The Sociological Quarterly ISSN 0038-0253

OF RHETORIC AND REPRESENTATION: The Four Faces of Ethnography

Patricia A. Adler*
University of Colorado

Peter Adler*
University of Denver

Influenced by the new literary movement and postmodernism, in the 1990s sociologists began to reflexively examine their writings as texts, looking critically at the way they shape reality and articulate their descriptions and conceptualizations. Advancing this thread, in our presidential address we offer an overarching analysis of ethnographic writing, identifying four current genres and deconstructing their rhetoric: classical, mainstream, postmodern, and public ethnography. We focus on the differences in their epistemological, organizational, locational, and stylistic self-presentations with an eye toward better understanding how these speak to their intended audiences, both within and outside of the discipline.

As an outgrowth of the merging of the humanities and the social sciences, the practice of identifying tropes within sociological genres grew in the 1980s. Influenced by literary criticism, ethnographers, in particular, became involved in a reflexive movement, directing their gaze at the process of how they construct and analyze their texts. This has been called the "linguistic turn" in ethnography.

Denzin and Lincoln (1994, 2000) have articulated several "moments" in this reflexive process, of which the three most influential were the "blurred genres" period (Geertz 1973, 1983) in which the social sciences turned to the humanities for models, theories, and methods of analysis; the "crisis of representation" (Clifford and Marcus 1986; Marcus and Fischer 1986; Clifford 1988; Geertz 1988; Van Maanen 1995) that deepened the reflexive thrust in research and writing and challenged the conventions of ethnographic realism; and the "crisis of legitimacy" (Atkinson 1990; Lincoln and Guba 1990; Hammersley 1992; Smith 1992) in which ethnographers called into question the link between experience and text. These movements questioned the authority and accuracy of sociological texts, challenging researchers and writers to examine their politics and rhetoric. Issues of representation sensitized ethnographers to multiple, possibly conflicting interpretations of reality and the problems of voice (Hertz 1997), especially as some people and the interpretations they offered might be privileged over others.

We focus in this Address on the linguistic turn in *ethnography* both because of our biographies and because these ideas have received their greatest foment in the ethnographic realm of our discipline. Vidich and Lyman (1994:25) have noted that ethnography means "the science devoted to describing ways of life of humankind." One of the

*Direct all correspondence to Patricia Adler and Peter Adler, 3975 Newport Lane, Boulder, CO 80304; e-mail: socyprof@hotmail.com

contributions of the linguistic turn has been to sensitize social scientists to the power of words. Without explicitly focusing on our words we may take them for granted, assuming that they are passive. Reconnecting to the power of words reminds us that the ties between the voice as signifier and the audience as signified are meaningful. It is time once again that we cast our attention on how we describe humankind to our various audiences, especially through our prose.

Ethnography's focus on representation has generated analyses of a variety of genres, examining how they stylistically shape their form and content. Van Maanen (1988) suggested that interpretive ethnography has been expressed as one of three types of tales: realist, impressionist, and confessional. Traditional, naturalist ethnography with its authorial omniscience comprised the first; confessional tales (what Geertz [1988:90] referred to as "the diary disease") represented attempts to reflexively expose those realist ethnographers' strategic choices and active constructions; and impressionist tales evolved as myriad alternative means to express ethnography through innovative approaches. In addition to these three, critical ethnographies drew attention to class structures and issues of inequality and sought to activate sociological consciousness into praxis (cf. Burawoy et al. 1991, 2000; Madison 2005), while feminist ethnographies highlighted the sexist language and practices and patriarchal features of culture and social structure that oppressed women, offering forms of resistance to the hegemonic order (cf. Stacey 1988; Smith 1992; Visweswaran 1994; Behar and Gordon 1996; Skeggs 2001; Lassiter 2005).

Van Maanen (2006) has more recently suggested that five templates (or temptations) characterize ethnography in the early 21st century, absorbing and integrating previous genres. Realism, he argues, continues to dominate the field with a belief system and representational practice that emphasizes "getting the news out," but integrates aspects of the confessional mode through heightened reflexivity. Historical ethnography, the least common, locates its descriptions in temporal anchors and addresses what some see as ethnography's Achilles' heel, atemporality. Critical studies take a larger structural view of macrotopics, with particular attention to the microfoundations of political economy. Poststructural ethnography builds on the impressionist tradition, emphasizing language above all to capture the fluidity of meanings, unstable identities, rapid transitions in society, liminality, and changes in our workplaces and social roles. Finally, advocacy ethnography challenges the existence of value-free neutrality and inserts normative values and morality throughout the text (not just in the conclusion).

Addressing sociological texts as literature sensitizes us to look beyond our scientific practice to see our constructions as an art form. It highlights the many ways we present our ideas and the effect of our rhetoric on the messages these convey. It transforms us from technical writers into artists who use a creative palette to carve out our observations and articulations. While some social scientists might ridicule those who reflect about the artistic nature of our enterprise, challenging it as a mere exercise in navel-gazing or a threat to the cachet of our discipline as social science,[1] we believe that examining the ways we borrow from the humanities only makes us a better science. It enables us to engage a broader panoply of methods, structures, and representations.

THE ART OF SOCIOLOGY

Although many have offhandedly noted the way sociological research mixes art and science (Gans 1962; Richardson 1990; Wolcott 1995; Gubrium and Holstein 1997; Gusfield 2000; Willis 2000), Nisbet (1976) was the first to offer a systematic consideration of sociology as an art form. He explored and historically documented the connections between art and sociology, inspired by the common themes and sources of inspiration that bind them. Ironically, he was energized to articulate these overlaps as a "prophylaxis" against scientism: "science with the spirit of discovery and creation left out" (p. 4). He noted that in both art and sociology, themes and styles progress in the context of times and places, with characteristic formal tendencies developing. These may become coercive in the way they direct the motivations and energies of individuals. Nisbet focused primarily on the themes around which classical sociological theory revolved and their relation to the history of ideas. We evoke the metaphor of sociology as art to address the stylistic issue.

Brown (1977) believed that sociology integrates science and art. These paradigms diverge as science emphasizes logical deductions, controlled research, objective truths, and explanatory proofs, and art invokes subjective symbols, feelings and meanings, and interpretations and insights. But they converge insofar as they pioneeringly create paradigms through which experience becomes intelligible. Their fusion, he believed, brings together the two principal ideals of scholarship and create what he terms a "poetic of sociology," the aesthetic view of sociological knowledge. Appreciating the aesthetic dimensions of sociological knowledge helps us to better understand that knowledge.

Analyses of the art, or poetic, of sociology are important, we believe, as by deconstructing our language we learn more about ourselves as a discipline and how to better reach our constituencies. This is especially true since mainstream sociology[2] is most often criticized for its arcane, antiseptic, and overly sophisticated and jargonized writing.

Although there have been several metagenre analyses, fewer analyses deconstruct the rhetoric of ethnographic writing. Brown's (1977) aesthetic analysis proposed several tropes, textual devices, metaphors, and root metaphors that sociologists use to construct and convey their arguments and insights. Edmondson (1984) focused on how texts persuade their readers, contrasting qualitative sociology with its more positivistic counterparts. Hammersley (1990) offered highly specific depictions of ethnography's major features, taking readers through the sections of such works and suggesting guidelines for assessing their validity and relevance. Atkinson (1990) took a more poetic approach, deconstructing the thematic rhetorical constructions and conventions through which ethnography is written. He followed this with a textual analysis of how ethnographic texts are represented, read, and received (Atkinson 1992). All of these have in common that they take as their subject the genre of traditional, realist ethnography.

Our work adds to this body of literature by delineating different genres of ethnographic representation and analyzing them as texts. No one has addressed these genres by the *audience* and *rhetorical strategies* employed in each. There are potentially numerous types of ethnographic genres, but for our purposes we identify and focus on the

deconstruction of four different representational forms or faces in which ethnographies are written: classical, mainstream, postmodern, and public.

We lay the foundation for our discussion by outlining the language and concerns of what we call classical ethnography. This embodies the realist genre in its most basic form, as it is written primarily for an audience conversant in qualitative research epistemology. Slightly different is its mainstream cousin, also a realist genre but varied in tone, format, and concerns by its desire to appeal to a generalist, hypothetico-deductive audience. From here we discuss the rejection of classical ethnography by the postmodern movement and how works in this genre invoked different representational concerns and issues. Finally, we broach the topic of public ethnography, a newer form that has its roots in more popularistic writing. Again, classical ethnography serves as the foil against which we define and illustrate the public counterpoint. We conclude by discussing the way the rhetorical differences of each face of ethnography attract different audiences and create divergent contributions, gaining some features at the expense of others, giving each a particular forte and shortcoming.

CLASSICAL ETHNOGRAPHY

Vidich and Lyman (1994) traced the history of ethnography to the 15th and 16th centuries, but the classical mode of ethnography is most strongly rooted in the Chicago School of the early 20th century, led by Burgess and Park and advanced by later generations of scholars such as Hughes and Blumer, Becker and Geer, Strauss, and others (Rock 1979, 2001; Platt 1983; Bulmer 1984; Kurtz 1984; Vidich and Lyman 1994; Fine 1995; Deegan 2001; Herman-Kinney and Verschaeve 2003; McCall 2006, to name just a few treatments of this topic). From there it further evolved into the California School, influenced by ethnomethodology, existential sociology, phenomenological sociology, and other interpretive branches of the Sociologies of Everyday Life (see Douglas et al. 1980; Vidich and Lyman 1985). Denzin (2006) suggested that the cohort of ethnographers that came of age after the Vietnam War represents a third Chicago School, influenced by such formations as standpoint epistemologies, feminist, queer, critical race, postcolonialist, and indigenous methodologies. The classical genre is most often published in the chief qualitative journals such as the *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, *Qualitative Sociology*, and *Symbolic Interaction*. Classical ethnography stands at the core of the genre, symbolizing the center of how interpretive sociology represents itself to its members. As such, it has evolved over the course of its history and continues to do so, yet it remains essentially rooted in the traditions forged during its early incarnation.

In general, ethnographic writing displays a prose style that is different from quantitative, critical, comparative-historical sociology or other genres. It stresses readability and accessibility. It tries not to overload readers with convoluted words. It tries to avoid long and excessively complex sentences with many prepositional phrases and dependent clauses. It generally takes an active rather than a passive voice. As Becker (1986, 1998) has noted, it is written simply and clearly in a way that is accessible to the intelligent lay

audience and is both engaging and fun to read. At the same time, it uses persuasive rhetoric. Through a variety of rhetorical conventions and devices, it seeks to convince readers that it offers a compelling and accurate empirical portrait of the people and setting(s) studied and a credible theoretical analysis of these findings.

The Introduction

Classical ethnographies begin by introducing either the empirical topic or the theoretical theme, usually the one with the greater audience appeal. An empirical example can be found in Jackson-Jacobs' (2004:835) opening: "Crack cocaine inspired fear in many Americans in the 1980s," a powerful sentence that captures readers' attention about a well-known social problem. Authors then establish the importance of their topic. Schulz and Lempert (2004:437) began their discussion of women's health professions by giving some sense of this issue's place and scope in society: "Persistent racial disparities in health are among the most pressing public health concerns of our time." Schweingruber (2006:41) located the value of his topic in its contribution to a body of literature: "Sociologists have a long-standing concern with the encroachment of capitalism on the selves of workers."

Theoretical beginnings may launch right away into a broad body of theory, such as in Tsushima and Burke's (1999:173) exposition of the parent identity: "Identity theory proposes that hierarchically organized feedback control processes continuously regulate the meanings which compose a given role-identity." Others introduce a specific concept, as Haenfler (2004:407) did in his paper on subcultural resistance in the straight edge movement: "Resistance has been a core theme among both subcultural participants and the scholars who study them."

Both the theoretical concept and the empirical topic must then be cast, separately, within their appropriate bodies of literature. Introductory literature reviews in the classical genre range from very short to moderate in length, although recently, longer treatments have been appearing as separate literature review sections. Briefer treatments tend to present only the topics that have been addressed and the sources or citations that have addressed them, without an extensive discussion of what has been said about them, such as we see in Robins, Sanders, and Cahill's (1991:3) article on animal–human interaction: "Studies have examined owners' attitudes toward their pets (Rowen 1984; Serpell 1986; Tuan 1984), changes in life-style resulting from pet ownership (Catanzaro 1984), resources and skills involved in pet ownership (Case 1987), pets' membership in human families (Hickrod and Schmitt 1982), owners' bereavement on the death of a pet (Quackenbush 1985), negative effects of pet ownership (Simon 1984), and the elderly's relations with pets (Bustad 1980)." Longer treatments briefly summarize the key aspects of the extant literature, but these rarely go beyond a couple of pages and are generally contained within the framework of the Introduction itself.

Literature reviews often end by pointing out a void in scholarly knowledge. This sets up authors to indicate how the contribution of their article will fill this void. In our piece (Adler and Adler 2005b:349) on the solitary aspects of self-injury, for instance, we noted, "These categories have been articulated in the literature on deviance, but they have not

been significantly engaged, empirically. It is our aim in this paper to examine the dimensions of how self-injurers' acts and associations are socially organized and structured."

Somewhere in the Introduction, authors briefly mention the sources of their data and the nature of the setting. The classical Introduction concludes with an overview of the paper that indicates, in a clear and active tone, what the paper discusses. Rarely do authors indicate, here, exactly what their findings or conclusions are; rather, they only say what they will talk about.

The authorial voice used in the Introduction is usually more formal and scholarly than other parts of the paper, less conversational in tone, and tighter in writing. It uses technical social science rhetoric, but to a lesser degree than what might be found in other types of sociology. This voice serves several functions: It ties the paper to an existing body of scholarly knowledge, the paper's place within it, and it displays the authors' ability to produce what academic audiences recognize as legitimate scholarship within the social scientific canon.

The Methods Section

Classical Methods sections often resemble Van Maanen's (1988) descriptions of confessional tales. They employ a highly personal rhetoric and tell the story of researchers' journeys through their settings, the people they met, and the relationships they forged. In contrast to the introductory overview, which usually employs the present tense, Methods sections are often written in the past tense, as their descriptions of what researchers encountered in the field and how they gathered their data are grounded in a specific time and place.

Lofland and Lofland (1995) noted that researchers employing the naturalistic fieldwork approach frequently "start where they are." In so saying, they acknowledge the frank link between fieldworkers' biographies and their research topics: People tend to pick topics that "opportunistically" (Riemer 1977) exploit their personal histories or situational locations. Researchers can decide later, they assert, how their settings will intersect (or not) with their disciplinary interests. Discussions of what Stewart (1998) called the "ethnographer's path" are important because they illuminate how researchers find their settings, how their relations with subjects develop and evolve, and how these lead to and influence the data gathering. This orientation immediately and unabashedly casts classical ethnography as a subjective methodology.

Authors generally raise subjectivity issues immediately, as Sheff (2005:256–7) did in her study of a polyamorous community, where people forged sexual and familial relationships that included more than two people: "Originally I approached the group not as a researcher but rather to investigate the potential impact of polyamory on my own relationship. My partner introduced the idea of the two of us engaging in a relationship with another woman shortly after we met in 1993. He imagined it would fulfill his life-long dream of forging an alternative family, and it fit me well because I identify as bisexual."

Classical ethnographies also represent subjectivity as critical to developing rapport with subjects. In Yount's (1991) study of women coal miners on Colorado's Western Slope, she noted that her family's long-term affiliations with mining helped her gain entrée and establish a base of commonality with workers. These Methods sections implicitly acknowledge that the shared understanding that researchers' subjectivity, position, history, entrée, and connections bring into the setting will provide a unique and positive vantage. As Douglas (1976) and we (Adler and Adler 1987) noted, claims to methodological authority are based on researchers being there, on their closeness and the depth insight that this produces, rather than on distance, detachment, or objectivity.

Readers then use such subjective disclosures to assess the validity of the data. For example, in DiIorio and Nusbaumer's (1993) study of abortion escorts, they discussed how as "complete member researchers" (Adler and Adler 1987) they shared the experiences, worldview, and goals of the people they studied. Over the course of months they socialized, commiserated, shook, screamed, and cried with the other escorts in the face of hostile and aggressive "Operation Rescue" abortion protesters. The feelings they held in common with their subjects enabled them to have a fuller and deeper understanding of the way escorts managed their own anger. Atkinson (1990) noted that by rhetorically using members' colloquialisms, situating themselves in the midst of the here-and-now action, and describing their first-person "shock of recognition" (Wiley 1987), authors not only establish their own credibility but bring readers into the midst of the action. Brown (1977) suggested that this authoritative stance fosters an authorial voice that conveys truthfulness.

After telling their story of gaining entrée, developing trust, and how they overcame obstacles to forging rapport, researchers typically describe the setting(s) and people they encountered, followed by a brief description of what data were gathered. In some cases the average length of the interviews, topics covered, and feelings established between researchers and participants is discussed. Studies that rely exclusively on in-depth interviews tend to have longer treatments of the demographic, biographical, or empathetic overlaps between researchers and their participants that validate claims to rapport. These discussions, again, take the active voice and display researchers' roles and presence in their settings. Where there is room, researchers may briefly discuss any epistemologically problematic issues that arose, so that readers can assess how these were handled, but because of space limitations in most journals, these are usually reserved for book-length methodological treatments.

Some Methods sections conclude with a discussion of data analysis, although many do not address this topic at all. This is usually couched in reference to classical analytical concepts such as triangulation (Denzin 1970) or cross-checking (Douglas 1976), inductive analysis (Becker and Geer 1960), the analysis of total patterns or subjects' collective belief systems (Wiseman 1970), and the principles (although not the actual practice) of grounded theory (Glaser and Strauss 1967), such as theoretical sampling and theoretical saturation. These brief references "bookmark" the thinking strategies of classical ethnographers but usually fall short of formal coding strategies.

The Data Section

Most Data sections are framed by a single type-A heading overarching the presentation of the empirical material that comprises the heart of the work. These headings present the paper's empirical theme and are similar to the article's title. Thus, for example, the Data section heading of Leyser's (2003) study of *Doing Masculinity in a Mental Hospital* is "Gendered Life at Marion Center." Eder's (1985) study of *The Cycle of Popularity: Interpersonal Relations among Female Adolescents* employed "The Development of a Stratification System" to head its Data section. Our article (Adler, Kless, and Adler 1992) on *Socialization to Gender Roles* used two A-level headings, "Boys' Popularity Variables" and "Girls' Popularity Variables," to organize the Data section.

Although some analysts of ethnographic rhetoric (Atkinson 1990) advise using the "ethnographic present" tense, in our view this has rhetorical drawbacks. While it may simplify decisions about writing, it sometimes reads like an artificial contrivance. Research is done at a specific point in time, analyzed and written at another time, submitted for publication later, and appears in print after that. Given that readers may encounter the work even later than that, by this time, the descriptions of people and places found in the Data section are likely to be historically dated. Many authors, then, use the past tense for both empirical descriptions as well as discussions of what previous people have written in the literature.

Beyond headings and subheadings, the meat of the Data section follows a progression that repeats itself, beginning with the presentation of a specific concept and its elaboration or explanations. Examining our study of self-injurers as loners (Adler and Adler 2005b:357), we introduced the dimension of Social Isolation and articulated its meaning by writing, "Part of the reason they stayed to themselves was that they viewed their behavior as private, not to be shared with others." These definitions are then followed by examples or illustrations. In illustrations, researchers rhetorically employ quotes from their subjects to apply the concept, such as, "Dana noted that, 'When I get hurt like that, I get really self-involved. I get my blinders on, I'm all about me, and don't disturb me' " (p. 358). With examples, researchers use their own words to offer specific empirical descriptions of the concept, such as, "Janice flunked gym class in high school, and endured the ignorant jeers of her classmates for it, because she refused to put on the shorts required to participate in physical education activities, fearing that people would see her scars" (p. 359).

This alternation of statement and description uses code switching between different authorial voices in the text, what Churchill (2005) refers to as the simultaneous mastery of multiple dialects, to convey whether the writing is statement, explication, description, illustration, generic comment, or analysis. Atkinson (1990) noted that the textual shift between the generic voice of the sociologist and the illustration voice of the actors in the social scene constitutes a tension between exemplar and exposition and forges a complementary relationship between the multiple voices in the text.

One of the hallmarks of classical ethnographic writing is the simple, direct style of presentation that is personal, storied, and close to ordinary speech. Data sections use this narrative form, a literary genre, to rhetorically enhance the reality effect. Although they

are not overly laden with references to the researchers' presence,[3] they convey a vivid, rich, thick (Geertz 1988) description that captures the sights, smells, and sounds of the settings and activities as members experience them. Quotations from subjects are introduced in a personal and descriptive way. For example, Sheff (2005:260) framed the comments of one of her polyamorous subjects by writing, "Yansa, a twenty-nine-year-old African American health care provider and stepmother of one, related her reasons for agreeing to monogamous relationships even though she knew she desired multiple partners."

The use of citations within the text to empirical studies incorporates what Atkinson (1990:44) referred to as the "invisible college," contrasting or reinforcing the work of others and rhetorically enhancing authors' scholarly credentials by lodging their writing within the extant literature. For example, in discussing the residential mobility of college crack users, Jackson-Jacobs (2004:845) wrote, "As nice-looking white college students looking for housing in a student neighborhood, they did not face the type of discrimination frequently experienced by black renters, especially poor black renters (Massey and Denton 1993; Yinger 1995)."

Throughout, while Fine (1999) noted that the core of the classical ethnographic genre revolves around the use of extensive, persuasive, high-quality descriptive data, Atkinson (1990) suggested that the *vraisemblance* of a text, its empirical plausibility, and its correspondence to depictions advanced by other written accounts, heightens readers' sense that the research is grounded in reality. These foster the *verisimilitude* or credibility of classical ethnographic texts, giving them enhanced resonance and increasing their claims to validity and reliability. They are critical components of the conventions by which ethnographically driven data are recognized and interpreted as having realism and catapulting the subjective lens to advantage.

The Conclusion

Conclusion sections begin with a review of the material that has just been presented. This review differs from both the overview in the Introduction and the empirical presentation in the Data section; it pulls out the generic aspects of the data that are the most germane to what lies ahead, laying the groundwork for the further discussion that will follow. Here, authors tell readers what significance they should extract from what they have just read. The Conclusion in Copes and Hochstetler's (2003:298–99) analysis of male street thieves' construction of masculinity began by noting, "Offenders' views of what it means to be a man influence actions within a context that leaves few outlets available." They then overviewed the limitations their subjects had in establishing their masculinity via traditional means and how this led them, within the framework of their culture, to seek the alternative means discussed.

In the Conclusion, authors make what Churchill (2005:19) called the third level of translation, that from the ethnographer to the reader, as they bring "an interpretive perspective that could illuminate more than what a simple verbatim transcript would" to the data they analyze. Schutz (1967) referred to this as moving from the "natural attitude" of the everyday-life participant to the "theoretical stance" of the analyst.

Building on the conceptual organization of the empirical material found in the Data section, authors forge theoretical models and apply them to theoretical literature, comparing them to other models of human nature, human behavior, human social interaction, or human social organization. Monahan, Marolla, and Bromley's (2005:313) discussion of the social organization of sexual assault told readers that "The cases reported on here have at least three implications for a more general understanding of rape." Copes and Hochstetler's (2003:300) article on male thieves noted, "One aim of this article was to contribute to the theoretical understanding of criminal decision making." Conclusions advance generic social scientific knowledge by adding to, going beyond, contradicting, refuting, advancing, and/or modifying existing theoretical understandings. This return to the scholarly mien is marked by a voice shift from the storied back to the more formal mode. Conclusions talk to Introduction sections by addressing literature that has been initially raised up-front and using the same rhetorical personae.

A noteworthy difference between ethnographic and other genres lies in the theoretical reach of its grasp. At their best, these authors do not make small and measured statements, but rather employ the rhetoric of the context of discovery to generate new ideas, concepts, and theory. In Coles's (2002:432) article on black single fathers, she explicitly rejected the mainstream notion that small, nonprobability, or qualitative data must be considered tentative and exploratory by writing, "While this sample size is neither random nor large enough from which to generalize, the goal of qualitative research is to capture the complex assumptions, meanings, and motivations that guide the decision-making process. The intent of this study was not to test theory but rather to build theory from the ground up, explore new territory in the growing field of fatherhood, give voice to a previously unheard from group of fathers, and provide a sense of how they choose to parent." Thus, the goal is to find universalistic, far-reaching conclusions that move readers well beyond the particularistic features of a specific empirical study.

MAINSTREAM ETHNOGRAPHY

Although classical ethnographies are written to appeal primarily to qualitative researchers, mainstream ethnographies seek a broader audience of social scientists. They are intended to reach readers of such generalist journals as those published by regional and national associations (*The Sociological Quarterly*, *American Sociological Review*, *American Journal of Sociology*, *Social Problems*, *Sociological Perspectives*), and to some of the leading journals in each subfield (*Administrative Science Quarterly*, *Sociology of Education*, *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *Criminology*, etc.).[4]

To accomplish this goal, they must meet the standards of mainstream reviewers and editors who are often unfamiliar with the epistemology of qualitative/interpretive sociology and likely to apply a hypothetico-deductive and objectivist lens in evaluating the work. Mainstream ethnographies build on but differ from classical ethnographies in notable ways, often requiring a different rhetoric. Like classical ethnographies, they

represent the realist genre, as both attempt to portray the "truth" of the world by gathering in-depth, firsthand, naturalistic data that incorporate the subjects' perspectives and to weave various (often competing or conflicting) perspectives into one presentation where each has its place, but are framed within a coherent narrative of authorial authority. We focus here, primarily, on their differences.

The Introduction

Like mainstream social science, mainstream ethnographies have a tighter, stiffer, more formal voice. The emphasis on accessibility is replaced by a more abstruse canon.

Mainstream Introduction sections more commonly define their terms. Hunt and Manning (1991:52) offered an empirical definition: "Following the earlier work of Manning (1974), we define lies as speech acts which the speaker knows are misleading or false, and are intended to deceive." Fine and Holyfield (1996:22) began with a conceptual definition: "Although cohesion has numerous definitions, the standard views suggest that cohesion constitutes those forces which cause members to remain within a group (Festinger, Schachter, and Back 1950:164; Piper et al. 1983) and/or to resist centrifugal forces (Brawley, Carron, and Widmeyer 1988; Gross and Martin 1952:553)."

Not only does the need to define their terms lengthen mainstream Introductions, but they also require a significantly different type of literature review. Here, authors not only indicate who has discussed aspects of each topic, but they also elaborate on what has been said about the topic. These literature reviews are often divided into multiple subsections and may include topics not addressed later in the paper.[5] In Eder and Parker's (1987) article on the way extracurricular activities affect gendered high school peer group culture, their Introduction has several distinct and lengthy literature reviews. The initial section addressed the reproduction of culture in schools, the cultural production and reproduction of gender, gender socialization in schools, gender socialization in extracurricular activities, how gender stratification emerges in (elementary, middle, and high) schools, and the role of sport in socialization to masculinity. A second distinct literature section entitled "Gender Relations and Values" examined girls' and boys' socialization to adult roles (separately), values embedded in adult occupational roles, roles that are important to adult cultural entertainment (by gender), and the tendency for boys to actively participate in sports while girls stand on the side leading cheers.

Beyond laying a large foundation of information, extensive literature reviews rhetorically imply that knowledge advances in a clean, linear progression, building on prior scholarly contributions. As such, they mimic the hypothetico-deductive model, where research questions purport to derive from an extant body of literature, giving mainstream ethnographies the feel of the "context of verification."

Such discussions are also used to indicate voids in the literature in a way that gives the appearance that the current research was explicitly conducted subsequent to the discovery of these lacunas. Thus, after defining cohesion and reviewing the literature about it, Fine and Holyfield (1996:23) noted that, "To explore the production of

cohesion, we focus on voluntary organizations." Since we noted earlier that most ethnographic work is inductive in its approach, developing conceptual themes only after researchers are enmeshed in their empirical settings, this rhetorically casts what Kaplan (1964) calls "reconstructed logic" as "logic-in-use." Such persuasive rhetoric is likely to make mainstream gatekeepers feel much more comfortable; indeed, they often demand it.

Finally, mainstream Introductions are more likely to state "research questions" that will be addressed in the paper and to offer a greater foregrounding of the paper's empirical and theoretical content in the introductory overview.

The Methods Section

Careful elaboration is often needed in mainstream ethnographies to justify the use of qualitative methods and to explain their epistemological bases. In Sackmann's (1992:143) study of the influence of organizational subcultures on the production of knowledge, she legitimated her use of qualitative research by writing, "Rather than hypothesizing about subcultures and their locations a priori, an inductive research methodology was chosen so that unknown groupings could emerge." Roth's (2004:616) study of client gender preferences for stockbrokers validated her small sample of 76 Wall Street financial professionals by saying that although it is "not large compared to quantitative studies, it is substantial for an in-depth interview study of this type."

Seeking to strengthen their claims to validity and reliability, mainstream ethnographers cast their studies in a more objective light. Gone are the discussions of researchers' personal connections to their topics, subjects, and settings; these are negatively interpreted by mainstream audiences as fodder for insurmountable bias. In Kinney's (1993:25) middle-school study of how adolescents escape nerdy identities, he discussed how he distanced himself from affiliation with any special group of youth: "I attempted to carve out a neutral identity for myself at the school by making and maintaining connections with students in a wide variety of peer groups and by being open to their different viewpoints." Sometimes researchers objectify (and rhetorically distance) themselves by referring to themselves in the third person ("the senior author"), as in Hunt and Manning's (1991) piece. Even more common is the use of the passive voice, such as we see throughout Sackmann's (1992:143) study: "The methodology combined four components. . . . " "An emerging hypothesis about cultural groupings was further examined. . . . " "A mid-range methodology was developed. . . . " The passive voice obviates reference to the researchers, rhetorically creating the sense that the data were gathered without any contamination by the taint of human subjectivity.

Mainstream ethnographies often lay out a research design that is planned rather than inductive and emergent, and provide a legitimation for this plan. In Sackmann's (1992) research she chose three different sites of a corporation for her study: the headquarters and two divisions. Thomas's (1993) research on racial dynamics in mentor–protégé relationships incorporated a pilot study before moving to the full-blown organizational study. Sackmann used pilot interviews as well. These strategies

mimic the exploratory feature of survey design and the constructing and pretesting of survey questionnaires.

Other features may strive to eliminate subjectivity. Roth (2004) used a cohort study design to control for important human capital variables, market conditions, and organizational prestige. Thomas sought to overcome the potentially subjective bias of his being an African-American male of junior rank in his data gathering on cross-racial mentoring by engaging two senior white male colleagues in his field as sponsors, meeting regularly with them to debrief, to discuss his observations and feelings about the interviews, and to gain their assistance in understanding his relationships with informants. More extensive use of grounded theory's (Glaser and Strauss 1967; Strauss and Corbin 1998) research design are often incorporated here, as mainstream audiences are familiar with this work, its formal rationality placing it at the positivistic end of the qualitative spectrum, such as we see in the theoretical sampling and "multiple operationism" (Webb et al. 1981) used by Flaherty's (1991:77) article on perceptions of time and engrossment.

Formal techniques are also preferred by mainstream journals for data analysis. Thomas (1993) hired a detached, objective outsider to code his data independently so that he could compare his interpretations with that person's and attain intercoder-reliability. He then subjected his data to three phases of analysis, each building on the previous findings to generate a more intricate model of mentor–protégé relationships. Sackmann (1992) conducted two thematic content analyses, individual and group, and used 10 final interviews to validate theoretically emerged themes. Flaherty (1999) used analytic induction to generate a universal theoretical model. Charmaz's (2006) more recent iteration of grounded theory suggested that researchers can preclude forcing their subjective preconceptions on their data through the use of initial coding, focused coding, axial coding, and theoretical coding, thus fostering objective validity and reliability.

Cress and Snow's (1996) study of homeless mobilization used Ragin's (1987) qualitative comparative analysis, based on the logic and techniques of Boolean algebra, to identify the multiple and conjectural causes of events, thereby identifying their necessary and sufficient conditions. Richards and Richards (1994) explained how researchers can use a variety of computer programs, complete with index systems of interlinked nodes and trees that construct and test theoretical models, to move qualitative analysis into the context of verification. By speaking to the language and concerns of the hypothetico-deductive audience, as opposed to the more Gestalt, impressionistic accounts of the classicists, these measures cleanse the data and assuage mainstream readers' fears of ethnographic subjectivity.

The Data and Conclusion Sections

Fewer differences are usually found between the Data and Conclusion sections of mainstream ethnographies and their classical counterparts. One notable departure involves the greater likelihood for mainstream articles to use A-level headings entitled "Results" or "Findings" overarching their data sections, a definite harkening to a more positivistic style. They may also, guided by reviewers' and editors' requests, follow these headings

with a preview of the conceptual model of the data to be presented, such as what we did in our paper on organizational loyalty in college basketball teams (Adler and Adler 1988), where we elaborated the five components of our data section framework in its opening paragraphs.

Consistent with the types of analytical procedures described above, mainstream ethnographies are more likely to contain if–then propositional logic, tables, and numbers. Cress and Snow's (1996) paper contains eight tables comparing the resources, organizational fields, resource paths, benefactor relationship, and militancy among homeless social movement organizations. Thomas (1993) offered tables and figures, with one especially elaborate model intricately outlining outcomes of the way African Americans' and whites' complementary versus contradictory preferences for denial and suppression of direct engagement about sensitive issues affect the outcomes of their relationships.

Notably, there is hardly any location of researchers' selves within the text and significantly less detailed presentation of subjects. The introduction of quotes is generic and impersonal. Thomas referred to his speakers by their race and status as either a mentor or a protégé without even a pseudonym to identify them individually. Sackmann offered even less, just attributing remarks to "individual employees" or "one of the informants." This more formal detachment from the narrative voice and the identities of subjects fosters a sense of what Atkinson (1990) referred to as authorial omniscience.

Moving to the end of the paper, mainstream ethnographies are more likely to either have separate Discussion and Conclusion sections (as we see in Sackmann [1992] and in Tsushima and Burke's [1999] paper on the parent identity) or to call their final section something such as Discussion and Conclusions (Thomas 1993) or Discussion and Implications (Cress and Snow 1996). Separated Discussion sections focus more exclusively on empirical trends and patterns, leaving the more theoretical analyses for the Conclusions.

POSTMODERN ETHNOGRAPHY

Just as classical ethnography rejected the positivism of its mainstream counterpart, postmodern ethnography critiqued the classical genre as postpositivistic. Emerging in the 1980s and gaining momentum in the 1990s, postmodern ethnography brought a greater consciousness and reflexivity to researchers' roles in the field, the rhetorical construction of their texts, issues of power and authority, and critiques of the concepts of validity and reliability. It took many experimental shapes and forms, crosscut several disciplines, appeared in scholarly books and articles, and branched out into other media. Although it blossomed early within the confines of classical ethnographic outlets, it rapidly created its own forums in new, specialized journals. Postmodern ethnography can be found in such outlets as *Qualitative Inquiry*, *Cultural Studies*, *Critical Methodologies*, *Studies in Symbolic Interaction*, *Qualitative Social Research* (an online journal), and to a lesser extent, *Qualitative Health Research*, *Qualitative Social Work: Research and Practice*, *Ethnography*, and *Field Work*. Although more varied than its classical

and mainstream counterparts, several concerns framed the challenges raised by postmodern ethnography and the way it forged itself against these foils (see Ellis and Bochner 1996; Richardson 1997; Goodall 2000; Lather 2001; Bochner and Ellis 2002).

Significantly more radical than its predecessors, postmodern ethnography advocated a stronger rejection of mainstream ethnography's focus on objectivity and its bases of appeal for validity and reliability. It rejected notions of authority and legitimacy, replacing them with the belief that there is no fixed or single standard for ethnography. Postmodernists rejected traditional ethnographic standards as parochial, narrow, and silly, citing them as destructive, limiting, and restrictive. Although Bochner (1999) rejected criteria in general as constructions of the structures that create them, Richardson (1999) suggested forging a set of criteria for the new millennium by which to evaluate postmodern ethnographic work: substantive (empirical) contribution, aesthetic merit, reflexivity, impact (on the audience), and credibility of the lived expression of reality. In this way, she advocates an integration of analytical science with the creative arts.

Rhetorically, the use of the narrative form reaches its apex here, with more unexpurgated use of storytelling and less constraint by traditional authorial frameworks and voices. Ellis and Bochner (2006) have argued that compared to the theoretically oriented analytical prose of classical ethnography, narrative stories are colloquially written and composed of a plot, a moral, and a point. Ronai's (1995:395) paper on her experiences of incest begins by dramatically setting the scene:

> If I hid from him well, like in the tangles of the sheets and blankets of the unmade bed, careful to hide the outline of my body, and stayed hidden long enough, he might forget the whole idea. When he caught me, or when I cooperated, he would remove my panties and place me on the bed, my bottom propped up on a pillow. He would part my legs, forcefully if necessary, while holding me down. Placing his head between them, his whiskered face scratched raw places on my inner thighs. His entire mouth covered my small vulva as he rhythmically licked and sucked. His brown eyes peered from beneath wavy brown-black hair, intent on my every reaction. These are my earliest memories of my father.

Here, the narrative authorial voice is interwoven into the text with other voices in a manner different from the classical genre. Rather than being surrounded by propositions, descriptions, and analyses, it may be brusquely interrupted by other juxtaposed voices. Freeman's (1992:479–80) discussion of the perfect valentine blends present, past, and future, reality and imagination, self and other:

> The perfect valentine . . . I select a book, leather-bound of course (he'll think I have good taste) . . . I bind myself, the valentine, with ribbon and hide it in my purse . . . I leave the "perfect valentine" on his bedside table. I leave myself on the bedside table. . . .
>
> He fantasizes about me as he already knows me and as he wishes he could know me but is too afraid to ask me. And in that merging of valentine and fantasy, a magical reality is born in which his mute lover is given voice, his voice.

> I scream in terror as he rapes me, scream in pleasure as he satisfies me, tremble in fear as he binds me hand and foot, tremble in shame as he whips me . . . the phone rings, shattering his magical realism and momentarily silencing my space of death (a space in which I died and was reborn in his image.)
>
> Hi, this is Jennifer. I just wanted to tell you how special last night was, and to ask you if you got my valentine.

These layers of voice are reflectively shifted and interposed to dramatically create the three Jennifers (the one in the valentine present, the one between the sheets, and the one in his imagination) that Freeman interweaves in her fragmentary first-person impressionistic tale. Not only does she tell readers that she "was there," but she rhetorically brings readers right "there" with her, making us ponder about ourselves, our interactions, our language.

Other explorations of voice include Ronai's (1995) use of a multilayered, multitemporal, poly-vocal approach, shifting between the first-person accounts of her victimized childhood experiences, her detached and objective exposition of the literature, her first-person reflections from the past on her childhood self's thoughts, the third-person voice through which she objectifies her childhood self in the past, and her first-person present-day ethnographic analyst's voice, tying them all together. Yet the paper has no linear structure; it flows between these voices, tenses, and stances unpredictably. In Krieger's (1983) ethnography of a women's community she absented the authorial voice completely, rhetorically manipulating the remarks of her subjects so that they fit together into a text, without the conscious feel of her framing and interpretation. Readers are left to figure out throughout the text where the action takes place and between whom it occurs. Laffan (1997) experimented with voice by splitting his chapters into two sections: an account of the action central to the chapter and an analysis that stands on its own apart from the action described.

Throughout, postmodern ethnography encompasses a greater reflexivity and subjectivity. Authors explore the boundaries of self-awareness and self-exposure, but do so throughout the text as opposed to merely in Methods sections. For example, Karp's (1996) book on depression, in part, is subjective, experiential, and person centered. As someone who suffered from depression throughout his life, he shared many of his subjects' experiences with anxiety, medication, therapists, and support groups. Some of the different ways he cast himself within the text include, "Karen was willing to be interviewed because I was one of those who knew about her history with depression" (p. 50), "My comments thus far suggest some of my deep reservations about the overuse of antidepressant medications" (p. 81), or "As I often did during interviews, I used my own experience to ask a question or generate a response. For example, when individuals first expressed the feeling that they were stuck with the depression, I offered that for me depression is akin to being tied to a chair with restraints on my wrists" (p. 124).

Other postmodern ethnographies go beyond situating the author in the text to treating the author's perceptions as the primary source of data. In Krieger's (1996) reflective essays about her life experiences as a woman, a lesbian, and a teacher, each essay has three levels of discussion: She starts by describing specific experiences, embeds

within these some reflections about her present and past life evoked by these experiences, and further embeds insights about gender as they naturally flow out of her activities and reflections. She is the principal subject of each essay, especially her internal emotional life, giving the book an intimacy unusual in academic discourse. Rothman (2005:B10), discussing her writing about the birth of her son, suggested that sociologists have increasingly turned their optical lens on their own lives and feelings, sliding "back and forth between memoir and sociology, treading recklessly close to what a colleague calls 'me-search.'"

Another convention embraced by postmodern ethnography is standpoint epistemology (Collins 1991; Clough 1993, 1994), adopted from the critical, feminist approach, which questions the perspective of traditional social science as patriarchal. By presenting the world through the lens of the subjective knower (the researcher) in a political, race/class/gender way, standpoint epistemology challenges the masculine perspective that presumes a universal sociological subject: the white male. Denzin and Lincoln (2000) consider this "proliferation of interpretive epistemologies grounded in the lived experiences of previously excluded groups in the global, postmodern world" (Denzin 1997:53) part of ethnography's sixth moment.

Collins (1991) offered us a text grounded in the black woman's standpoint that captures the "outsider within" status by examining the representations standing at the core of black women's lived experiences in late 20th-century America through the perspective of the voices, images, sayings, songs, fictions, and autobiographies of black bloodmothers, othermothers, and sisters. Trinh (1989, 1991, 1992) augmented Collins's work but also challenged it with the ephemerality of her plural feminist, Asian-American, African-American standpoint. She crossed global borders as well as the "insider–outsider position" by connecting the subjectivity of personal expressions of the self to the systems of difference and domination that objectify individuals. In so doing, she deconstructed such terms as reality, realism, lived experience, and, ultimately, the self. Finally, Anzaldúa (1987) wrote from the standpoint of triple or quadruple oppression as a woman and lesbian of color, intermingling the white, Mexican, and Indian cultures. Her work plumbs the depths of her demons, peering visually into the inner life of her self as she inhabits the borderlands of these interstices.

Adapting literary criticism further, postmodernists engage in the deconstruction of texts. Clough (1992) described this as the application of poststructuralist thought to the empirical social sciences. Her métier involves the deconstruction of written texts, in which she applies a perspective other than the one from which a given text was written to analyze its frame and content. For example, she unpacked the realist narrative that informs (classical) ethnography's claim to authority as grounded in an oedipal logic of unconscious identifications, screening the projections and displacement of writers' desires with visions that substitute for their real desires.

Others deconstruct cultural texts, such as films. Denzin (1993) went beyond the story of Raymond and Charlie, the high-pressure auto salesman and his newly discovered autistic savant brother in the movie *Rain Man*, to challenge the myth of Las Vegas as a city of fateful action in which Baudrillard's simulacra of the postmodern self is

contained and controlled. He argued that as Charlie unravels this slick, neon version of the postmodern self, he connects to his deep, nonmutable, interior, expressive self, exposing the limits of the overly rational, intellectualized, existentially marginalized self embodied in the simulacra.

Finally, some use the self as text, solipsistically deconstructing it in search of the structures of inner meaning that may (or may not) be generalized to larger frameworks. Such discursive reflexivity may focus either interpretively on the content of what is known or structurally on the frame of knowing. Although the term autoethnography was originally used in classical ethnography to refer to the study of one's own people (see Hayano 1979), postmodern self-as-text autoethnographies (what Anderson [2006] refers to as "evocative autoethnography") focus inward to the study of one's own self (see Ellis and Bochner 2006). Anzaldúa's (1987) poetry about herself as a borderland would fall into this category, as would Ellis's (1998) deconstruction of her lisp to illustrate how people come to terms with minor bodily stigma and Denzin's (1999) writings about how people (based on his wife and himself) perform nature, tourism, history, and the American West in Montana. These analyses verge close to ethnomethodology in their close reading of the accomplishment of everyday life.

Finally, postmodern ethnography is notable for branching out into a variety of alternate presentational genres. Writing about the broad range of what she calls Creative Analytical Practice, Richardson (1999:660) heralded the spread of ethnography into such forms as "autoethnography, poetry, drama, conversation, new journalism, readers' theater, performance, hypertext, fiction, faction, creative nonfiction, true fiction, aphorisms, comedy, satire, layered texts, writing stories, songs, museum installations, photographs, body painting, choreography, and so forth." In Richardson's (1992:128–29) poem of Louisa Mae's Story of Her Life, she took a series of interviews with her subject and transformed them, using Louisa Mae's own words, into a poem of her devising. Ellis and Bochner (1992:83) took notes and used sociological introspection (Ellis 1991) to write their intersecting narratives of their abortion experience, which they pieced together into a performed play:

> **Scene 2: Making the Decision**
>
> (TED AND ALICE TURN TOWARD EACH OTHER)
>
> Ted: When I ask Alice, "What are you going to do?" I think I already know the answer.
>
> Alice: "I don't know. I've called an abortion clinic, and I have a call in to my gynecologist. I'm only gathering information. But I guess I want to have an abortion."
>
> (ALICE TURNS AWAY; TED TURNS TOWARD AUDIENCE)
>
> Ted: I am surprised at how quickly she has acted to set an abortion in motion.

While many of these forms may be reproduced in written text, others cannot, and require immediate copresence to see, feel, touch, or hear, or else they evaporate temporally.

As a genre, postmodern ethnographies do not necessarily contain the clear components found in their classical or mainstream counterparts. Introductions and Methods sections may or may not exist. The rigorous data gathering marking these genres may also be absent. Methodological reflections are often intermingled into the text or raised

to the level of data. There may be some framing in the beginning and end, interspersed throughout the work, or none at all.

PUBLIC ETHNOGRAPHY

Although popularistically oriented (or "pop") ethnography has been around for decades, it was not until the late 20th century that it rose in prevalence and coalesced into the acknowledged genre of public ethnography. This format seeks to bring the findings and analyses of sociology to the intelligent lay reader.

In his American Sociological Association (ASA) Presidential Address, Burawoy (2005a) championed the broader arena of public sociology. Sociology moved left and the world moved right, he claimed, and called for greater attention to bridge these two. Sociologists need to engage extra-academic audiences to bring them knowledge and offer critical insights about social trends and conditions, and to imply policy without being so engaged by values that they overly politicize and discredit the discipline. Public sociology, what he calls "third wave sociology" (Burawoy 2005b), can reach the extra-academic audience, people beyond the academy engaged in a conversation about society, by being reflexive, relevant, and accessible. Burawoy's call was well received in the discipline and has been referred to by some as the *zeitgeist* of the early 21st century (Nichols 2005).

Ethnography is one of the métiers most suited to perform this task, we believe, because of the close relationship between the research and the writing style of ethnography and journalism. Moreover, rather than testing narrow hypotheses, ethnography has the potential to address issues of great public significance. Works that fall into this borderland between ethnography and journalism, representing examples of public ethnography or sociologically informed journalism, include Reisman's (1950) *The Lonely Crowd*, Terkel's (1972) *Working*, Hochschild's (1983) *The Managed Heart*, Bellah et al.'s (1985) *Habits of the Heart*, Bourgois' (1995) *In Search of Respect*, Anderson's (1999) *Code of the Street*, Duneier's (1999) *Sidewalk*, and Ehrenreich's (2001) *Nickel and Dimed*. These have not only appealed to a crossover audience, but won academic recognition as well.

Public ethnography is often more suited for books than articles and may not fit the format of scholarly journals. Shorter works appear in the op-ed pages of national newspapers, intellectual magazines (*The Atlantic Monthly*, *The Public Interest*, *The NY Times Magazine*, *The American Prospect*, *The New Republic*, *The Nation*), and in the ASA journal *Contexts*, the public face of professional sociology.

Book-length works of public ethnography usually do have something approximating chapters of Introduction, Methods, Data, and Conclusions, yet these differ from all of the three genres already discussed. Introductory chapters usually situate the authors and key people in their settings, drawing readers into these scenes with their visual maps, photographs, and rich descriptions. For example, Duneier (1999) worked with a photojournalist who took pictures of his setting and people, incorporating 92 of these into his book. The first chapter is usually where issues of method and theoretical framing are presented as well.

In his Preface, Anderson (1999) noted that his book addresses the theme of interpersonal violence, particularly among inner-city youths. Duneier mentioned Jacobs's (1961) concept of "broken windows" and the role of public characters in keeping things fixed and maintaining urban civility. Bourgois' (1995) theoretical agenda is more ambitious, raising issues of the relationship between culture and economy, between individual responsibility and structural constraints, and between men and women in the context of changing family values. But in all of these works, theoretical concepts are explained in a folksy way so that ordinary people can understand them and all references are banished from the text to footnotes.

Discussions of methods are short and informal, also absent of literature, with longer methodological treatments or citations relegated to footnotes or appendices. For example, Anderson covered his epistemological issues in the Preface with one paragraph, a reference to his earlier book, and one footnote. All authors earnestly indicate their own presence in the setting, using this to establish their strong claim to methodological integrity and empirical authority. Bourgois moved into Spanish Harlem with his Costa Rican wife and they raised their child there, noting in his Acknowledgments that these were important methodological assists. Fluent in Spanish, he spent hundreds of nights on the streets and in crack houses observing dealers and addicts. He was intricately enmeshed into the lives and relationships, family events, tragedies, and celebrations of his community. Duneier spent significant parts of three summers, one fall, and one school break living in New York, during which he hung out and worked the sidewalk book stands with his subjects. Anderson is a recognized and well-respected member of the Philadelphia African-American community, comfortable in the spectrum of all social classes.

Data chapters may follow either analytical or strictly empirical organizations, with foci either on concepts such as "Campaigning for Respect" (Anderson) and "Redrawing the Gender Line on the Streets" (Bourgois), or factual issues such as "John Turner's story" (Anderson) and "A Christmas on Sixth Avenue" (Duneier).

Rhetorically, these all employ a naturalistic tone that is highly concerned with describing and articulating a place and the people there and with expressing some empirical reality. In describing Germantown Avenue, Anderson (1999:29) noted:

> The streets are noisy and very much alive with sociability—yells, screams, loud laughter and talk, car screeches, rap music, and honking horns. A car pulls up and honks its horn for a passenger. . . . Everybody knows everybody here, and as best they can, some people try to watch out for others.

This style of writing is novelistic, with rich descriptions not only of behavior but also of nonverbal framings. Bourgois (1995:233) conveyed the sensation of his subjects' body language, demeanor, and emotions throughout his text with such conversational passages as:

> *Primo:* And I got mad {making exaggerated whole-body wrestling motions}, and I grabbed her by the neck, and I threw her to the sofa. {pounding fist to palm} BOOM . . . and I WHAAAAAM, POOOM {pounding again}, smacked her in the face with all my might.

But the bitch laughed. I hit her like hard, man! Hard man! Hard!

Caesar: {jumping up} Ooh, she laughed. I like that! (ellipses in original)

Extremely long quotes are common, often lasting for pages and pages. Rarely found in mainstream or classical ethnographies, these verbatim accounts not only tell the story in participants' words and entice members of the audience to care about them as people; this word-for-word quoting makes the reading enjoyably light and fun and, like postmodern ethnography, brings readers into the scene. Anderson (1999:54–63), for instance, used a 10-page-straight verbatim quote to tell Yvette's story. Duneier and Bourgois included pages on end of a naturally occurring conversation between subjects.

Such transcription would not be possible using the kinds of data-collection techniques usually employed by other ethnographers. While mainstream ethnographers' primary tool is in-depth interviews, classical ethnographers usually supplement this with participant observation, and postmodern ethnographers add to or replace these with systematic self-introspection, public ethnographers regularly bring their recorders to their settings and leave them running for much of the time. As a result, they convey the interaction between the participants more directly and with less (apparent) mediation by their authorial voice. Yet Churchill (2005) reminded us that authorial translation must still occur in decisions about what to write and include.

Introducing tape and digital recorders into everyday settings beyond planned interviews requires some adaptation and adjustment by setting members. Duneier (1999) wrote that he brought his recorder to the scene every day because he considered getting the exact words that his subjects used of paramount importance: "The meanings of a culture are embodied, in part, in its language, which cannot be grasped by an outsider without attention to the choice and order of the words and sentences" (p. 339). Although some of his subjects were suspicious of his purposes or hesitant about this device at first, he asserted that as they grew to know and trust him they eventually overcame this ill-ease to the point of volunteering to "manage" the taping by themselves, leaving the recorder resting on the table or wearing it in their pockets while Duneier was away from the scene or out of town.

Through these transcriptions incorporating their conversations with participants and through references to themselves as setting members, public ethnographers vividly convey their placement and depict their role in these scenes and subcultures. Bourgois (1995:254) often inserted reflections accentuating his presence, such as, "I could sense this tension during our tape-recording sessions, by the way Primo repeatedly interrupted Candy in an almost juvenile, obnoxious manner." Duneier (1999) offered both specific and general descriptions of his participation: "Ron called me over to help him lift the industrial-plastic drop cloth, taking care that no water seeped onto the top row of their *Vogues*. As we did so, Mudrick, an unhoused man who sometimes assisted the others, came over and talked to Marvin" (p. 53); "It is midnight and we have been on Sixth Avenue since 9:00 a.m. Ron doesn't return. Marvin infers that he'll be up drinking and smoking all night" (p. 58). In this way, they write themselves into the texts.

Theory, where readdressed in conclusion chapters, is often not the strong suit of this genre. The scholarly, analytic voice is generally muted or absent. Although Duneier returned to the broken windows concept and asserted that his public characters foster and maintain a moral order, in a highly controversial exchange, Wacquant (2002:1469) argued that this work "proffers a sprawling stockpile of data without any theory to organize it and strives, by default, to bring these data to bear on a crime-and-policing issue that they are ill-suited to address." Anderson's conclusion section incorporated two pages of empirical reflections, but was called by Wacquant (2002:1469), "animated by a thesis, that proximate mentoring makes a difference in the fate of ghetto residents, that is glaringly disconnected from, even invalidated by, its own findings."[6] Only Bourgois returned explicitly to scholarly theses, offering critical discussions of race, class, and gender relations, and of individual, cultural, and structural influences on life on the street and their implications for the underground political economy.[7] But here as well, the tone and audience holds, and these discussions take part in a simplified mien with all theoretical references in footnotes.

CONCLUSION

Each of these genres is uniquely shaped and defined by its representational conventions, focusing on some ethnographic features to the exclusion of others. We have shown how each makes rhetorical appeals to its audiences. What remains to be discussed is what is gained and lost through the representational choices of each mode, and the resulting relative position of each.

The only form of ethnography to appear in the highest-status journals, mainstream ethnography has the advantage of potentially reaching the largest professional audience. It thus represents the quantitative sociological view of qualitative sociology. Although rhetorically recast and redesigned to diminish the role of subjectivity for the epistemological tastes of hypothetico-deductive sociologists, it retains core elements of rigorous, naturalistic data-gathering and inductive analysis. Its theoretical contributions, although occasionally curtailed in reach by mainstream norms, are welcomed insofar as they address the ongoing canon of generic social scientific knowledge. Issues of hegemonic struggle continue to buffet the acceptance of ethnography by the mainstream, but there will always be individuals who strive to translate qualitative offerings for this audience and there will always be some niche position for its reception.

Postmodern ethnography reaches the smallest audience of all, as it is not well received outside of very narrow interpretive circles. Its strong critique of its closest neighbor, classical ethnography, left the interpretive field scarred and fractured by divisions (cf. the exchange by Anderson [2006], Ellis and Bochner [2006], and Denzin [2006]). Positively, it moved beyond its initial critical posture toward offering more fleshed exemplars of new ways to creatively advance its genre. With its focus on the exploration of new forms, it offers great possibilities for continuing innovation. There is increasing unlikeliness, however, that it will ever be legitimized beyond its own rather narrow orbit.

Although initially eagerly embraced, there has since been a significant "nomo pomo" backlash. Fine (1999:534) acidly referred to postmodern ethnography as "transforming the intensive labor of field research into the armchair pleasures of 'me-search.'" Sanders (1999) noted that not only has postmodern ethnography failed to make inroads into the main body of available fieldwork discussions, but the hostility between positivistic and inductive social scientists, muted to a state of near truce during the 1980s, has become reignited because of the disrespect in which mainstream sociologists hold the postmodernist movement. Van Maanen (2006) remarked that the postmodern label in sociology and anthropology has become "rather poisonous," regarded as cultist, reflexive to the point of reduction, and filled with polysyllabic jargon. Thus, from its peak period of efflorescence and influence in the 1990s, it has waned and become mostly limited in practice to scholars in Communication and Cultural Studies.

Public ethnography brings sociological ethnography to the widest audience of all, offering the greatest potential for changing the social world in applied and policy circles. Its accessible rhetoric may be able to translate cultural and structural perspectives for lay readers, offering alternatives to the individualist discourse and explanations that dominate the way ordinary people think. But these benefits come at a price. The danger lies in public ethnography speaking down to its publics, abandoning rigorous, theoretical ethnography in favor of what Wacquant (2002) called "magazine sociology."

Classical ethnography in its the purest form, geared toward an audience that reads and accepts its methodology and subjectivity, eliminates the need to compromise the researcher's location or to apologize for or justify itself. In speaking to insiders, it can explore micro issues of the empirical world's interpretive and discursive social construction just as freely as it can address macro issues of theoretical development and social structure. Somewhat chameleonic in nature, it was transformed by the political success of positivistic sociology in the 1960s to move beyond loosely inductive rhetoric toward more positivistic grounded theory (Sanders 1999). It then incorporated some key contributions of postmodern ethnography in the 1980s and '90s, such as a greater sensitivity toward subjective reflection, more discussion of the role of researchers in the field, incorporation of the narrative form, less unthinking use of the authorial voice, and a greater sensitivity to writing and rhetoric. With the rise of public ethnography it shifted again, relinquishing denser scholarly writing to become even more accessible, often moving literature out of the text into footnotes and lightening conversations about epistemology and theory. Yet despite (or perhaps because of) its rhetorical malleability, it retains its core position and audience, embodying the essential kernel of the ethnographic discourse.[8]

In sum, we believe that only a sociology with the discipline to examine its representational forms, to explore how the words we use inform our audiences, will move forward in the best interest of science and our constituencies. Although this analysis has focused on one type of sociological writing, ethnography, we implore our brethren in other parts of our discipline to also turn their attention to how the power of their words and rhetoric influences the messages that they send. Rather than navel-gazing, then, we see this exercise as a full-body examination that is long overdue.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This Address was presented at the joint annual meeting of the Midwest Sociological Society and the North Central Sociological Association in Chicago, IL, April 2007. We would like to thank Mitch Duneier and John Van Maanen for suggestions they made to earlier drafts of this article.

NOTES

[1]When we selected the "Art of Sociology" as the theme for the 2006 Midwest Sociological Society's annual meeting, we received several angry letters and other anecdotal feedback from people who refused to attend a conference that focused so strongly on such "trivial" matters.

[2]We refer here to the type of sociology that lies at the hegemonic center of the discipline: highly quantitative, positivistic, strongly worded in the rhetoric of science, using sophisticated statistical techniques, often relying on large data sets that have been precollected, most often practiced in large research universities in the Midwest (and some other regions), and appearing in what is usually referred to as the discipline's holy triumvirate of journals, *American Sociological Review*, *American Journal of Sociology*, and *Social Forces*. This appellation of "mainstream" is related to, but not wholly the same, as what we refer to as mainstream ethnography.

[3]Atkinson (1990:46) refers to this rhetorical minimization of the authors' presence as the "degree zero" of writing.

[4]There is no hard-and-fast rule about where ethnographies get published. It is possible, but unlikely, for a classically written ethnography to be accepted in a mainstream generalist or specialty journal, unless the editor comes from an ethnographic background. However, even though the late Spencer Cahill, a classically trained ethnographer, edited *Social Psychology Quarterly* for three years (2004–2006), few classical or even mainstream ethnographies were published under his tenure. Despite the ecumenical statements made by most editors of mainstream journals (see, e.g., Jacobs 2004), relatively few classical ethnographies (or ethnographies of any ilk) appear in these venues (some mainstream editors note that few are actually submitted and that there is no systematic bias against qualitative work in their journals). Those that survive the editorial process are often shaped into mainstream formats.

[5]Apparently, the exhaustive literature reviews in these articles have become so commonplace and, perhaps, burdensome for some, that Fine (2007:2), upon taking over the editorship of *Social Psychology Quarterly*, had to admonish potential submitters to "shorten their literature reviews, [merely] nodding at the past."

[6]We are well aware of the published contretemps that occurred between Loïc Wacquant (2002) and public urban ethnographers Kathy Newman, Elijah Anderson, and Mitch Duneier in his scathing review of their books. Elsewhere, Adler and Adler (2005a), we have outlined our disagreements with Wacquant's attacks on these three scholars. However, from personal communications, anecdotes, and corridor talk we have heard among ethnographers that Wacquant's problems with public urban ethnography, as illustrated by these three exemplars, are not isolated to him. Thus, we feel that we are representing a portion of the scholarly population who agree with much of Wacquant's criticisms, even if we have distanced ourselves from them in large part.

[7]Interestingly, of the three books highlighted here, Bourgois' is the one only published by a university press (the others are trade publications). Greater theoretical development is likely to have been sought by such reviewers and editors. Nevertheless, as we define it, Bourgois' book still fits the criteria of public ethnography.

[8]This, of course, represents our own genre and, perhaps, our bias. There are, no doubt, people who practice other forms of ethnography, and sociology more generally, who disagree.

REFERENCES

Adler, Patricia A. and Peter Adler. 1987. *Membership Roles in Field Research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

——. 1988. "Intense Loyalty in Organizations: A Case Study of College Athletics." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 33:401–17.

——. 2005a. "Review Essay: Lost in Translation? Review of Wacquant's *Body and Soul*." *Symbolic Interaction* 28:433–35.

——. 2005b. "Self-Injurers as Loners: The Social Organization of Solitary Deviance." *Deviant Behavior* 26:345–78.

Adler, Patricia A., Steven J. Kless, and Peter Adler. 1992. "Socialization to Gender Roles: Popularity among Elementary School Boys and Girls." *Sociology of Education* 65:169–87.

Anderson, Elijah. 1999. *Code of the Street*. New York: Norton.

Anderson, Leon. 2006. "Analytic Autoethnography." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 35:373–95.

Anzaldúa, Gloria. 1987. *Borderlands/la frontera*. San Francisco, CA: Aunt Lute.

Atkinson, Paul. 1990. *The Ethnographic Imagination: Textual Constructions of Reality*. London, England: Routledge.

——. 1992. *Understanding Ethnographic Texts*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Becker, Howard S. 1986. *Writing for Social Scientists*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

——. 1998. *Tricks of the Trade*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Becker, Howard and Blanche Geer. 1960. "The Analysis of Qualitative Field Data." Pp. 652–60 in *Human Organization Research*, edited by Richard Adams and Jack Preiss. Homewood, IL: Dorsey.

Behar, Ruth and Deborah A. Gordon, eds. 1996. *Women Writing Culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bellah, Robert, Richard Madsen, William M. Sullivan, Ann Swidler, and Steven Tipton. 1985. *Habits of the Heart*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bochner, Arthur P. 1999. "Assessing Alternative Modes of Qualitative and Ethnographic Research: How Do We Judge?" Presented at the annual meeting of the Society for the Study of Symbolic Interaction, Chicago, IL, August 8.

Bochner, Arthur P. and Carolyn Ellis, eds. 2002. *Ethnographically Speaking: Autoethnography, Literature, and Aesthetics*. Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira.

Bourgois, Philippe. 1995. *In Search of Respect*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, Richard H. 1977. *A Poetic for Sociology*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bulmer, Martin. 1984. *The Chicago School of Sociology*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Burawoy, Michael. 2005a. "For Public Sociology." *American Sociological Review* 70:4–28.

——. 2005b. "Third Wave Sociology and the End of Pure Science." *The American Sociologist* 36(3–4):152–65.

Burawoy, Michael, Alice Burton, Ann Arnett Ferguson, Kathryn J. Fox, Joshua Gamson, Nadine Gartrell, Leslie Hurst, Charles Kurzman, Leslie Salzinger, Josepha Schiffman, and Shiori Ui. 1991. *Ethnography Unbound*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Burawoy, Michael, Joseph A. Blum, Sheba George, Zsuzsa Gille, Teresa Gowan, Lynne Haney, Maren Klawiter, Steven H. Lopez, Seán Ó Riain, and Millie Thayer. 2000. *Global Ethnography*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Charmaz, Kathy. 2006. *Constructing Grounded Theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Churchill, Christian J. Jr. 2005. "Ethnography as Translation." *Qualitative Sociology* 28:3–24.

Clifford, James. 1988. *Predicament of Culture*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Clifford, James and George E. Marcus. 1986. *Writing Culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Clough, Patricia T. 1992. *The End(s) of Ethnography*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

——. 1993. "On the Brink of Deconstructing Sociology: Critical Reading of Dorothy Smith's Standpoint Epistemology." *The Sociological Quarterly* 34:169–82.

——. 1994. *Feminist Thought: Desire, Power, and Academic Discourse*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Coles, Roberta. 2002. "Black Single Fathers: Choosing to Parent Full-Time." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 31:411–39.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 1991. *Black Feminist Thought*. New York: Routledge.

Copes, Keith and Andy Hochstetler. 2003. "Situational Construction of Masculinity among Male Street Thieves." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 32:279–304.

Cress, Daniel M. and David A. Snow. 1996. "Resources, Benefactors, and the Viability of Homeless SMOs." *American Sociological Review* 61:1089–109.

Deegan, Mary Jo. 2001. "The Chicago School of Ethnography." Pp. 11–25 in *Handbook of Ethnography*, edited by Paul Atkinson, Amanda Coffey, Sara Delamont, John Lofland, and Lyn Lofland. London, England: Sage.

Denzin, Norman K. 1970. *The Research Act*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.

——. 1993. "*Rain Man* in Las Vegas: Where Is the Action for the Postmodern Self?" *Symbolic Interaction* 16:65–77.

——. 1997. *Interpretive Ethnography*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

——. 1999. "Performing Montana." Pp. 147–58 in *Qualitative Sociology in Everyday Life*, edited by Barry Glassner and Rosanna Hertz. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

——. 2006. "Analytical Autoethnography, or Déjá Vu All over Again." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 35:419–28.

Denzin, Norman K. and Yvonna S. Lincoln. 1994. "Introduction: Entering the Field of Qualitative Research." Pp. 1–17 in *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, edited by Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

——. 2000. "Introduction: The Discipline and Practice of Qualitative Research." Pp. 1–29 in *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. 2d ed., edited by Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

DiIorio, Judith A. and Michael R. Nusbaumer. 1993. "Securing Our Sanity: Anger Management among Abortion Escorts." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 21:411–38.

Douglas, Jack D. 1976. *Investigative Social Research*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Douglas, Jack D., Patricia A. Adler, Peter Adler, Andrea Fontana, C. Robert Freeman, and Joseph Kotarba. 1980. *Introduction to the Sociologies of Everyday Life*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Duneier, Mitchell. 1999. *Sidewalk*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Eder, Donna. 1985. "The Cycle of Popularity: Interpersonal Relations among Female Adolescents." *Sociology of Education* 58:154–65.

Eder, Donna and Stephen Parker. 1987. "The Cultural Production and Reproduction of Gender: The Effect of Extracurricular Activities on Peer-Group Culture." *Sociology of Education* 60:200–13.

Edmondson, Ricca. 1984. *Rhetoric in Sociology*. London: Macmillan.

Ehrenreich, Barbara. 2001. *Nickel and Dimed*. New York: Henry Holt.

Ellis, Carolyn. 1991. "Sociological Introspection and Emotional Experience." *Symbolic Interaction* 14:23–50.

——. 1998. " 'I Hate My Voice': Coming to Terms with Minor Bodily Stigmas." *The Sociological Quarterly* 39:517–37.

Ellis, Carolyn and Arthur P. Bochner. 1992. "Telling and Performing Personal Stories: The Constraints of Choice in Abortion." Pp. 79–101 in *Investigating Subjectivity*, edited by Carolyn Ellis and Michael G. Flaherty. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

——, eds. 1996. *Composing Ethnography*. Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira.

——. 2006. "Analyzing Analytic Autoethnography: An Autopsy." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 35:429–49.

Fine, Gary Alan, ed. 1995. *A Second Chicago School?* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

——. 1999. "Field Labor and Ethnographic Reality." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 28:532–39.

——. 2007. "The Last Editor's Note." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 70:1–3.

Fine, Gary Alan and Lori Holyfield. 1996. "Secrecy, Trust, and Dangerous Leisure: Generating Group Cohesion in Voluntary Organizations." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 59:22–38.

Flaherty, Michael G. 1991. "The Perception of Time and Situated Engrossment." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 54:76–85.

——. 1999. *A Watched Pot*. New York: New York University Press.

Freeman, Jennifer. 1992. "The Perfect Valentine." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 20:478–83.

Gans, Herbert J. 1962. *The Urban Villagers*. New York: The Free Press.

Geertz, Clifford. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*. New York: Basic Books.

——. 1983. *Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretive Anthropology*. New York: Basic Books.

——. 1988. *Works and Lives: The Anthropologist as Author*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Glaser, Barney and Anselm Strauss. 1967. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.

Goodall, H. L. Jr. 2000. *Writing the New Ethnography*. Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira.

Gubrium, Jaber F. and James A. Holstein. 1997. *The New Language of Qualitative Method*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gusfield, Joseph. 2000. *Performing Action*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Haenfler, Ross. 2004. "Rethinking Subcultural Resistance: Core Values of the Straight Edge Movement." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 33:406–36.

Hammersley, Martyn. 1990. *Reading Ethnographic Research*. New York: Longman.

——. 1992. *What's Wrong with Ethnography? Methodological Explorations*. London, England: Routledge.

Hayano, David. 1979. "Auto-Ethnography: Paradigms, Problems, and Prospects." *Human Organization* 38:99–104.

Herman-Kinney, Nancy J. and Joseph M. Verschaeve. 2003. "Methods of Symbolic Interactionism." Pp. 213–52 in *Handbook of Symbolic Interactionism*, edited by Larry T. Reynolds and Nancy J. Herman-Kinney. Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira.

Hertz, Rosanna, ed. 1997. *Reflexivity and Voice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hochschild, Arlie Russell. 1983. *The Managed Heart*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hunt, Jennifer and Peter K. Manning 1991. "The Social Context of Police Lying." *Symbolic Interaction* 14:51–70.
Jackson-Jacobs, Curtis. 2004. "Hard Drugs in a Soft Context: Managing Trouble and Crack Use on a College Campus." *The Sociological Quarterly* 45:835–56.
Jacobs, Jane. 1961. *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*. New York: Vintage.
Jacobs, Jerry A. 2004. "ASR: Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow." *American Sociological Review* 69:v–vi.
Kaplan, Abraham. 1964. *The Conduct of Inquiry*. Scranton, PA: Chandler.
Karp, David A. 1996. *Speaking of Sadness*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Kinney, David A. 1993. "From Nerds to Normals: The Recovery of Identity among Adolescents from Middle School to High School." *Sociology of Education* 66:21–40.
Krieger, Susan. 1983. *The Mirror Dance*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
——. 1996. *The Family Silver*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Kurtz, Lester. 1984. *Evaluating Chicago Sociology*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
Laffan, Barry. 1997. *Communal Organization and Social Transition*. New York: Peter Lang.
Lassiter, Luke Eric. 2005. *The Chicago Guide to Collaborative Ethnography*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
Lather, Patti. 2001. "Postmodernism, Post-Structuralism and Post(Critical) Ethnography: Of Ruins, Aporias, and Angels." Pp. 477–92 in *Handbook of Ethnography*, edited by Paul Atkinson, Amanda Coffey, Sara Delamont, John Lofland, and Lyn Lofland. London, England: Sage.
Leyser, Ophra. 2003. "Doing Masculinity in a Mental Hospital." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 32:336–59.
Lincoln, Yvonna S. and Egon G. Guba. 1990. "The Alternative Paradigm Dialog." Pp. 17–30 in *The Paradigm Dialog*, edited by Egon G. Guba. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
Lofland, John and Lyn Lofland. 1995. *Analyzing Social Settings*. 3d ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
Madison, D. Soyini. 2005. *Critical Ethnography*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Marcus, George E. and Michael M. J. Fischer. 1986. *Anthropology as Cultural Critique*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
McCall, George J. 2006. "The Fieldwork Tradition." Pp. 3–22 in *The Sage Handbook of Fieldwork*, edited by Dick Hobbs and Richard Wright. London, England: Sage.
Monahan, Brian A., Joseph A. Marolla, and David G. Bromley. 2005. "Constructing Crime: The Organization of Sexual Assault." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 34:284–316.
Nichols, Lawrence T. 2005. "Editor's Introduction: A Conversation about Public Sociology." *The American Sociologist* 36:3–4.
Nisbet, Robert. 1976. *Sociology as an Art Form*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Platt, Jennifer. 1983. "The Development of the 'Participant Observation' Method in Sociology: Origin, Myth, and History." *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 19:379–93.
Ragin, Charles C. 1987. *The Comparative Method: Moving beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Reisman, David. 1950. *The Lonely Crowd*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
Richards, Thomas J. and Lyn Richards. 1994. "Using Computers in Qualitative Research." Pp. 445–62 in *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, edited by Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Richardson, Laurel. 1990. *Writing Strategies: Reaching Diverse Audiences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
——. 1992. "The Consequences of Poetic Representation: Writing the Other, Rewriting the Self." Pp. 125–40 in *Investigating Subjectivity*, edited by Carolyn Ellis and Michael G. Flaherty. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

——. 1997. *Fields of Play*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
——. 1999. "Feathers in Our CAP." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 28:660–68.
Riemer, Jeffrey. 1977. "Varieties of Opportunistic Research." *Urban Life* 5:467–77.
Robins, Douglas M., Clinton R. Sanders, and Spencer E. Cahill. 1991. "Dogs and Their People: Pet-Facilitated Interaction in a Public Setting." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 20:3–25.
Rock, Paul. 1979. *The Making of Symbolic Interactionism*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Littlefield.
——. 2001. "Symbolic Interactionism and Ethnography." Pp. 26–38 in *Handbook of Ethnography*, edited by Paul Atkinson, Amanda Coffey, Sara Delamont, John Lofland, and Lyn Lofland. London, England: Sage.
Ronai, Carol Rambo. 1995. "Multiple Reflections of Childhood Sexual Abuse: An Argument for a Layered Account." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 23:395–426.
Roth, Louise Marie. 2004. "Bringing Clients Back In: Homophily Preferences and Inequality on Wall Street." *The Sociological Quarterly* 45:613–35.
Rothman, Barbara Katz. 2005. "The I in Sociology." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, April 22, pp. B10–11.
Sackmann, Sonja A. 1992. "Culture and Subcultures: An Analysis of Organizational Knowledge." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 37:40–61.
Sanders, Clinton. 1999. "Prospects for a Postmodern Ethnography." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 28:669–75.
Schulz, Amy J. and Lora Bex Lempert. 2004. "Being Part of the World: Detroit Women's Perceptions of Health and the Social Environment." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 33:437–65.
Schutz, Alfred. 1967. *The Phenomenology of the Social World*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
Schweingruber, David. 2006. "Success through a Positive Mental Attitude? The Role of Positive Thinking in Door-to-Door Sales." *The Sociological Quarterly* 47:41–68.
Sheff, Elisabeth. 2005. "Polyamorous Women, Sexual Subjectivity, and Power." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 34:251–83.
Skeggs, Beverley. 2001. "Feminist Ethnography." Pp. 426–42 in *Handbook of Ethnography*, edited by Paul Atkinson, Amanda Coffey, Sara Delamont, John Lofland, and Lyn Lofland. London, England: Sage.
Smith, Dorothy. 1992. "Sociology from Women's Perspective: A Reaffirmation." *Sociological Theory* 10:88–97.
Stacey, Judith. 1988. "Can There Be a Feminist Ethnography?" Women's Studies International." *Forum* 11:21–27.
Stewart, Alex. 1998. *The Ethnographer's Method*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Strauss, Anselm and Juliet Corbin. 1998. *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques*. 2d ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Terkel, Studs. 1972. *Working*. New York: Avon Books.
Thomas, David A. 1993. "Racial Dynamics in Cross-Race Developmental Relationships." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 38:169–94.
Trinh, Minh-Ha. 1989. *Women, Native, Other: Writing Postcoloniality and Feminism*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
——. 1991. *When the Moon Waxes Red: Representation, Gender, and Cultural Politics*. New York: Routledge.
——. 1992. *Framer Framed*. New York: Routledge.

Tsushima, Teresa and Peter J. Burke. 1999. "Levels, Agency, and Control in the Parent Identity." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 62:173–89.

Van Maanen, John. 1988. *Tales of the Field*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

——, ed. 1995. *Representation in Ethnography*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

——. 2006. "The Past, Present and (Presumed) Future of Ethnography." Talk given at the University of Colorado, Boulder, February 6.

Vidich, Arthur J. and Stanford M. Lyman. 1985. *American Sociology*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

——. 1994. "Qualitative Methods: Their History in Sociology and Anthropology." Pp. 23–59 in *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, edited by Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Visweswaran, Kamala. 1994. *Fictions of Feminist Ethnography*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Wacquant, Loïc. 2002. "Scrutinizing the Street: Poverty, Morality, and the Pitfalls of Urban Ethnography." *American Journal of Sociology* 107:1468–532.

Webb, Eugene J., Donald T. Campbell, Richard D. Schwartz, Lee Sechrest, and J. B. Grove. 1981. *Nonreactive Measures in the Social Sciences*. 2d ed. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Wiley, Juniper. 1987. "Reflections: The 'Shock of Recognition' as a Problem in Participant-Observation." *Qualitative Sociology* 10:78–83.

Willis, Paul E. 2000. *The Ethnographic Imagination*. Malden, MA: Polity.

Wiseman, Jacqueline P. 1970. *Stations of the Lost*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Wolcott, Harry F. 1995. *The Art of Fieldwork*. Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira.

Yount, Kristen R. 1991. "Ladies, Flirts, and Tomboys: Strategies for Managing Sexual Harassment in an Underground Coal Mine." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 19:396–422.