research, the primary goal is to establish rapport with key leaders or decision makers in the community who may serve as gatekeepers (people who formally or informally control access to the group or community). Gaining rapport involves trust on the part of the study population, and that trust depends on how the researcher presents herself or himself. In many cultures, people have difficulty understanding why a person would come to study them because they do not know about universities and research and cultural anthropology. They may provide their own explanations based on previous experience with outsiders whose goals differed from those of cultural anthropologists, such as tax collectors, family planning promoters, and law-enforcement officials.

Stories about false role assignments can be humorous. During his 1970s fieldwork in northwest Pakistan, Richard Kurin reports that, in the first stage of his research, the villagers thought he was an international spy from America, Russia, India, or China (1980). Over time, he convinced them that he was not a spy. So what was he? The villagers came up with several roles for Kurin. First, they speculated that he was a teacher of English because he was tutoring one of the village boys. Second, they guessed that he must be a doctor because he gave people aspirin. Third, they thought he might be a lawyer who could help them in local disputes because he could read court orders. Last, they decided that he was a descendant of a local clan because of the similarity of his last name and that of an ancestral king. For Richard Kurin, the last of these—being a true “Karan”—was best of all.

Being labeled a spy continues to be a problem for anthropologists. Christa Salamandra, a Western-trained doctoral student in anthropology, went to Damascus, Syria (Map 2.2), to do research for her dissertation in anthropology (2004). Although Damascus has an ancient history, it is increasingly cosmopolitan. Damascenes, however, have little exposure to anthropology. Syria has no university with a department of anthropology, and there are no Syrian anthropologists. Salamandra’s research interests in popular culture (movies, cafés, and fashion) perplexed the local
people, who decided she must be a foreign spy. One person said to her, “Your question is CIA, not academic” (2004:5). Nevertheless, she managed to carry out her study and write a book about popular culture in Damascus.

**GIFT-GIVING AND EXCHANGE**  Giving gifts to people involved in the research can help the project proceed, but gifts should be culturally and ethically appropriate. Learning the local rules of exchange is important (Figure 2.2).

Matthews Hamabata, a Japanese American who did fieldwork in Japan, learned about the complexities of gift-giving among Japanese business families (1990). He developed a close relationship with one family, the Itoos, and helped their daughter apply for admission to universities in the United States. When the applications were completed, Mrs. Ito invited him to an expensive restaurant to celebrate. After the dinner, she handed him a small, carefully wrapped package, expressing her embarrassment at the inadequacy of her gift in relation to all that he had done for her daughter. When he returned home, he opened the gift. It was a box of chocolates. Upon opening the box, he discovered 50,000 yen (about US$250). Hamabata felt insulted: “Who do the Itoos think they are? They can’t buy me or my services!” (1990:21–22). He asked some Japanese friends what he should do. They told him that the gift signaled the Itoos’ wish to have a long-standing relationship and that returning the money to the Itoos would be an insult. They advised him to give a return gift later on, in order to maintain the relationship. His gift should leave him ahead by about 25,000 yen, given his status as an anthropologist in relation to the Itoos’ status as a rich business family. This strategy worked, and the relationship between Hamabata and the Itoos remained intact.

**MICROCULTURES AND FIELDWORK**  Class, “race”/ethnicity, gender, and age all affect how the local people will perceive and welcome an anthropologist. Some examples illustrate how micrcultures influence rapport and affect the research in other ways.

**Class**  In most fieldwork situations, the anthropologist is more wealthy and powerful than the people studied. This difference is obvious to the people. They know that the anthropologist must have spent hundreds or thousands of dollars to travel to the research site. They see the anthropologist’s expensive equipment (camera, tape recorder, video recorder, even a vehicle) and valuable material goods (stainless steel knives, cigarettes, flashlights, canned food, and medicines).

Many years ago, Laura Nader urged that anthropologists should also **study up** by doing research among powerful people such as members of the business elite, political leaders, and government officials (1972). As one example of this approach, research on the high-fashion industry of Japan placed the anthropologist in touch with members of the Japanese elite—influential people capable of taking her to court if they felt she wrote something defamatory about them (Kondo 1997). Studying up has prompted greater attention to accountability to the people being studied, whether or not they are able to read what the anthropologist has written about them or are wealthy enough to hire a lawyer if they do not like how they and their culture have been presented.

**“Race”/Ethnicity**  For most of its history, cultural anthropology has been dominated by Euro-American White researchers who study “other” cultures that are mainly non-White and non-Euro-American. The effects of “Whiteness” on role assignments range from the anthropologist being considered a god or ancestral spirit to being reviled as a representative of a colonialist past or neocolonialist present. While doing research in a village in Jamaica called Haversham, Tony Whitehead learned how “race” and status interact (1986). Whitehead is an African American from a low-income family. Being of a similar “race” and class as the rural Jamaicans with whom he was doing research, he assumed that he would quickly build rapport because of a shared heritage. The people of Haversham, however, have a complex status system that relegated Whitehead to a position that he did not predict, as he explains:

“I was shocked when the people of Haversham began talking to me and referring to me as a “big,” “brown,” “pretty-talking” man. “Big” was not a reference to my weight but to my higher social status as they perceived it, and “brown” referred not only to my skin color but also to my higher social status. . . . More embarrassing than bothersome were the references to how “pretty” I talked, a comment on my Standard English speech pattern. . . . Frequently mothers told me that their children were going to school so that they could learn to talk as pretty as I did (1986:214–215)

This experience prompted Whitehead to ponder the complexities of “race” and status cross-culturally.

**Gender**  If a female researcher is young and unmarried, she is likely to face more difficulties than a young unmarried man or an older woman, married or single, because people in most cultures consider a young unmarried female on her own as extremely unusual. Rules of gender segregation may dictate that a young unmarried woman should not move about freely without a male escort, attend certain events, or be in certain places. A woman researcher who studied a community of gay men in the United States says:

“I was able to do fieldwork in those parts of the setting dedicated to sociability and leisure—bars, parties, family gatherings. I was not, however, able to observe in those parts of the setting dedicated to sexuality—even quasi-public settings such as...
as homosexual bath houses…. Thus my portrait of the gay community is only a partial one, bounded by the social roles assigned to females within the male homosexual world. (Warren 1988:18)

Gender segregation may also prevent male researchers from gaining access to a full range of activities. Liza Dalby, a White American, lived with the geishas of Kyoto, Japan, and trained to be a geisha (1998). This research would have been impossible for a man to do.

**Age** Typically, anthropologists are adults, and this fact tends to make it easier for them to gain rapport with people their age than with children or the aged. Although some children and adolescents welcome the participation of a friendly adult in their daily lives and respond to questions openly, others are more reserved.

**CULTURE SHOCK** Culture shock is the feeling of uneasiness, loneliness, and anxiety that occurs when a person shifts from one culture to a different one. The more different the two cultures are, the more severe the shock is likely to be. Culture shock happens to many cultural anthropologists, no matter how much they have tried to prepare themselves for fieldwork. It also happens to students who study abroad, Peace Corps volunteers, and others who spend a long time living in another culture.

Culture shock can range from problems with food to language barriers and loneliness. Food differences were a major problem in adjustment for a Chinese anthropologist who came to the United States (Huang 1993). American food never gave him a “full” feeling. An American anthropologist who went to Pohnpei, an island in the Federated States of Micronesia (see Map 5.6, p. 111), found that her lack of skills in the local language caused her the most serious adjustment problems (Ward 1989). She says, “Even dogs understood more than I did… [I will never] forget the agony of stepping on a woman’s toes. Instead of asking for forgiveness, I blurted out, ‘His canoe is blue’” (1989:14).

A frequent psychological aspect of culture shock is the feeling of reduced competence as a cultural actor. At home, the anthropologist is highly competent, carrying out everyday tasks, such as shopping, talking with people, and mailing a package, without thinking. In a new culture, the simplest tasks are difficult and one’s sense of self-efficacy is undermined.

Reverse culture shock may occur after coming home. An American anthropologist describes his feelings on returning to San Francisco after a year of fieldwork in a village in India:

We could not understand why people were so distant and hard to reach, or why they talked and moved so quickly. We were a little frightened at the sight of so many white faces and we could not understand why no one stared at us, brushed against us, or admired our baby. (Beals 1980:119)

**Fieldwork Techniques**

The goal of fieldwork is to collect information, or *data*, about the research topic. In cultural anthropology, variations exist about what kinds of data to emphasize and the best ways to collect data.

**culture shock** persistent feelings of uneasiness, loneliness, and anxiety that often occur when a person has shifted from one culture to a different one.

**THINKING OUTSIDE THE BOX**

Think of an occasion in which you experienced culture shock, even if as the result of just a brief cross-cultural encounter. How did you feel? How did you cope? What did you learn from the experience?
DEDUCTIVE AND INDUCTIVE RESEARCH  

A deductive approach is a form of research that starts from a research question or hypothesis, and then involves collecting relevant data through observation, interviews, and other methods. An inductive approach is a form of research that proceeds without a hypothesis and involves gathering data through unstructured, informal observation, conversation, and other methods. Deductive methods are more likely to collect quantitative data, or numeric information, such as the amount of land in relation to the population or the numbers of people with particular health problems. The inductive approach in cultural anthropology emphasizes qualitative data, or nonnumeric information, such as recordings of myths and conversations and filming of events. Most anthropologists, to varying degrees, combine deductive and inductive approaches and quantitative and qualitative data.

Cultural anthropologists have labels for data collected in each approach. Etic (pronounced like the last two syllables of “phonemic,” or ee-tik) refers to data collected according to the researcher’s questions and categories, with the goal of being able to test a hypothesis (Figure 2.3). In contrast, emic (pronounced like the last two syllables of “phonemic,” or ee-mik) refers to data collected that reflect what insiders say and understand about their culture, and insiders’ categories of thinking. Cultural materialists (review Chapter 1) are more likely to collect etic data, whereas interpretivists are more likely to collect emic data. Again, however, most cultural anthropologists collect both types of data.

PARTICIPANT OBSERVATION  
The phrase participant observation includes two processes: participating, or being part of the people’s lives, and, at the same time, carefully observing. These two activities may sound simple, but they are actually quite complex.

Being a participant means that the researcher adopts the lifestyle of the people being studied, living in the same kind of housing, eating similar food, wearing similar clothing, learning the language, and participating in the daily round of activities and in special events. The rationale is that participation over a long period improves the quality of the data. The more time the researcher spends living among the people, the more likely it is that the people will live their “normal” lives. In this way, the researcher is able to overcome the Hawthorne effect, a research bias that occurs when participants change their behavior to conform to the perceived expectations of the researcher. The Hawthorne effect was discovered in the 1930s in a study of an industrial plant in the United States. During the study, research participants altered their behavior in ways they thought would please the researcher.

TALKING WITH PEOPLE  
Common sense tells you that participating and observing are important, but what about talking to people and asking questions such as “What is going on here?” “What does that mean?” and “Why are you doing that?” The process of talking to people and asking them questions is such an important component of participant observation that the method should actually be called participant observation and talking. Cultural anthropologists use a variety of data-collection techniques that rely on talking with people, from informal, casual, and unplanned conversations to more formal methods.

An interview is a technique for gathering verbal data through questions or guided conversation. It is more purposeful than a casual conversation. An interview may involve only two people, the interviewer and the interviewee, or several people in what are called group interviews or focus groups. Cultural anthropologists use different interview styles and formats, depending on the kinds of information they seek, the amount of time they have, and their language skills. The least structured type of interview is an open-ended interview, in which the respondent (interviewee) takes the lead in setting the direction of the conversation, determining the topics to be covered, and choosing how much time to devote to a particular topic. The interviewer does not interrupt or provide prompting questions. In this way, the researcher discovers what themes are important to the person.

A questionnaire is a formal research instrument containing a preset series of questions that the anthropologist asks in a face-to-face setting or by mail or e-mail. Cultural anthropologists who use questionnaires favor a face-to-face setting. Like interviews,
questionnaires vary in the degree to which the questions are structured (close ended) or unstructured (open ended). Structured questions limit the range of possible responses—for example, by asking research participants to rate their positions on a particular issue as “very positive,” “positive,” “negative,” “very negative,” or “no opinion.” Unstructured interviews generate more emic responses.

When designing a questionnaire, the researcher should have enough familiarity with the study population to be able to develop questions that make cultural sense. Researchers who take a ready-made questionnaire to the field with them should ask another researcher who knows the culture to review the questionnaire in advance to see whether it makes sense. Further revisions may be required in the field to make the questionnaire fit local conditions. A pilot study using the questionnaire among a small number of people in the research area can expose areas that need further revision.

**COMBINING OBSERVATION AND TALKING** A combination of observation of what people actually do with verbal data about what people say they do and think is essential for a well-rounded view of a culture (Sanjek 2000). People may say that they do something or believe something, but their behavior may differ from what they say. For example, people may say that sons and daughters inherit equal shares of family property when the parents die. Research into what really happens may reveal that daughters do not, in fact, inherit equal shares. Similarly, an anthropologist might learn from people and their laws that discrimination on the basis of skin color is illegal. Research on people’s behavior might reveal clear examples of discrimination. It is important for an anthropologist to learn about both what people say and what happens. Both are “true” aspects of culture.

**SPECIALIZED METHODS** Cultural anthropologists also use several kinds of specific research methods. The choice depends on the anthropologist’s research goals.

**Life History** A life history is a qualitative, in-depth description of an individual’s life as narrated to the researcher. Anthropologists differ in their views about the value of the life history as a method in cultural anthropology. Early in the twentieth century, Franz Boas rejected this method as unscientific because research participants might lie or exaggerate (Peacock and Holland 1993). Others disagree, saying that a life history reveals rich information on individuals and how they think, no matter how “distorted” their reports are. For example, some anthropologists have questioned the accuracy of parts of Nisa: The Life and Times of a !Kung Woman (Shostak 1981), probably the most widely read life history in anthropology. It is a book-length story of a Ju’hoansi woman of the Kalahari Desert of southern Africa (review Culturama, Chapter 1, p. 19). Presented in Nisa’s voice, the book offers details about her childhood and several marriages. The value of the narrative is not so much whether it is “true” or not; rather, the value is that we learn from Nisa what she wants to tell us, her view of her experiences. That counts as “data” in cultural anthropology, for it is “truly” what she reported to Marjorie Shostak.

**Time Allocation Study** A time allocation study is a quantitative method that collects data on how people spend their time each day on particular activities. This method relies on standard time units and then labeling or coding the activities that occur within certain time segments (Gross 1984). Activity codes must be adapted to fit local contexts. For example, activity codes for various kinds of work would not be useful...
in a time allocation study in a retirement home. Data can be collected through observation that may be continuous, at fixed intervals (for instance, every 48 hours), or on a random basis. Continuous observation is extremely time-consuming and means that the number of people observed is limited. Spot observations help increase the number of observations but may inadvertently miss important activities. Another option for data collection is to ask people to keep daily time logs or diaries.

**Texts** Most cultural anthropologists collect and analyze *textual material*, a category that includes written or oral stories, myths, plays, sayings, speeches, jokes, transcriptions of people’s everyday conversations, and material on the Internet and social media outlets.

In the early twentieth century, Franz Boas recorded thousands of pages of texts from American Indians of the Northwest Coast of Canada, including myths, songs, speeches, and accounts of how to perform rituals. These collections provide valuable records of cultures that have changed since the time of his fieldwork. Surviving tribal members have consulted them in order to recover forgotten aspects of their culture. Boas would be interested to know about new studies in cultural anthropology that analyze Internet websites for their social meaning. The Internet has been labeled a modern-day Pandora’s box because it makes available to the viewing public any and all knowledge and opinions, right or wrong, evidence-based or not. Anna Kata, a graduate student in anthropology at McMaster University in Canada, examined several Internet sites for the *social discourse*, or shared themes, about the dangers of vaccination (2010). As background, she consulted published data showing that around 74 percent of Americans and 72 percent of Canadians are online. Of them, between 75 and 80 percent of users search for health information, and of them, 70 percent say that the information they access influences their medical treatment decisions, so the Internet plays a large role in people’s medical decision making.

Using Google as her search engine, Kata applied several criteria to label a particular website as “anti-vaccination.” In all, she examined eight American and Canadian sites for content analysis. The prominent themes that emerged are safety (vaccines are poisons); effectiveness (vaccines are not effective); alternative medicine favored over vaccines (“back to nature”); civil liberties (parental rights); conspiracy theories (accusations of cover-up); religion (go with God-given immune system); misinformation about vaccine studies; and emotional appeals (personal testimonies). Combatting anti-vaccination views with education is necessary but not sufficient, Kata concludes. Analysis of the social discourse on the Internet can help pinpoint areas that need specific attention.

**Multiple Research Methods and Team Projects** Most cultural anthropologists use a mix of several different methods for their research because just one would not provide all the varieties of data necessary to understand a given topic. For example, consider what interviews with people in 100 households would provide in breadth of coverage, and then add what you could learn from life histories collected from a subset of five men and...
Inuit Place Names and Landscape Knowledge

The South Baffin Island Place Name Project is dedicated to collecting and recording Inuit place names and landscape knowledge as a means to preserving climatically important information (Henshaw 2006).

Inuit is a cluster name for many indigenous peoples who live in the Arctic region of Canada, Alaska, and Greenland. Before contact with Europeans, Inuit life was one of constant mobility. Now, most Inuit are settled in villages and towns. As a result, their detailed knowledge of migration routes, locations along these routes, and how to adapt to changing conditions when on the move are being lost.

One project looks at toponymy (to-PAH-nuh-mee), or the naming of places. Inuit toponymy is one aspect of a rich set of indigenous knowledge, or local understanding of the environment, climate, plants, and animals.

The South Baffin Island Place Names Project used several methods for collecting data. The first step was community-wide workshops, with 10 to 15 people gathered together in a community hall. The researchers laid out large maps, and the Inuit added place names to the map and explained their importance.

The second step was conducting one-on-one interviews with Inuit elders. These elders have lived in particular areas and can provide specialized knowledge about their use (for shelter, fishing and hunting, and storage), routes to and from the site, and likely weather conditions.

The third step was participant observation. The anthropologists, with Inuit collaborators, went to many of the sites. They gained first-hand experience about travel conditions to and from the sites and conditions at the sites. They made video recordings and took photographs.

The fourth step was analytical and archival. The researchers created a computer database, linking the ethnographic data to maps.

This research project has many uses. It will provide a data baseline, starting with elders’ memories and narratives of important sites and migration routes. It will show, over time, environmental changes that have occurred and how people are adapting to them.

It will create an archive of indigenous knowledge that can be used by future generations of Inuit in protecting their cultural heritage.

FOOD FOR THOUGHT

Choose an ordinary day in your week, create a map of where you go, and take notes about how key locations are named (such as your dorm room, dining hall, classrooms, and other locations). What names do you use for key sites, and what do the place names mean to you? How would you change your daily route depending on differences in the weather or season?
Recording Culture
How does an anthropologist keep track of all the information collected in the field and record it for future analysis? As with everything else about fieldwork, things have changed since the early times when a notebook and pencil were the major recording tools. Taking detailed notes, nonetheless, is still a cultural anthropologist’s trademark method of recording data.

FIELD NOTES  Field notes consist of daily logs, personal journals, descriptions of events, and notes about those notes. Ideally, researchers should write up their field notes each day. Trying to capture, in the fullest way possible, the events of even a single day is a monumental task and can result in dozens of pages of handwritten or typed field notes. Laptop computers now enable anthropologists to enter their daily observations directly into the computer.

TAPE RECORDINGS, PHOTOGRAPHS, AND VIDEOS
Tape recorders are a major aid to fieldwork. Their use may raise problems, however, such as research participants’ suspicions about a machine that can capture their voices, and the ethical issue of protecting the identities of people whose voices are preserved on tape. María Cátedra reports on her use of tape recording during her research in the Asturias region of rural Spain (Map 2.4):

At first the existence of the "apparatus," as they called it, was part wonder and part suspect. Many had never seen one before and were fascinated to hear their own voice, but all were worried about what I would do with the tapes. . . . I tried to solve the problem by explaining what I would do with the tapes: I would use them to record correctly what people told me, since my memory was not good enough and I could not take notes quickly enough. . . . One event helped people to accept my integrity in regard to the "apparatus." In the second braña [small settlement] I visited, people asked me to play back what the people of the first braña had told me, especially some songs sung by a group of men. At first I was going to do it, but then I instinctively refused because I did not have the first people’s permission. . . . My stand was quickly known in the first braña and commented on with approval. (1992:21–22)

To be useful for analysis, tape recordings have to be transcribed (typed up), either partially or completely. Each hour of recorded talk takes between 5 and 8 hours to transcribe.

Like tape recordings, photographs or videos capture more detail than scratch notes. Any researcher who has watched
people performing a ritual, taken scratch notes, and then tried to reconstruct the details of the ritual later on will know how much of the sequencing and related activity is lost to memory within just a few hours. Reviewing photographs or a video recording of the ritual provides a surprising amount of forgotten or missed material. The trade-off, however, is that if you are using a camera or video recorder, you cannot take notes at the same time.

**Data Analysis**

During the research process, an anthropologist collects a vast amount of data in many forms. How does he or she put the data into a meaningful form? In data analysis, as with data collection, two basic varieties of data exist: qualitative (prose-based description) and quantitative (numeric presentation).

**Analyzing Qualitative Data**

Qualitative data include descriptive field notes, narratives, myths and stories, songs and sagas, and more. Few guidelines exist for undertaking a qualitative analysis of qualitative data. One procedure is to search for themes or patterns. This approach involves exploring the data, or “playing” with the data, either “by hand” or with the use of a computer.

Many qualitative anthropologists use computers to help sort the data for *tropes* (key themes). Computer scanning offers the ability to search vast quantities of data more quickly and perhaps more accurately than with the human eye. The range of software available for such data management is expanding. The quality of the results, though, still depends on careful and complete inputting of the data, as well as an intelligent coding scheme that will tell the computer what it should be scanning for in the data.

The presentation of qualitative data relies on people’s own words—their stories, explanations, and conversations. Lila Abu-Lughod followed this approach in conveying Egyptian Bedu women’s narratives in her book *Writing Women’s Worlds* (1993). Abu-Lughod offers a light authorial framework that organizes the women’s stories into thematic clusters such as marriage, production, and honor. Although she provides an introduction to the narratives, she offers no conclusion, thereby prompting readers to think for themselves about the meanings of the stories and what they say about Egyptian Bedu women’s lives.

Some anthropologists question the value of such artistic, interpretive approaches because they lack scientific verifiability. Too much depends, they say, on the individual selection process of the anthropologist, and interpretation often depends on a small number of cases. Interpretive anthropologists respond that verifiability, in the scientific sense, is not their goal and, in fact, is not a worthwhile goal for cultural anthropology. Instead, they seek to provide a plausible interpretation or a fresh understanding of people’s lives that offers detail and richness.

**Analyzing Quantitative Data**

Analysis of quantitative, or numeric, data can proceed in several directions. Some of the more sophisticated methods require knowledge of statistics, and many require the use of a computer and a software package that can perform statistical computations. The author’s research on low-income household budgets in Jamaica involved the use of computer analysis, first to divide the sample households into three income groups (lower, medium, and higher) and second to calculate percentages of expenditures in three categories of goods and groups of goods: food, housing, and transportation (Figure 2.4). Because the number of households was quite small (120), the analysis could have been done “by hand,” but using the computer made the analysis proceed more quickly and more accurately.

**Representing Culture**

Ethnography, or a detailed description of a living culture based on personal observation and study, is the main way that cultural anthropologists present their findings about culture. The early ethnographers tended to treat a particular local group or village as a unit unto itself with clear boundaries. Since the 1980s, ethnographies have changed in several ways:

- Ethnographers now treat local cultures as connected with larger regional and global structures and forces.
- Ethnographers tend to focus on one topic of interest and avoid a more holistic approach.
- Ethnographers study Western, industrialized cultures as well as other cultures.

**Urgent Issues in Cultural Anthropology Research**

This section considers two urgent issues in cultural anthropology research: fieldwork ethics and safety during fieldwork.

**Ethics and Collaborative Research**

Anthropology was one of the first disciplines to create and adopt a code of ethics. Two events in the 1950s and 1960s prompted cultural anthropologists to reconsider their role in research in relation to the sponsors of their research and to the people with whom they were studying. The first was *Project Camelot* of the 1950s; it was a plan of the U.S. government to influence political leadership in South America in order to strengthen U.S. interests (Horowitz 1967). The U.S. government employed several anthropologists to collect information on political leaders and events, without revealing their purpose.

The second major event was the Vietnam War (or the American War, as people in Vietnam refer to it). It brought to the forefront of anthropology questions about government interests in ethnographic information, the role of anthropologists...
during wartime, and the protection of the people with whom anthropologists conduct research. Two bitterly opposed positions emerged within anthropology. On one side was the view that all Americans, as citizens, should support the U.S. military effort in Vietnam. People on this side said that any anthropologist who had information that could help subvert communism should provide it to the U.S. government. The other position stated that an anthropologist’s responsibility is, first and always, to protect the people being studied, a responsibility that takes priority over politics. Anthropologists taking this position opposed the war and saw the people of South Vietnam as victims of Western imperialism. They uncovered cases in which some anthropologists submitted information about people’s political affiliations to the U.S. government, with the result being military actions and death of the people exposed by the research.

This period was the most divisive in the history of U.S. anthropology. It led, in 1971, to the adoption by the American Anthropological Association (AAA) of a code of ethics. The AAA code of ethics states that an anthropologist’s primary responsibility is to ensure the safety of the people participating in the research. A related principle is that cultural anthropology does not condone covert, or “undercover,” research. Both of these central principles now create controversy among anthropologists in terms of whether or not cultural anthropologists should participate in the U.S. Human Terrain System (HTS). The HTS seeks to reduce wartime casualties of the U.S. military and civilians by employing cultural anthropologists and others knowledgeable about the local culture in on-the-ground operations. The rationale is reasonable: culturally informed and sensitive militaries will avoid offending local people and will be more effective in bringing closure to war or counter-insurgency operations (González 2009). While that sounds good, a major problem arises because joining the HTS is likely to place the anthropologist in a position of providing information about local people to the military whose war interests may, in fact, end up harming people. The principle of “do no harm” is impossible, some argue, to reconcile with military action.

COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH A new direction in methods explicitly seeks to involve members of the study population in collaborative research—from data collection to analysis and presentation. Collaborative research is an approach to learning about culture that involves anthropologists working with members of the study population as partners and participants rather than as “subjects.”

collaborative research an approach to learning about culture that involves anthropologists working with members of the study population as partners and participants rather than as “subjects.”
The collaborative research team led by Luke Eric Lassiter includes Muncie community members (far left and far right) and students and faculty from Ball State University.

The African American community of Muncie, Indiana. This project resulted in a book with shared authorship among Lassiter, the students, and the community members (2004). The project collected information about African American life that is now housed in a library archive.

Cultural anthropologists are working to find better ways to share the benefits of research with the people and places they study. Research methods in cultural anthropology have come a long way from the armchair, to new strategies for non-hierarchical research. More progress lies ahead, however, in democratizing anthropology and making everyone a “barefoot anthropologist.”

Safety in the Field

Fieldwork can involve serious physical and psychological risks to the researcher and to members of his or her family. The image of “the anthropologist as hero” has muffled, to a large degree, both the physical dangers and the psychological risks of fieldwork.

Dangers from the physical environment are often serious and can be fatal. In the 1980s, the slippery paths of the highland Philippines claimed the life of Michelle Zimbalist Rosaldo, a major figure in late twentieth-century cultural anthropology (review Figure 1.2, p. 10). Disease is a frequent problem. Many anthropologists have contracted infectious diseases that have chronic effects or that may be fatal.

Violence figures prominently in some, but not most, fieldwork experiences. During the five years that Philippe Bourgois conducted fieldwork in East Harlem, New York, he witnessed the following: a shooting outside his window, a bombing and machine-gunning of a numbers joint, a shoot-out and police car chase in front of the pizza parlor where he was eating, the aftermath of a fire-bombing of a heroin house, a dozen serious fights, and “almost daily exposure to broken-down human beings, some of them in fits of crack-induced paranoia, some suffering from delirium tremens, and others in unidentifiable pathological fits of screaming and shouting insults to all around them” (1995:32). He was rough-handled by the police several times because they did not believe that he was a professor and not a drug-dealer. He was once mugged for the sum of $8. Although his research placed him in danger, it also enabled him to gain an understanding, from the inside, of everyday violence in the lives of desperately poor and addicted people.

Anthropological research may involve danger from political violence or even war. War zone anthropology, or research conducted within zones of violent conflict, can provide important insights into topics such as the militarization of civilian lives, civilian protection, the cultural dynamics of military personnel, and postconflict reconstruction (Hoffman and Lubkemann 2005). This kind of research requires skills and judgment that anthropology classes or books on research methods do not typically address (Nordstrom 1997, Kovats-Bernat 2002). Previous experience in conflict zones as a worker in international aid organizations or the military is helpful.

What about fieldwork danger in supposedly normal situations? After more than 20 years of fieldwork in the Kalahari Desert, Nancy Howell (1990) suddenly had to confront the issue of danger in the field when one of her teenage sons was killed and another injured in a truck accident in Botswana, while with their father, Richard Lee, who was doing fieldwork there. In the months following the accident, she heard from many anthropologist friends who shared stories about other fieldwork accidents.

Howell contacted the American Anthropological Association (AAA) to see what advice it provides about fieldwork safety. The answer, she learned, was “not much.” The AAA responded with financial support for her to undertake a detailed inquiry into fieldwork hazards in anthropology. Howell drew a sample of 311 anthropologists listed as employed in the AAA’s Guide to Departments. She sent them a questionnaire asking for information on gender, age, work status, health status, and work habits in the field; she also asked about health problems and other hazards they had experienced. She received 236 completed questionnaires, a high response rate indicating strong interest in the study.

Her analysis revealed regional variation in risk and danger. The highest rates were in Africa, followed by India, the Asia/Pacific region, and Latin America. Howell offers recommendations about how anthropologists can prepare themselves more effectively for preventing and dealing with fieldwork risks. They include increasing risk awareness, training in basic medical care, and learning about fieldwork safety in anthropology classes.

Research methods in cultural anthropology have come a long way from the time of the armchair anthropologists. Topics have changed, as have techniques of data gathering and data analysis. New concerns about ethical research, including for the military, and fieldworkers’ safety continue to arise and reshape research practices.
How do cultural anthropologists conduct research?

Cultural anthropologists conduct research by doing fieldwork and using participant observation. In the nineteenth century, early cultural anthropologists did armchair anthropology, meaning that they learned about other cultures by reading reports written by explorers and other untrained observers. The next stage was verandah anthropology, in which an anthropologist went to the field but did not live with the people. Instead, the anthropologist would interview a few members of the study population where he (there were no women cultural anthropologists at this time) lived, typically on his verandah.

Fieldwork and participant observation became the cornerstones of cultural anthropology research only after Malinowski’s innovations in the Trobriand Islands during World War I. His approach emphasized the value of living for an extended period in the field, participating in the daily activities of the people, and learning the local language. These features are the hallmarks of fieldwork in cultural anthropology today.

New techniques continue to develop in response to changing times. They include multisited research, in which the anthropologist studies a topic at more than one location, and consumer research that relies on rapid research techniques to deliver information for product design and development that responds to users’ needs and preferences.

What does fieldwork involve?

Fieldwork in cultural anthropology involves several stages. The first is to choose a research topic. A good topic is timely, important, and feasible. Ideas for topics can come from a literature review, restudies, current events and pressing issues, and sheer luck. Once in the field, the first steps include site selection, gaining rapport, and dealing with culture shock. Microcultures affect how anthropologists gain rapport and shape their access to particular cultural domains. Participating appropriately in the culture involves learning local forms of gift-giving and other types of exchange to express gratitude for people’s hospitality, time, and trust.

Research techniques vary between being more deductive or more inductive and accordingly will emphasize gathering quantitative or qualitative data. Cultural materialists tend to focus on quantitative data, whereas interpretivists gather qualitative data. When in the field, anthropologists take daily notes, often by hand but now also using computers. Several other methods of documenting culture include photography, audio recording, and video recording.

Anthropologists’ theoretical orientation, research goals, and the types of data collected affect their approach to data analysis and presentation. Quantitative data may involve statistical analysis and presentation in graphs or tables. The presentation of qualitative data is more likely to be descriptive.

What are some urgent issues in cultural anthropology research today?

Questions of ethics have been paramount to anthropologists since the 1950s. In 1971, U.S. anthropologists adopted a set of ethical guidelines for research to address their concern about what role, if any, anthropologists should play in research that might harm the people being studied. The AAA code of ethics states that an anthropologist’s primary responsibility is to avoid doing harm to the people involved. Further, cultural anthropologists should never engage in covert research and should always explain their purpose to the people in the study and preserve the anonymity of the location and of individuals.

Collaborative research is a recent development that responds to ethical concerns by pursuing research that involves the participants as partners rather than as subjects.

Safety during fieldwork is another important issue. Danger to anthropologists can come from physical sources such as infectious diseases and from social sources such as political violence. A survey of anthropologists in the 1980s produced recommendations about increasing safety during fieldwork.
KEY CONCEPTS

- collaborative research, p. 42
- culture shock, p. 35
- deductive approach (to research), p. 36
- emic, p. 36
- ethnography, p. 41
- etic, p. 36
- fieldwork, p. 28
- indigenous knowledge, p. 39
- inductive approach (to research), p. 36
- informed consent, p. 31
- interview, p. 36
- kula, p. 31
- multisited research, p. 29
- participant observation, p. 28
- qualitative data, p. 36
- quantitative data, p. 36
- questionaire, p. 36
- rapport, p. 33
- toponomy, p. 39

SUGGESTED READINGS

Michael V. Angrosino. Projects in Ethnographic Research. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, 2005. This brief manual provides students with ideas about what conducting research in anthropology is like. It discusses the fundamental stages of three projects, with insights into how students can conduct their own research.
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