

Linda Garro, Dept. of Anthropology, University of Connecticut and University of California, Los Angeles

It's unfortunate that Russ Bernard, although on the list of original invitees, was not able to attend this meeting. His publications and other efforts to raise the level of awareness within anthropology of the wide range of research methods used by and available to cultural anthropologists are a real service to the field. Also valuable, in my view, are published efforts to explicate and/or critically evaluate particular methods, particularly those which situate these discussions within the context of specific research projects. At the same time, I am curious about the extent to which graduate student "apprenticeships" in cultural anthropology has been impacted by such endeavors. Have such efforts led to an increased understanding within anthropology of diverse "worldviews" with regard to models, theories and practices that undergird research processes and research practices? Among other things, to what extent do anthropology graduate programs provide opportunities for learning about diverse research methods; for discussing the epistemological underpinnings and concomitants of different research practices; for balanced consideration of the claims of those who advocate, as well as those who critique or highlight the limitations/ tradeoffs of particular research practices; for thinking about sampling; for sustained consideration of what "systematic" qualitative research entails and/or the role of "systematic" qualitative research methods in addressing research questions? In my view, attention to method is critical to anthropological efforts to "explain both cultural reproduction, thematicity, and force.... and cultural variation, inconsistency and change" (Strauss and Quinn 1997:4) and to do so without conceptualizing culture in ways that suggest bounded entities.

In my own work I've used a number of interview approaches that can be seen as at least somewhat "structured" or "systematic" in the sense that, at least part of the time, the same or a similar question is asked of all participants. I'm using a very broad brush stroke here - encompassing the range from asking someone with a chronic illness condition to tell me the story of their illness to true-false questions where responses are amenable to quantitative analysis and direct comparisons across individuals.

In thinking about the workshop themes, I was reminded of a soon-to-be-published paper by the anthropologist Roy D.'Andrade (2005). He writes: "To find something out about the world one must first have some idea about the world, and second, have some way to find out whether or not this idea about the world is true." D'Andrade brings up a distinction discussed by Reichenbach, a philosopher of science, between "contexts of discovery" and "contexts of verification" or "justification." D'Andrade points out that both aspects of investigation are necessary, and the difficulty of each varies by circumstance. Further, philosophers of science tend to have more to say about methods of verification (e.g., hypothesis-testing, correlational methods, experimental methods) than about methods of discovery. I raise this distinction because it may provide a framework for at least some of our discussions, when accompanied by a caution against reification and the recognition that it is an oversimplification.

Along these lines, even though diverse ways of "carrying out" ethnographic fieldwork can often fruitfully be seen as methods of discovery, it is also the case that the process of doing fieldwork may bring both aspects of investigation into play (explicitly or implicitly). Spradley (1980) characterized this as the "ethnographic research cycle." Agar (1996:62) provides a concise summary of the concurrent process of data collection and analysis in ethnographic fieldwork:

In ethnography... you learn something ("collect some data"), then you try and make sense out of it ("analysis"), then you go back and see if the interpretation makes sense in light of new experience ("collect more data"), then you refine your interpretation ("more analysis"), and so on. The process is dialectic, not linear. Such a simple statement is so important in capturing a key aspect of doing ethnography.

Even in early stages of fieldwork the culturally-appropriate use of structured data collection methods can have an important role to play with regard to the ethnographic research cycle. In light of the time constraints present in any field project, the ethnographically appropriate use of structured data collection methods can be a boon to the field researcher.

In my own field work, as a participant observer I strive to remain open to a wide range of opportunities for learning about what is going on in a cultural setting. Opportunistic data collecting is part of anthropological fieldwork. But one way I encourage or create opportunities for learning is through systematic or structured methods of data collection which allow me to focus attention on specific topics of interest. Such research contexts create opportunities for discovering new information relevant to my research goals, information that supports or challenges what I thought already understood, and/or information that allows me to assess agreement and variability across individuals. In addition, comments and reflections put forward by participants in such research contexts may provide the basis for further investigation, such as questions posed in later interviews. For example, in research exploring cultural understandings about illness in a Canadian Anishinaabe community, several individuals talked about illness attributed to *ondjine* in a relatively early and fairly informal illness "free list" interview and provided some case examples. These accounts and case examples, along with other cases I soon learned about, were consistently talked about in almost stereotypic or script-like ways - the explanation given was relatively consistent from person to person. It didn't take long, however, before I realized that the situation was considerably more complicated. Illness cases that didn't quite fit with my emerging interpretation really stood out and led to further discussions and analysis. My understanding of this common, but quite complex, attributional framework emerged rather slowly and incrementally. Learning how to ask was an important part of this process. The process also included listening to the conversations of others, relatively informal interviews and illness case histories but also through thinking long and hard about the case examples, thinking about what I had been told about *ondjine* in relation to other culturally available themes relevant to illness and other troubling experiences; and eventually coming up with an analysis that linked what appeared on the surface to be quite disparate explanations. Further, in time, I came to understand that almost everyone in the community shared the understanding that attributions of *ondjine* were made under a certain set of conditions. But those interviewed who rejected *ondjine* as a credible explanation of illness only talked about the prototypical set of conditions as did many of those who only spoke English. Those who regularly spoke *Anishinaabemowin* often gave the prototypical set of conditions as well, but other explanatory accounts of *ondjine* were also put forward. Toward the end of my fieldwork, I asked a

series of true-false questions, which I then analyzed using cultural consensus analysis, as a way of confirming my understanding of the cultural model. To this end, I purposefully selected a sample of individuals over 30 who spoke Anishinaabemowin and who did not reject *ondjine* as a possible explanation for illness.

I've gone into some detail with this example because I wouldn't want the type of research process I've described to fall outside the scope of whatever "standards of rigor" are taken to mean.

## REFERENCES

Agar, Michael H. 1996 *The Professional Stranger: An Informal Introduction to Ethnography*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, San Diego: Academic Press (first edition published in 1980).

D'Andrade, Roy 2005 (in press) Some methods for the study of cultural cognitive structure. In Quinn, Naomi (ed.) *Finding Culture in Talk: A Collection of Methods*. Palgrave MacMillan.

Spradley, James P. 1980 *Participant Observation*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Strauss, C. and N. Quinn 1997 *A Cognitive Theory of Cultural Meaning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.