

CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY: METHODOLOGICAL POSSIBILITIES

Leslie Robertson,

Associate Professor, Anthropology. University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada.

Keywords: power, epistemology, decolonizing knowledge, ethical framework, the field, context, fieldwork, ethnography, “culture,” place and space, voice, representation, the past, engagement, transformation, agency, collaboration, cultural translation, cultural critique, advocacy, activism.

Anthropology is unquestionably a discipline with well-known intellectual traditions, or histories... [It is] not a social science tout court, but something else. What that something else is has been notoriously difficult to name, precisely because it involves less a subject matter ... than a sensibility (Cerwonka and Malkki 2008).

My claim is that thinking through hope as a method allows us to begin to confront the most fundamental problem – what knowledge is for (Miyazaki 2006).

For whom do we write?” The preposition “for” does not refer here so much to the public dissemination of the work as to its moral obligation: towards whom should we feel obliged? (Fassin 2013)

Contents

1. Introduction: Power-Knowledge
 2. Ethics
 3. “The Field”
 4. Fieldwork
 5. Interviewing
 6. The Past: Traces
 7. Transformation
- Glossary
Bibliography
Biographical Sketch

Summary

Building on foundational questions about knowledge and power, this chapter discusses methodology as a body of ideas and practices grounded in on-going relationships between (academically-positioned) researchers and the communities, institutions, or individuals to whom they are accountable. Ways of doing cultural anthropology are constantly changing in response to shifting conceptual, political and ethical terrains. I focus on methodological building blocks in cultural anthropology organized around shifting ethical practices; epistemological questions; ideas about “the field” and changing dialogues about fieldwork. Central approaches include participant observation, oral history, ideas about voice and the verbal arts; conceptual approaches to memory studies and ethnographic history; research exploring relationships between the individual and “culture;” politics surrounding representation; and finally, ever-emerging

dialogues about collaboration, engagement and transformative research practices. As an imaginative endeavour that requires improvisation, research with and alongside others presents myriad possibilities.

1. Introduction: Power-Knowledge

More than any other formal aspect of anthropological thought, methodology generates possibility because it is about improvising to some degree —*with* others. This calls for imagination and creativity, for building bridges between knowledge and action. Although the discipline has generated a deep record of models and concepts, it is not committed to a singular methodological practice. We make use of a suite of methods, usually also multiple theories drawn from diverse traditions of thought. Characteristically, we develop paradigms and methods best suited to each research context. Anthropology is a superb portal through which to consider the particular (the micro) within what is too often taken to be universal in human behaviour. Research involves parallel processes grounded in ethical awareness, in constant considerations about power. Doing research in cultural anthropology means leaning into the different epistemological worlds carved out by knowledge practices within the academy and among the peoples who are subjects, participants, collaborators and colleagues, in research. For any researcher considering her or his practice, research often begins with the question asked by Marc-Adélar Tremblay (1983), “What knowledge and knowledge for what?”

Methodology includes the researcher’s approach in its entirety: it is ontological, epistemological, ideological, theoretical, social and, biographical. Recognizing the enormity of a task to represent methodology in cultural anthropology, the chapter addresses what I regard as primary building blocks of anthropological practice that generate debate or tension – and so, usually, activate change within the discipline. The citation of scholars here is partial and should not be taken as exhaustive, as representing the best or primary sources on any topic. I includes social anthropologists (generally associated more with European anthropology), when their work exemplifies current scholarship taken up in (a more Americas-centered), cultural anthropology. Like all scholars, I write from a particular place (Canada) at a particular moment wherein public and academic dialogues about decolonization are reinvigorating research practices. My presentation on methodology inevitably reflects this moment.

“There is no such thing as an innocent anthropology” Gerald Sider (2009:43).

I begin with primary critiques of the power-knowledge nexus (initially developed by Michel Foucault) and elaborated through generations of interdisciplinary scholarship. As a discipline, practitioners of cultural anthropology have (at least) one foot in the social worlds in which they participate outside of academia. We establish relationships based in understandings about how to proceed that must reflect the political and social boundaries of those with whom we work. With this in mind, I briefly trace thresholds of practice through three important critiques of cultural anthropology from non-dominant perspectives. These may be understood as decolonizing moments that sent jolts through a primarily North American-centred discipline concerned with “culture.” The critiques

reveal taken-for-granted assumptions that both inform knowledge production and have effects on the “real world.”

1.1. Imperialism / Colonialism

Based as it is in a predominantly Anglo American and western European canon, cultural anthropology must be regarded within historical and contemporary contexts of colonialism and imperialism (Sillitoe 2007). Much productive labour goes into the consideration of power relations in the research context. Given that a major goal of anthropology is to work across significant cultural, social and political codes, we must take into account the ways that knowledge practices reflect researcher’s historical and geo-political positions.

In the Americas, formative relationships in cultural anthropology were established through studies *about* indigenous, First Nations (in Canada) and Native Americans (in the USA) societies. The discipline grew around responses to simultaneously witnessing and administering indigenous populations then expected to disappear in the wake of colonialism and settlement. In the aftermath of epidemics, relocations and imperial military campaigns; the dispossession of lands, starvation and brutal assimilationist processes in the Americas, scholars embarked on projects of salvage. The systematic documentation of languages and customs and the appropriation of material cultures from this era continue to inform ethical approaches to knowledge production in cultural anthropology. Archives built during this time are current sites for repatriation and revitalization and also for revisionist scholarship that contributes to a vital record of the history of anthropology. The vast resonances of trans-Atlantic slavery constitute another important reality affecting power relationships in cultural anthropology. As settler nations, research in the Americas has also attended closely to the shifting politics that surround immigration and the (legal and illegal) movement of peoples. Legacies of colonial and imperial moments are easily reignited through scholarship and are a focus of work that has especially acknowledged “race.” At the heart of critiques about 19th and early 20th century scholarship are understandings about the complicity of anthropologists in imperialist processes that facilitate (d) their mobility, their access to peoples and places and their appropriations of all manner of cultural property.

Like all arenas of academic inquiry, anthropology is grounded in political contexts that inform primary methodological dynamics. Given the centrality of relationships among those who produce knowledge (historically, educated Europeans and Euro-Americans) and those whom are the subjects of knowledge production (often “colonized” or subordinated populations), anthropology’s geo-political location has always mattered. As Bruce Knauft (1996:2) notes, “the holistic openness to world conditions and emerging paradigms has been one of anthropology’s enduring strengths.” At no time was this made more explicit than in the 1960’s and 1970’s with the “emergence of political and academic thought ... inspired by anti-war, free speech, civil rights, feminist and gay liberation movements” (Maskovsky and Susser 2016).

Within this context Sioux scholar Vine Deloria Jr. wrote the first authored critique of cultural anthropology from a Native American perspective. His book *Custer Died for your Sins – an Indian Manifesto* (1969), rocked the discipline, launching a critical

conversation about anthropology with indigenous communities (especially in North America). In the chapter ‘Anthropologists and other Friends,’ Deloria addressed anthropologists and missionaries alongside American Congress, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. In part, his anger followed from the failure of anthropologists to support Indian rights, yet clearly, careers were being made on the research that resulted from their relationships in Native American communities. Deloria pointed out that tribal communities actually competed with anthropologists for funding from private foundations and federal agencies. He criticised notions of “pure research ... a body of knowledge absolutely devoid of useful application and incapable of meaningful digestion” (ibid: 80). In his words, “abstract theories create abstract action.” Deloria’s identification of the violence of abstraction and his remarks about the objectification of research subjects, pointed to common representations constructed through academic research that haunt indigenous peoples — likenesses of the exotic, authentic, essentialized “Indian,” that render people invisible or make them into caricatures. Deloria noted that theoretical and conceptual ideas were often informed only by preceding scholarship and were completely divorced from realities on the ground. His critique opened awareness that anthropological conversations *within* the academy may actually – and often did — occur at the expense of people who are the subjects of research. In cultural anthropology, on-going dialogues about authenticity, representation and exploitation are key.

Research [is] a significant site of struggle between the interests and ways of knowing of the West and the interests and ways of resisting of the Other ... Research is not an innocent or distant academic exercise but an activity that has something at stake and that occurs in a set of political and social conditions (Tuhiwai-Smith 1999:2, 5).

A second methodological revolution in cultural anthropology may be tied to the indigenous scholarship movement known as Kaupapa Māori initiated in the late 1990’s by Māori scholar Linda Tuhiwai-Smith. In her work *De-colonizing Methodologies* (1999), she argued that western scholarship is conducted through “imperial eyes.” Her critique began a movement towards the recognition of “indigenous methodologies” ushering in a new epoch of scholarship that acknowledged multiple traditions of knowledge or ways of knowing. Important here is that what we count as knowledge is culturally and ideologically specific; that knowledge systems adhere to identifiable canons, procedures, representational and classificatory norms; that the ways we frame questions reflect ideas about time and space, race and gender, and history and bodies; relationships among individuals and, among individuals and their society. Awareness of the ways particular kinds of knowledge adheres to particular systems of classification lead to conversations about ways that anthropology (and other disciplines) translates knowledge. What happens as knowledge is translated across linguistic boundaries and also from oral forms into textual forms? How do powerful western concepts distort local meanings? In what ways do scientific approaches erase experiential approaches to *being* in the world? Tuhiwai-Smith’s attention to the importance of particular vocabularies contributes to cultural anthropology’s continuous awareness of the difficulties of cross-cultural translation. Her examples here include repertoires concerning spatial and temporal phenomena as well as critical forms of sociality. Her work resonates with the continual attention paid by cultural anthropologists to translation, to discontinuities among knowledge systems and to recognition of incommensurable ways of knowing.

A third essay by Palestinian scholar Leleh Khalili represents another generation of critique of the knowledge-power nexus within the discipline. In 'The Ethics of Social Science Research' (2011), Khalili summarizes evaluations of dominant western social science research, with special attention to forms of representation and global ethical positioning. Her critique draws from Edward Said's *Orientalism* (1979) that dismantled dominant modes of representing "the East." Khalili addresses ways that western scholarship reproduces transnational hierarchies through wielding powerful categories and classifications of knowledge linked to imperial histories *and* contemporary global inequalities. Her essay strikes to the heart of epistemological questions about what we know that are tied to where we are located and how we are privileged. Khalili reminds researchers to be constantly aware of "where power lies" (2011:71). She writes that researchers should commit to "keeping in view all the time" the "overt and occulted power calculations sedimented in all documents — whether written or oral" (ibid: 74). Importantly, Khalili (2011:69) calls attention to "transnational epistemic communities," networks of power that usually include the state and associated organizations – NGO's and universities – connected through funding. This is the institutional nexus of knowledge, research and power. To her, epistemologies (ways of knowing) are repositories for relations of power and these may be masked by the use of different scholarly vocabularies (like narrativity, performativity, and objectivity.) She asks that researchers be constantly attentive to positioning their knowledge and especially aware of different combinations of asymmetry in power: among researchers and the subjects of "our ethnographies and histories," among the subjects of research and their state; among the subjects of research and their relationships with global power structures; and the subjects of research and their relationships with their peers (ibid: 77). Leleh Khalili calls for ethical responsibility throughout the whole research process from our choice of methods to the politics of our interpretations, the content and forms of representation. Her attention to geo-political location and the ways knowledge travels through particular networks of power are increasingly relevant in contemporary cultural anthropology

1.2. Epistemologies

Methodology begins and continues with choices entangled in the kinds of questions mentioned above. How do researchers think about the world and imagine their place in it? What are their beliefs about how things work? What theoretical explanations (i.e. generalizations about the world and things in it), do researchers hold to? All of this is epistemology, a theory of knowledge about what things can be known, about what constitutes knowledge and how it may be generated (see Guba and Lincoln 2004:22-37). Epistemology is related to ontology, to one's understandings about reality, its form and nature and possibility. Ontological questions are those that ask what is *true* or *real*. To some extent, all research questions are framed by understandings about truth and this raises important distinctions between more positivist and more constructivist approaches.

Positivism is an approach to knowledge that asserts one knowable truth that is accessible through the application of structured approaches controlled by the researcher (usually, the scientific method, experimentation, hypothesis-testing and, various forms of quantitative measurement). Positivism and neo-positivist approaches state that

inquiry is value free and, that the results may then usually be applied in a general manner to wider populations or phenomena than those under original investigation (Hesse-Biber 2011). At the other end of a knowledge spectrum is Constructivism, a paradigm that acknowledges the existence of multiple, coexisting knowledges “depending on social, political, cultural, economic, ethnic, and gender factors that differentiate the interpreters. These constructions are subject to continuous revision...” (Guba and Lincoln 2004:31). Most researchers are thoughtful about their positions along this spectrum as their predilections lead to different ethical choices, ideas about authority, voice and what they consider to be acceptable modes of theory-building (ibid:29). In *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography* (1986), Clifford and Marcus proposed the term “partial truths” that recognizes findings (especially in ethnographic research), are particular to the research context and not generalizable to a larger world or intended to close down meaning by being a final word. Following Donna Haraway (1988), many in cultural anthropology acknowledge “situated knowledges” — understanding that truth and knowledge are partial, situated, subjective, power imbued, and relational.

“Who is *we*?” (Rich 1984:231). A researcher’s epistemological stance is inevitably connected to their biography. Experiential knowledge informs the researcher’s positionality in a world that is gendered, aged, raced, classed, sexed, housed etc. Our realities are to some considerable degree, shaped by politics of difference, by our “place” (in all senses) within regions and nations and within ideological regimes and structures that affect how researchers perceive themselves and how others in the world perceive them. In cultural anthropology, a good deal of scholarship has been dedicated to understanding ways that positionality affects methodologies. Especially important is the practice of reflexivity developed by feminist scholars in the 1980’s.

Reflexivity generates heightened awareness and vertigo, the creative intensity of a possibility that loosens us from habit and custom and turns us back to contemplate ourselves just as we may be beginning to realize that we have no clear idea of what we are doing. The experience may be exhilarating or frightening or both ... (Myerhoff and Ruby 1982:1).

Reflexivity is a kind of folding back onto ourselves; a constant state of awareness of the eyes we look through as researchers (Behar and Gordon 1995). This involves thinking about ourselves as individuals suspended in webs of power; as observers using approaches derived from particular constellations of knowledge; as individuals whose own life circumstances influence how we do research, what we believe and, how we interpret and represent phenomena. “Reflexive anthropology turns the fieldworker’s ongoing negotiation of his or her professional role into an object of study” (Sluka and Robben 2007:9). Within a practice often dependent upon insights and approaches developed by a single researcher, reflexive writing makes the researcher’s choices evident and outlines their research path thus, offering readers one way to assess the validity of the research. Sandra Harding calls this self-reflexive loop a form of “strong objectivity” (Harding 1995:18). As researchers work with people (or with the works and acts of people), they also have to be aware of the ontological positions and epistemological groundings of others. Conscious and unconscious assumptions about how things work in the world always affect research design. Some aspects of the world will be visible to some that are entirely invisible to others.

2. Ethics

Anthropologists [are] drawn into complicated terrains where our own ethical imagination intersects and rubs up against the ethical imagination of others (Muehlebach 2013: 305).

Anthropology developed within contexts of colonial expansion and exploitation (Asad 1973). Its approaches have been used in covert research projects commissioned by states and brought into military service in counterinsurgency efforts since the discipline's inception (see Price 2013). In part because of this history and the subversive potential of its methods, the discipline has generated a robust internal dialogue about ethical practice (Lambek 2012). Anthropological approaches create "obligations that compel those who seek knowledge to put themselves on the line by making truth claims that they know will intervene within the settings and among the people they describe" (Rutherford 2012:465). Research has repercussions for people and we as researchers have professional and ethical responsibilities to ensure to the best of our abilities, that people with whom we work are not harmed. Perhaps the most important edict is to conduct no covert or deceptive research (see American Anthropological Association).

To the people with whom we work we owe disclosure of our research goals, our methods, and our sponsorship. What theoretical choices have we made? What ideological frameworks guide our work? What is the relationship among these and the worlds of those with whom we work? In what ways is our work political? Where do we stand as a researcher? These questions address the impact of structures of meaning imposed on material we collect. Our answers to them affect how "data" is interpreted and used – or not used. Research is a privileged activity. Customarily, the researcher selects the topic, the sites and the people with whom they wish to work. They choose theoretical perspectives imbued with images of peoples' abilities to act in the world, or their capacities for change that may or may not be commensurate with self-definitions. Researchers have historically had control over the products of research and the intended audiences. Ethically, researchers *and* participants benefit by imagining their work together as political. Research generates knowledge that may be interpreted as "facts" capable of undermining local political projects or unwittingly bolstering agendas researchers are unaware of. Participants deserve to know where funding comes from and what obligations (of ownership, dissemination, publication, reporting, etc.) are attached to that funding. The agendas of sponsoring agencies and their interests in the lives of individuals and communities where research is conducted — matters. This is the realm of "epistemic communities" identified by Khalili (2011:69).

2.1. Responsibilities to Individuals

Throughout this chapter, I use the term participant to identify people with whom researchers engage. Changes in the way anthropology names the subjects in / of research are interesting to note as they reflect shifting power relationships. Early participants in research were called "informants" or "subjects," depending on location "the Native." Later, with the influence of critical theory, participants became "the Other" and "interlocutors;" within present contexts of engagement – they are "cultural experts," "collaborators," "colleagues" and sometimes, "co-authors."

Cultural anthropologists enter into a number of relationships, juggling responsibilities to variously defined collectivities and to individuals. Given their potential vulnerability, researchers' primary ethical responsibility is to individuals who must be well informed about potential risks of research. Voluntary and informed consent is a process that is dynamic and continuous. It involves constant dialogue with individuals to discuss expectations, activities and the (real and imagined) risks of research as it unfolds. Participants are informed of realistic consequences that may include social, political, and / or economic threats to their well being. Informed consent does not necessarily imply or require a written or signed form when this may be counter to local knowledge protocols or the politics of information flow. It is the quality of consent, not the format that is most important. In sites where consent forms are not appropriate, verbal consent is often acknowledged on audio / video recordings or in supporting statements by those who witness the initial act of consent. Regardless of the form, all research participants are entitled to ask questions and express concerns. They should be left with a way for them to contact the researcher and / or organizations or institutions with whom the researcher is affiliated, long after the project has ended.

As they enter into personal relationships with individuals, researchers must take seriously the importance of confidentiality. They are largely in control over what is made visible at the end of research; participants may or may not be included in the production and editing of final products. Interviewing in particular carries with it the risk of wider circulation of personal information – about stigmatizing conditions, political activities, health status, or gossip about others that may be harmful. Cultural anthropologists enter into ethical agreements to keep confidential all information deemed private – to not share this in their own social circles, with others in the community, with agencies or institutional bodies or authorities. As researchers we cannot guarantee anonymity (no way to be identified); research participants must be fully aware of what this might mean for them. The use of pseudonyms (made up names to conceal the identity of speakers) is one way to work with anonymity. But unbeknownst to researchers, small details may still identify participants to others, especially within small communities, social or professional networks. Rather than recording names, researchers often code and are directed by Research Ethic Boards (REBs) to digitally encrypt or number their research materials – audio and video recordings, fieldnotes, etc. Many participants are well aware of the dangers posed by revealing sensitive knowledge; they will refuse to speak about certain topics or tell only what they wish to safely share. Regardless of this awareness, it is the responsibility of the researcher to inform participants of these risks.

-
-
-

TO ACCESS ALL THE **52 PAGES** OF THIS CHAPTER,
Visit: <http://www.eolss.net/Eolss-sampleAllChapter.aspx>

Bibliography

Abu-Lughod, Lila. (1996). Writing Against Culture. In Richard G. Fox (ed.), *Recapturing Anthropology: Working in the Present*. Santa Fe, NM, School of American Research Press. Pp. 137-162. [An important essay written by a feminist anthropologist that critiques the “culture” concept” and addresses insider or “native” anthropology].

American Anthropological Association (no date) Code of ethics for cultural anthropology and other subfields in anthropology. <http://www.americananthro.org/ParticipateAndAdvocate/Content.aspx?ItemNumber=1895>, accessed 16 May 2016. [The Association’s homepage for ethics statements, their evolution, and useful links].

Antze, Paul, and Michael Lambek. (1996). *Tense Past: Cultural Essays in Trauma and Memory*, 304 pp. New York, NY, Routledge. [A comprehensive examination of memory and trauma through multiple contexts of their application].

Angel-Ajani, Asale. (2004). Expert witness: notes toward revisiting the politics of listening. *Anthropology and Humanism* 29(2):133-144. [An ethnographic examination of ethical use of the anthropological voice in the context of unequal power.].

Asad, Talal (ed). (1973). *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter*, 288 pp. London, UK, Ithaca Press. [Early examination of social anthropology’s relationship with colonial institutions practices and ideologies].

Bakhtin, Mikhail. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, 480 pp. Translations by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin, TX, University of Texas Press. [Translations of Bakhtin’s essays and notes on communicative contexts].

Basso, Keith (1996) *Wisdom Sits in Places: Landscape and Language Among the Western Apache*, 191 pp. Albuquerque, NM, University of New Mexico Press. [Examines complex meanings attached to deeply inhabited places through the culture framework of four Apache participants].

Basso, Keith H., and Steven Feld, (eds.). (1996). *Senses of place*, 310 pages. Santa Fe, NM, School of American Research Press. [Eight prolific ethnographers present case studies exploring an emerging anthropology of place].

Bateson, Gregory. (1958). *Naven*, 384 pp. Stanford: Stanford University Press. [An early experimental ethnography examining a ritual complex among Iatmul people in Papua New Guinea, from three separate perspectives].

Behar, Ruth. (1990). Rage and redemption: Reading the life story of a Mexican marketing woman. *Feminist Studies* 16(2): 223-258. [Important methodology paper examining feminist life story research that interrogates violence, privilege and representation.]

Berliner, David C. (2005). The abuses of memory: reflections on the memory boom in anthropology. *Anthropological Quarterly* 78(1):197-211. [A critical examination of memory studies in anthropology and the role of memory as an emerging, malleable concept – comparable to “culture.”]

Bernard, H. Russell, and Clarence C. Gravlee, (eds.). (2011). *Handbook of methods in cultural anthropology*, 666 pp. New York, NY.: Rowman & Littlefield. [A comprehensive guide to qualitative and quantitative research methods and philosophical debates surrounding methodological sensibilities.]

Bestman, Catherine. (2013). Thee Reflections on Public Anthropology. *Anthropology Today* 29(6):3-6. [A concise evaluation of current questions and tensions in the field of public anthropology].

Biehl, João. (2013). *Vita: Life in a Zone of Social Abandonment*, 456 pages. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. [Humanistic, medical ethnography focused on a woman named Catarina, living in Vita, Brazil — a place where homeless and mentally ill persons experience profound abandonment.]

Bolsi, T., & Zimmerman, L. J. (eds.). (1997). *Indians and anthropologists: Vine Deloria, Jr., and the critique of anthropology*. 226 pp. Tucson, University of Arizona Press. [A collection of essays by Native American and Euro-American scholars examining changes in representation and ethnographic practice across disciplines. Works from the critiques of Vine Deloria Jr.]

Bødker K., Kensing F., Simonsen J. (2004). *Participatory IT Design. Designing for Business and Workplace Realities*, 360 pp. Cambridge, MA. The MIT Press, [Case studies and introduction to a new method of participatory work designed to develop information technologies for diverse organizations and purposes].

Boellstorff, Tom, Bonnie Nardi, Celia Pearce & T. L. Taylor (2012). *Ethnography and Virtual Worlds: A Handbook of Method*, 264 pp. Princeton, Princeton University Press. [Comprehensive guide written by anthropologists for studying virtual worlds (social media, games, etc.) using ethnographic methods.]

Bourgois, Philippe. (1996). *In search of respect: Selling crack in El Barrio*, 392 pp. New York, Cambridge University Press. [A powerful ethnography about race, violence and the crack cocaine economy in Spanish Harlem, New York City.]

Brettell, Caroline. (2000). Fieldwork in the Archives: Methods and Sources in Historical Anthropology. In H. Russell Bernard (ed.) *Handbook of Methods in Cultural Anthropology*, 816 pp. Lanham: Altamira Press. Pp. 513-546. [A detailed source on using archival material for projects in historical anthropology.]

Brosius, J. P. (1999). Analyses and Interventions: Anthropological Engagements with Environmentalism 1. *Current Anthropology* 40(3):277-309. [A review of representational and theoretical approaches to environmentalist organizations and movements that may be called “studying up” in anthropology.]

Brown, Michael (2003) *Who Owns Native Culture?*, 336 pp. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. [Presents case studies in which indigenous peoples defend control over their cultural property, contributing to an understanding of heritage as proprietary resource.]

Brown, Michael (2005). Heritage Trouble: Recent Work on the Protection of Intangible Cultural Property. *International Journal of Cultural Property* 12:40-61. [An essay reviewing recent efforts to define and preserve intangible cultural property, with focus on the impacts of organizing models expounded by the rise of the Information Society.]

Brown, Diedre and George Nicholas (2012) “Protecting Indigenous Cultural Property in the Age of Digital Democracy: Institutional and Communal Responses to Canadian First Nations and Maori Heritage Concerns.” *Journal of Material Culture*, 17.3: 307-324. [A comparative discussion of the uses and effects of digital technologies in heritage documentation and management by Canadian First Nations and New Zealand Maori peoples.]

Busza, Joana. (2004). Participatory research in constrained settings: Sharing challenges from Cambodia. *Action Research* (2)2:191-208. [Article describing the researcher’s efforts to integrate participatory research methods in evaluating an HIV-prevention program for sex workers in Cambodia, faced by complex local relations of power.]

Cerwonka, Allaine, and Liisa H. Malkki. (2008). *Improvising theory: Process and Temporality in Ethnographic Fieldwork*, 224 pp. University of Chicago Press. [Presented by way of a long correspondence between the two authors, this book confronts the challenges of marrying anthropological theory with on-the-ground approaches while demonstrating the critical process of improvising ethnographic method during research.]

Chapin, M., Lamb, Z., & Threlkeld, B. (2005). Mapping Indigenous Lands. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 34:619-638. [Article reviewing diverse methodological approaches that have been used in mapping the lands of indigenous peoples.]

Clifford, James. (1983). On Ethnographic Authority. *Representations* 2:118-146. [A seminal chapter describing the authoritative power of the ethnographic researcher to interpret and represent research subjects, with reference to major discipline defining factors such as colonial power.]

Clifford, James and George E. Marcus (eds.). (1986). *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*, 305 pp. Berkeley: University of California Press. [Seminal and widely cited book aimed at critiquing and reformulating anthropological approaches to ethnographic representation.]

Coleman, Simon and Pauline von Hellermann (eds.). (2011). *Multi-Sited Ethnography: Problems and Possibilities in the Translocation of Research Methods*, 220 pp. New York: Routledge. [A collection of essays emerging from a multi-disciplinary scholarly workshop that explored the emergence of multi-sited ethnography in concept and its methodological impacts.]

Cohen, David William. (1994). *The Combing of History*, 290 pp. University of Chicago Press. [Using a global range of examples and comparing academic and non-academic settings, this book reveals power structures at work in the production of knowledge and authoritative historical accounts.]

Comaroff, John, and Jean Comaroff. (1992). *Ethnography and the Historical Imagination*, 337 pp. Boulder, Co: Westview. [Two renowned anthropologists present a collection of essays on the theme of historical anthropology and social scientific approaches to constructions of culture.]

Crapanzano, Vincent. (1984). Life-Histories (Review). *American Anthropologist* 86(4):953-960. [Review of five books relating to the creation of life histories in the context of anthropological methods.]

Cruikshank, Julie. (1994). Oral Tradition and Oral History: Reviewing Some Issues. *Canadian Historical Review* 75(3): 403-418. [An anthropologist and expert on oral histories, discusses the importance of oral traditions in elucidating social processes despite their incompatibility with projects to construct historical accounts as complete narratives.]

Cruikshank, Julie. (1990). Introduction: Life History and Life Stories. In *Life Lived Like a Story*, 404 pp. J. Cruikshank in collaboration with A. Sidney, K. Smith and A. Ned. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press. pp. 1-20. [Introductory chapter to a book examining three collaborative oral histories with women elders in the Yukon. Cruikshank discusses life history approaches and the context of research.]

Cruikshank, Julie. (1998). Negotiating with Narrative: Establishing Cultural Identity at the Yukon International Storytelling Festival. In *The Social Life of Stories: Narrative and Knowledge in the Yukon Territory*, 240 pp. Julie Cruikshank. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press. pp.138-159. [Examines the political performance of oral narratives through a cross-cultural context of a storytelling festival in the Yukon.]

Cruikshank, Julie. (1988). Myth and Tradition as Narrative Framework: Oral Histories from Northern Canada. *International Journal of Oral History* 9(3): 198-214. [Early article from a specialist of northern indigenous oral traditions describing the use of myth and tradition in constructing ethnographic narratives.]

Current Anthropology (October 2010), Vol. 51(2), Special Issue: Engaged Anthropology: Diversity and Dilemmas. [An entire special issue in which authors discuss the emergence of a self-critical, interventionist approach to research.]

Davis, Anthony, and John R. Wagner. (2003). Who knows? On the importance of identifying “experts” when researching local ecological knowledge. *Human Ecology* 31(3):463-489. [Discusses the incorporation of Local Ecological Knowledge (LEK) in the development of resource management systems and the empowerment of local people within these processes, while highlighting methodological concerns such as how to identify local experts.]

Deloria, Vine, Jr. (1969). *Custer Died For Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto*, 278 pp. University of Oklahoma Press. [The first authored critique of cultural anthropology from a Native American perspective pointing to an asymmetrical relation of power which benefits scholarly careers and advances disciplinary projects at the expense of research subjects.]

Denzin, Norman; Yvonne Lincoln and Linda Tuhiwai Smith, eds. (2008). *Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies*, 624 pp. London: Sage. [A collection of chapters by indigenous and non-indigenous contributors discussing the development and application of critical and indigenous research methodologies shaping social scientific practice on a global scale.]

Denzin, N. K. (2001). The Reflexive Interview and a Performative Social Science, *Qualitative Inquiry* 1(1):23-46. [Offers a detailed discussion of the interviewer as a self-critical and moral participant in the research process and identifies qualitative interviews as sites in which interpretive knowledge artifacts or narratives are made.]

Desjarlais, Robert. (1997). *Shelter blues: Sanity and Selfhood among the Homeless*, 320 pp. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania. [An innovative ethnographic representation of the experience of homelessness that challenges established scholarly and scientific treatments of human subjectivity].

Desjarlais, Robert. (2003). *Sensory Biographies: Lives and Deaths among Nepal's Yolmo Buddhists*, 406 pp. Berkeley: University of California Press. [An ethnography featuring two life histories that serve as case studies of the sensory as a shaping factor in making and recollecting life experience.]

Elliott, Denielle and Dara Culhane (eds). (2016). *A Different Kind of Ethnography: Imaginative Practices and Creative Methodologies*. 144 pp. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. [A collection of essays presenting new perspectives and approaches focusing on the imaginative, sensory and creative possibilities for anthropological inquiry.]

Ellis, Carolyn; Adams, Tony E. & Bochner, Arthur P. (2010). Autoethnography: An Overview, 18 pp. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 12(1), Art. 10, <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs1101108>. [An article describing the integration of autobiographical and ethnographic methods to create autoethnography: a processual approach to research intending to elucidate cultural experience through close attention to personal experience.]

Escobar, Arturo. (2001). Culture Sits in Places: Reflections on Globalism and Subaltern Strategies of Localization. *Political Geography* 20:139-174. [A widely cited early exponent of local- and place-centered approaches to cultural anthropology, contextualized by an increasing social scientific interest in examining political issues concurrently at local and global scales.]

Fabian, Johannes. (2001). *Anthropology with an Attitude: Critical Essays*, 272 pp. Stanford: Stanford University Press. [A collection of essays commenting on the study of culture and the use of theory in social science today.]

Fabian, Johannes. (1983). *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes its Object*, 205 pp. New York: Columbia University Press. [Classic work containing widely cited revelations on ethnographic representation, treatment of the anthropological research subject as 'Other,' and notions of temporality in fieldwork].

Fadiman, Anne (2012). *The Spirit Catches you and you Fall Down: A Hmong Child, her American Doctors, and the Collision of two Cultures*, 368 pp. New York: Macmillan Publishers. [An account of cultural miscommunication in the case of an ill child from Laos seeking treatment in the United States.]

Faier, Lieba, and Lisa Rofel. (2014). "Ethnographies of Encounter." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 43: 363-377. [Referencing long-standing issues in anthropology relating to colonial contact and globalization, this article proposes a methodological ethnography of encounter to productively query how culture and frames of reference are made in the meeting of difference and relations of inequality.]

Falzon, Mark-Anthony (ed.). (2012). *Multi-sited Ethnography: Theory, Praxis and Locality in Contemporary Research*, 304 pp. Ashgate Publishing, Ltd. / London: Routledge [A volume of multi-disciplinary scope with contributions themed on issues of the field site and multi-sited ethnography as it relates to the in-depth study of social phenomena.]

Fassin, Didier. (2013). Why Ethnography Matters: On Anthropology and its Publics. *Cultural Anthropology* 28(4):621-646. [This article defines a practice of 'public ethnography' as distinct from established practices of public-oriented research in anthropology and sociology, and discusses problems in producing popularized and politicized ethnography for the public sphere.]

Fassin, Didier, Frédéric Le Marcis, and Todd Lethata. (2008). Life & Times of Magda A: Telling a Story of Violence in South Africa. *Current Anthropology* 49(2):225-246. [Article addressing anthropological approaches to violence and life story research through description of an in-depth study of one woman's life experiences within structural constraints.]

Fine, Michel, & Torre, M. E. (2006). Intimate details: Participatory action research in prison. *Action Research*, 4(3), 253-269. [Discusses issues of researcher position, knowledge creation, ethics and method in the context of an action-oriented research project confronting the extreme power differential of subordinated groups incarcerated by neo-liberal state institutions.]

Fine, Michelle and Lois Weiss. (2000). For Whom? Qualitative Research, Representations, and Social Responsibilities, in N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (eds.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 1065 pp. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. [Authors discuss issues of power, ethics and responsibility to research subjects in representing their lives and experiences.]

Finnegan, Ruth. (2003). *Oral Traditions and the Verbal Arts: A Guide to Research Practices*, 304 pp. New York: Routledge. [Addresses issues, challenges and possibilities specific to the anthropological study of verbal acts. Excellent guides to conducting interviews and various fields of interpretation.]

Fontana, Andrea and James Frey. (2008). The Interview: From Neutral Stance to Political Involvement, In N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln (eds.) *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials*, 701 pp. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. Pp. 115-159. [Authors critique ideas about the interview as an objective methodological tool yielding neutral scientific data; rather, interviews and their outcomes are bound by specific histories, politics and contexts.]

Fortun, Kim, and Todd Cherkasky. (1998). Counter-expertise and the Politics of Collaboration. *Science as Culture* 7(2):145-172. [Introduction to a journal issue dealing with progressive and politically engaged social science research, and specifically examining concepts and practices of collaboration.]

Freire, Paulo. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. 186 pp. New York: Herder and Herder. [A classic work and manifesto whose treatment of issues of education, class, and state and institutional power have informed thinking in anthropology and beyond.]

Garcia, Angela. (2010). *The Pastoral Clinic: Addiction and Dispossession along the Rio Grande*, 265 pp. Berkeley: University of California Press. [An ethnographic portrait of place and life experience examining historical and social contexts that have given rise to high rates of heroin addiction in New Mexico's Española Valley.]

Geertz, Clifford. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays*, 470 pp. Basic Books [Collection of essays by a widely recognized anthropologist, known for championing an interpretive ethnographic approach and influential in shaping disciplinary understandings of culture as a meaning-making system.]

Geismar, Haidy. (2012). Museum+ digital= ?. In *Digital Anthropology*, 316 pp. London / New York: Berg. Pp. 266-287. [Discussion which brings concerns surrounding representation in museum anthropology into dialogue with the impacts of the use of digital technologies in museum practice, discussing for example, impacts digital catalogues may have on knowledge organization.]

Glowczewski, Barbara, Rosita Henry and Ton Otto. (2013). Relations and Products: Dilemmas of Reciprocity in Fieldwork. *Asia Pacific Journal* 14(2):113-125. [A close discussion of the relationships that unfold between researchers and the people and civil institutions they work with and through, and how these relations shape the products of fieldwork.]

Gordillo, Gastón. (2014). *Rubble: The Afterlife of Destruction*, 336 pp. Durham: Duke University Press. [An ethnography closely examining the material and affective qualities of a landscape historically ruined and constantly shifting under relations of violence, state power and capital.]

Gordon, Deborah, and Ruth Behar (eds). (1995). *Women Writing Culture*, 457 pp. Berkeley: University of California Press. [Chapters united by themes in ethnography, narrative, feminism, race, and gender, offering a collective response to issues of anthropological representation raised in the seminal volume *Writing Culture* edited by anthropologists James Clifford and George E. Marcus.]

Greenspan, H. and S. Bolkosky. (2006). When Is An Interview an Interview? Notes from Listening to Holocaust Survivors. *Poetics Today* 27:2. [This article answers the question: 'what makes a good interview?' An evaluative study of multiple interview experiences as elicited from past interviewees leads the authors to interrogate the nature of the interview itself.]

Goulet, Jean-Guy G., and Bruce G. Miller (eds.). (2007). *Extraordinary Anthropology: Transformations in the Field*, 456 pp. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press. [Emphasizing the unpredictable in ethnographic fieldwork, contributions in this volume describe the intimate sides of research experiences and how they adapted conventional research agendas to extraordinary situations.]

Grasseni, Cristina. (2014). The Atlas and the Film: Collective Storytelling through Soundscapes, Sightscapes, and Virtualscapes. *Digital Visual Engagements* 2.2, <https://anthrovision.revues.org/1446>. [Article describing the researcher's use of film and media annotating software methods to represent findings in an urban fieldwork project oriented by visual anthropology.]

Guba, Egon and Yvonna Lincoln. (2004). Competing Paradigms in Qualitative Research: Theories and Issues. In Sharlene Nagy Hesse-Biber and Patricia Leavy (eds.) *Approaches to Qualitative Research: A Reader on Theory and Practice*, 545 pp. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Pp. 21-37. [Chapter outlining four major paradigms in qualitative research: positivism, postpositivism, critical theory, and constructivism.]

Gubrium, Jaber, F. (ed). (2012). *The SAGE Handbook of Interview Research: The Complexity of the Craft*, 625 pp. 2nd Ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. [An informational and instructive series of papers on interviewing techniques applicable to a multidisciplinary range of qualitative researchers.]

Gupta, Akhil. (1995). Blurred boundaries: The discourse of corruption, the culture of politics, and the imagined state. *American Ethnologist* 22(2): 375-402. [Discusses issues arising from anthropological research of the state, civil society and public culture, and the need to reformulate understandings of fieldwork where traditional participant-observation is limited by the translocality of research subjects.]

Gupta, Akhil, and James Ferguson. (1997). Discipline and Practice: "The Field" as Site, Method, and Location in Anthropology. In *Anthropological Locations: Boundaries and Grounds of a Field Science*. 275 pp. Berkeley: University of California Press. Pp. 1-46. [An introductory chapter outlining emergent methodological and theoretical issues in anthropology as globalizing forces and new research agendas challenge traditionally bounded notions of the local ethnographic fieldsite.]

Hale, Charles. (2008). Activist Research v. Cultural Critique: Indigenous Land Rights and the Contradictions of Politically Engaged Anthropology. *Cultural Anthropology* 21(1): 96-120. [Article presenting an argument for politically engaged anthropology making a case study of the researcher's involvement in an indigenous ancestral land rights court case in Nicaragua.]

Hanks, William. (2014). The Space of Translation. *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 4(2):17-39. [Particularly relevant to the field of linguistic anthropology but widely applicable to the ethnographic research endeavor, this article describes the limitations of cross-cultural interpretation and description and constraining factors in language translation.]

Haraway, Donna. (1988). Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective. *Feminist Studies* 14(3): 575-599. [A major influential work signaling a critical epistemological turn affecting the social sciences and beyond, this paper develops the concept of situated knowledges to challenge notions of a singularly accessible and simplistic research subject capable of yielding objective or absolute truth.]

Hastrup, Kirsten, Peter Elsass, Ralph Grillo, Per Mathiesen and Robert Paine. (1990). Anthropological Advocacy: A Contradiction in Terms? [and Comments]. *Current Anthropology* 31(3):301-311. [This article integrates a discussion of advocacy anthropology with the more established and ongoing consideration of anthropology as a representational practice.]

Harding, Sandra. (1995). "Strong Objectivity": A response to the new objectivity question. *Synthese* 104(3) 331-349. [Authored by a major influential figure in the epistemological turn in the social sciences, this article addresses contemporary debates around notions of objectivity, introduces the concept of 'strong objectivity,' and outlines the development and limitations of related approaches such as feminist standpoint epistemology.]

Hecht, Tobias. (2006). *After Life: An Ethnographic Novel*, 183 pp. Durham: Duke University Press. [A reinterpretation of the Latin American genre *testimonio*, this work of fiction is based on a decade's worth of ethnographic life history interviews with one individual whose stories blur the boundaries between reality and invention.]

Herzfeld, Michael. (2015). The Village in the World and the World in the Village: Reflections on Ethnographic Epistemology. *Critique of Anthropology* 35 (3):338-343. [A summarizing commentary for a journal issue looking at theoretical shifts in anthropology as researchers question the role of the singular local fieldsite in a globalizing world.]

Hesse-Biber, Sharlene. (2011). Feminist Research: Exploring, Interrogating and Transforming the Interconnections of Epistemology, Methodology and Method. In S. Hesse-Biber (ed.), *The Handbook of Feminist Research: Theory and Praxis*, 792 pp. (2nd Ed.). Los Angeles: Sage Publications. Pp. 1-26. [An introductory chapter for a collection focusing on the development and practice of feminist research methods.]

Hinson, Glenn. (2000). *Fire in My Bones: Transcendence and the Holy Spirit in African American Gospel*, 408 pp. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. [An ethnography examining African American religious experience in the United States and studying themes relevant to the anthropology of performance and religion.]

Holland, Dorothy, Dana E. Powell, Eugenia Eng, and Georgina Drew. (2010). Models of Engaged Scholarship: An Interdisciplinary Discussion. *Collaborative Anthropologies* 3:1-36. [An article based on the outcomes of an interdisciplinary working group formed to discuss emerging methodological shifts activated by engaged scholarship.]

Hooks, Bell. (1989). Choosing the Margin as a Space of Radical Openness. *Framework* 36:15-23. [A renowned cultural studies scholar known for work with post-structuralist theory and the politics of race, gender and representation discusses occupying the margin as a space for opposition and transformative possibility.]

Horst, Heather and Daniel Miller (eds.). (2013). *Digital Anthropology*. 316 pp. New York: Berg. [A collection of essays from anthropologists working in the realms of digital culture addressing a range of issues arising from humanity's interface with the digital in all its forms.]

Hymes, Dell H. (1981). *"In vain I tried to tell you": Essays in Native American Ethnopoetics*. 402 pp. Studies in Native American Literature 1. University of Pennsylvania publications in conduct and communication. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. [This book is demonstrative of the methodology and theory of ethnopoetics, examining Native American storytelling practices.]

Human Rights Review (1999) 1(1): 78-85; 85-91; 91-98. Special Issue: "Truth, Fact and Fiction in the Human Rights Community." [Articles respond to David Stoll's critique about truth in Rigoberta Menchu's testimonio and discuss its implications for research and indigenous rights activism.]

Ignace, Ron, George Speck, and Renee Taylor. (1993). Some Native Perspectives on Anthropology and Public Policy. In *Anthropology, Public Policy and Native Peoples in Canada*, 369 pp. Noel Dyck and James Waldram (eds.) Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press. Pp. 166-191. [Noel Dyck interviews three First Nations researchers in British Columbia who speak about their personal experiences and perspectives on anthropological research and suggest collaborative approaches.]

Ingold, Tim and Jo Lee Vergunst. (2008). *Ways of Walking: Ethnography and Practice on Foot*, 205 pp. Aldershot, Hampshire, England: Ashgate Publishing. [Two anthropologists of environment and landscape edit this collection in which researchers discuss their projects that include walking, traversing the land, and movement as methods.]

Ingold, Tim. (2008). Anthropology is not ethnography. *Proceedings of the British Academy*. Vol. 154. No. 2007. Oxford: The British Academy, Oxford University Press. [Text of Tim Ingold's speech in which he differentiates between anthropology as a comparative study of human beings and ethnography as a tool for describing the lives of others.]

Irving, Andrew. (2007). Ethnography, Art and Death. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 13:185-208. [Describes a collaboration with people who live with HIV/AIDS in Kampala that incorporates visual tools, storytelling, the emotive, the sensory and memory in various sites throughout the city. He seeks to examine how people imagine their experience of the illness.]

Jacobs-Huey, Lanita. (2002). The natives are gazing and talking back: Reviewing the problematics of positionality, voice, and accountability among "native" anthropologists. *American Anthropologist* 104.3 791-804. [A linguistic anthropologist discusses native anthropology—that is, anthropology conducted by indigenous scholars—and addresses issues of positioning, identity and accountability they face in the discipline and in the communities they work with.]

Johnston, Barbara Rose. (2010). Social Responsibility and the Anthropological Citizen. *Current Anthropology* 51(2):235-247. [Examines advocacy and participatory action, arguing that collaborative endeavors can produce credible research outcomes and foster equitable relations.]

Johnston, Barbara Rose and Holly Barker. (2008). *The Rongelap Report: Consequential Damages of Nuclear War*, 296 pp. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press. [The expert witness report concluding that the consequences of the hydrogen bomb dropped on Rongelap people of the Marshall Islands in 1954, resulted in "loss of a way of life." Methodologically, depicts an historical, ethnographic approach that includes oral histories, archival and collaborative frameworks.]

Kellett, Peter. (2009). Advocacy in Anthropology: Active engagement or passive scholarship? *Durham Anthropology Journal* 1:22-31. [Discusses issues and terminology surrounding advocacy in anthropology and contrasts two different positions on advocacy held by anthropologists.]

Khalili, Laleh. (2011). The Ethics of Social Science Research. In Heacock, Roger and Conte, Edouard, (eds.) *Critical Research in the Social Sciences: A Transdisciplinary East-West Handbook*. 306 pp. Birzeit: Ibrahim Abu-Lughod Institute of International Studies. Pp. 65-82. [A discussion of ever-present transnational networks of power that shape research projects and relationships between researchers and their subjects, and an argument for ethics as an informing principle and practice at the most foundational levels of research design.]

Kirsch, Stuart. (2014). *Mining Capitalism: The Relationship Between Corporations and their Critics*, 328 pp. Oakland: University of California Press. [Based in anthropological research, this book makes an example of the Ok Tedi copper and gold mine in Papua New Guinea to present a case of global relevance about corporations and the strategies they use to promote their interests against widespread opposition.]

Khubova, Daria, Andrei Ivankiev and Tonia Sharova. (1992). After Glasnost: Oral History in the Soviet Union. In Luisa Passerini (ed.) *Memory and Totalitarianism*, 209 pp. Oxford / New York: Oxford University Press. Pp. 88-101. [Examines oral history projects and complexities of personal versus public memory in the context of political events in the Soviet Union during the 20th Century.]

Kleinman, Arthur and Joan Kleinman. (1996). The Appeal of Experience; The Dismay of Images: Cultural Appropriations of Suffering in Our Times. *Daedalus* 125 (1): 1-23. [Discusses mediatized portrayals of human suffering and how such images and stories are appropriated toward various ends.]

Knauff, Bruce. (1996). *Genealogies for the Present in Cultural Anthropology*, 384 pp. New York: Routledge. [Book describing the growing and waning influences of a range of approaches in cultural and critical theory, focusing on how these trends shape the direction of cultural anthropology.]

Koven, Michele. (2014). Interviewing: Practice, Ideology, Genre, and Intertextuality. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 43:499–520. [This author employs a critical linguistic anthropological perspective to analyze interviews widely as a communicative genre, and ultimately argues that interviews are intertextual, unfolding in evident relation to other communicative events.]

Kowal, Emma. (2015). *Trapped in the Gap: Doing Good in Indigenous Australia*. 214 pp. New York / Oxford: Berghahn Books. [Ethnographic study of “white anti-racists” - well-intentioned researchers and workers who seek to foster relations of equality among indigenous and non-indigenous peoples.]

Kratz, Corinne A. (2010). In and out of Focus. *American Ethnologist* 37(4):805-826. [Discusses the use of focus groups as a research method and the ways ethnographic approaches interplay with specific project contexts to shape the process of knowledge production.]

Kuhn, Annette. (1995). *Family Secrets: Acts of Memory and Imagination*. 128 pp. London / New York: Verso. [Known for her work in film and visual analysis, this author draws together a collection of photographs relevant to her personal history to develop a discussion around personal versus collective memory creation.]

La Follette, Laetitia (ed.). (2013). *Negotiating Culture: Heritage, Ownership, and Intellectual Property*, 207 pp. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press. [A collection of case studies related to cultural ownership, written by scholars from different fields and presenting a range of contexts.]

Lambek, Michael. (2012). Ethics out of the Ordinary. In Richard Fardon, Oliva Harris, Trevor H. J. Marchand, Cris Shore, Veronica Strang, Richard Wilson, and Mark Nuttall, (Eds.) *SAGE Handbook of Social Anthropology*, 1184 pp. London: Sage Publications. Pp. 141-52. [A philosophical discussion of ethics as the term relates to and eclipses questions of anthropological method.]

Lassiter, Luke E. (2005a). Collaborative ethnography and public anthropology. *Current Anthropology* 46:83-106. [Outlines a history of collaborative research and ethnographic writing and describes how current collaborative projects are converging with efforts in public and applied anthropology.]

Lassiter, Luke E (2005b). *The Chicago Guide to Collaborative Ethnography*. 201 pp. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. [Informative discussion of the history of collaborative projects and a guide to developing and applying collaborative approaches as part of ethnographic research.]

Lassiter, Luke E (2008). Moving Past Public Anthropology and Doing Collaborative Research. *NAPA Bulletin* 29:70-86. [An article directed toward a student audience discussing issues around the concept of ‘public anthropology’ and describing how to develop collaborative research approaches that engage the public.]

Limon, Jose. (1991). Representation, Ethnicity, and Precursory Ethnography: Notes of a Native Anthropologist. In Richard G. Fox (ed.) *Recapturing Anthropology: Working in the Present*, 248 pp. Santa Fe, N.M.: School of American Research Press: Distributed by the University of Washington Press. Pp. 115–135. [Chapter about issues faced by “Native ethnographers” in a collection discussing the ongoing development of theory in anthropology, its challenges and directions.]

Lundy, Patricia and Mark McGovern. (2006). The Ethics of Silence: Action Research, Community “truth telling” and Post Conflict Transition in the North of Ireland. *Action Research* 4(1):49-64. [Discusses the role of ‘action research’ through a collaborative book project with members of a divided community seeking to document past violence.]

Lorde, Audre. (1981). The Master’s Tools Will Never Dismantle the Master’s House. In Cherrie Moraga and Gloria Anzaldúa (eds.), *This Bridge Called my Back: Writings by Radical Women of Color*, 261 pp. Watertown, MA: Persephone Press. Pp. 98-101. [An important essay in a collection of works by women of colour and feminists who variously address power, oppression and revolution as they apply to issues of race, class, gender and sexuality.]

Low, Setha M. and Sally Engle Merry. (2010). Engaged Anthropology: Diversity and Dilemmas. *Current Anthropology* 51(S2):S203-S226. [Introduction to a journal issue supplement outlining the concept, practice and dilemmas of engaged anthropology as it exists in the United States, and summarizing different forms of engaged anthropology discussed by contributors.]

Mandelbaum, David. (1973). The Study of Life History: Gandhi. *Current Anthropology* 14(3) :177-206. [Through the life story of Gandhi, the author uses multiple forms of documentary evidence to reveal the potential of life history studies in anthropology.]

Marcus, George E. and Dick Cushman. (1982). Ethnographies as Texts. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 11:25-69. [Article coauthored by one of the senior influential figures in the ‘representational turn’ in anthropology in the 1980s. The authors review ethnographic writing that signals the discipline’s self-critical awareness of its representation of ‘others’ in texts.]

Marcus, George E. and Michael M. J. Fischer (eds.). (1986). *Anthropology as Cultural Critique: An Experimental Moment in the Human Sciences*, 205 pp. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. [A widely known and cited work and one of the primary texts during an era of self-critical disciplinary attempts to reformulate approaches. Specifically concerned with critiquing ethnography as a method of representation.]

Marcus, George E. (1995). Ethnography in/of the World System: The Emergence of Multi-Sited Ethnography. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24:95-117. [Article written by the author whom popularized the term multi-sited ethnography. Describes a methodological shift as new and more complex research agendas form around subjects that transcend the local or singular fieldsite.]

Marcus, George E. (2006). "Where have all the tales of fieldwork gone?." *Ethnos* 71(1):113-122. [The author connects his perceived decline in the volume of ‘fieldwork stories’ shared by cultural anthropologists to a disciplinary shift in which researchers increasingly pursue topics that do not lend themselves to specific or singular geographic locations.]

Maskovsky, Jeff, and Ida Susser. (2016). A Critical Anthropology for the Present. In *After the Crisis: Anthropological Thought, Neoliberalism and the Aftermath*, 212 pp. New York: Routledge. Pp. 154-174. [Chapter discussing a decline in anthropology of critical approaches which make central issues of power, inequality and political economy, and identify new research directions for the critical tradition.]

McCarthy-Brown, Karen. (2001). *"Mama Lola." A Vodou Priestess in Brooklyn*, 447 pages. Berkeley, CA, University of California Press. [A polyphonic ethnography experimenting with fiction, focused on the apprenticeship and relationship between McCarthy-Brown and Mama Lola, a vodouan practitioner].

McIntosh, Janet. (2016). *Unsettled: Denial and Belonging Among White Kenyans*, 312 pp. Vol. 10. University of California Press. [An ethnographic study of the lives of white Kenyans following the country’s independence from Britain in 1963. The author examines how settler descendants position themselves morally in relation to the colonial past and with respect to national narratives of autochthony and belonging.]

McClellan, Catherine. (1970). *The Girl Who Married the Bear: A Masterpiece of Oral Tradition*. Ottawa: National Museums of Canada. 58 pp. (Publications in Ethnology). [This booklet presents one narrative

from the oral traditions of southern Yukon indigenous peoples, as told verbatim by eleven different storytellers. With supporting commentary by Catherine McClellan.]

Menchu, Rigoberta. (1984). *I..Rigoberta Menchu*, 251 pp. Ed. Elisabeth Burgos-Debray, trans. Ann Wright, London: Verso. [A powerful testimonio by Mayan activist Menchu, describing the experiences of indigenous people and others during the Guatemalan civil war. Later the subject of controversy.]

Miller, Bruce G. (2011). *Oral History on Trial: Recognizing Aboriginal Narratives in the Courts*, 213 pp. Vancouver: UBC Press. [Anthropologist and specialist of Aboriginal legal cases in Canada discusses how indigenous oral historical narratives or oral traditions may be incorporated in courts still largely guided by a European-centric, text-based legal system.]

Mintz, Sidney. (1985). *Sweetness and Power: The Place of Sugar in Modern History*, 274 pp. New York: Viking. [Traces the history of a single commodity—sugar—to elucidate a network of unfolding global trade relationships and their social aspects.]

Miyazaki, Hirokazu. (2006). *The Method of Hope: Anthropology, Philosophy, and Fijian knowledge*, 199 pp. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. [Fijian knowledge practices are a case study in this book about how hope comes from various forms of knowledge creation. The author also compares hope in a Fijian context with the concept in Western philosophy.]

Moretti, Cristina. (2015). *Milanese Encounters: Public Space and Vision in Contemporary Urban Italy*, 310 pp. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. [Ethnography of Milan examining group defining factors and incorporating analysis of the relationships between social practice and public space.]

Moretti, Cristina. (2011). The Wandering Ethnographer: Researching and Representing the City Through Everyday Encounters. *Anthropologica* 53(2): 245-255. [Article informed by material, spatial and affective theoretical frameworks analyzing complex social relations in Milan as they arise in everyday urban experience.]

Muehlebach, Andrea. (2013). On Precariousness and the Ethical Imagination: The Year 2012 in Sociocultural Anthropology. *American Anthropologist* 115(2):297–311. [Describes the pervasive ethic of the notion of precariousness in the discipline of anthropology and addresses the question of the goals of ethnography when faced with ‘things falling apart’.]

Mullins, Paul R. (2011). Practicing Anthropology and the Politics of Engagement: 2010 Year in Review. *American Anthropologist* 113(2):235–245. [Provides a 2010 review of advocacy, collaboration and activism in anthropology and recent works that have aimed to define the emerging practice of engaged anthropology.]

Muratorio, Blanca (1991). *The Life and Times of Father Alonso: Culture and History in the Upper Amazon*, 295 pp. New Brunswick / New Jersey: Rutgers University Press. [The life story of a Quichua man of the Ecuadorian Amazon, constructed using his family’s oral histories, contrasted with the author’s historical and ethnographic fieldwork of the societal context in which he lived.]

Myerhoff, Barbara and Jay Ruby. (1982). *A Crack in the Mirror: Reflexive Perspectives in Anthropology*, 299 pp. Jay Ruby (ed.). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. [A collection of essays about reflexivity in anthropology.]

Nader, Laura. (1972). Up the Anthropologist—Perspectives Gained from Studying Up. In D. H. Hymes (ed.) *Reinventing Anthropology*, 470 pp. New York: Pantheon. Pp. 284-311. [A classic and widely cited piece on insights gained from the experience of ‘studying up’.]

Nader, Laura. (2011). Ethnography as Theory. *Hau: Journal of Ethnographic Theory*. 1(1):211-219. [The author argues ethnography is not mere description, but has always been imbued with the guiding theoretical principles and frameworks adopted by the researcher. In this way ethnography is theory put into practice, which inevitably shapes research process, interpretations, and outcomes.]

Naples, Nancy A. (2003). Epistemology, Feminist Methodology and the Politics of Method. In *Feminism and Method: Ethnography, Discourse Analysis, and Activist Research*, 268 pp. New York: Routledge. Pp. 13-33. [Chapter in a book overviewing feminist theory and research methods that specifically addresses the epistemological positions or assumptions that may guide researchers to work within specific categories or forms of feminist research.]

Narayan, Kirin. (2012). *Alive in the Writing: Crafting Ethnography in the Company of Chekhov*, 168 pp. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. [A literary and biographical ethnography about the playwright Anton Chekhov doubling as a practical guide to combining empirical and creative writing to produce powerful and non-fiction works.]

Narayan, Kirin (1993). How native is a “native” anthropologist? *American Anthropologist* 95(3):671-686. [Issues a challenge to the categories of ‘foreign’ and ‘native’ anthropologist, and addresses assumptions surrounding ‘insider’ status and critical distance so often applied to Native anthropologists working within their home communities.]

Navaro-Yashin, Yael. (2012). *The Make-Believe Space: Affective Geography in a Postwar Polity*, 297 pp. Durham: Duke University Press. [An ethnography drawing upon material, spatial and affective frameworks to produce insight into subjective human experiences of Northern Cyprus, following its violent invasion by Turkey in 1974 and subsequent partition as a distinct landscape and polity.]

Ong, Aihwa. (2001). Colonialism and Modernity: Feminist Re-presentations of Women in Non-Western Societies. In Kum-Kum Bhavnani (ed.) *Feminism and Race*, 559 pp. Oxford / New York: Oxford University Press. Pp. 108-118. [Working from the basis that feminist subject identities are formed in the discovery of an ‘other’, the author argues that Western feminist thinkers encounter a problem with the same process of identification/de-identification in their efforts to understand women of the non-Western world.]

Passerini, Luisa. (1992). Introduction. In Luisa Passerini (ed.) *Memory and Totalitarianism*, 209 pp. Oxford / New York: Oxford University Press. Pp. 1-20. [Introductory chapter in which the author and editor of the volume provides an introduction to the phenomena of memory (and silence) in contexts of totalitarianism.]

Pauwels, Luke (2015) ‘Participatory’ Visual Research Revisited: A Critical-Constructive Assessment of Epistemological, Methodological and Social Activist Tenets. *Ethnography* 16(1):95-117. [This article combines a discussion of participatory and activist research with visual ethnographic methods, outlining and highlighting issues with two visual research methods historically used in the field.]

Personal Narratives Group (eds.), (1989). *Interpreting Women’s Lives: Feminist Theory and Personal Narratives*. 277 pp. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press. [Through individual research examples, a collection of international scholars present innovative interpretive and analytic approaches to studying women’s personal narratives and written documents.]

Portelli, Alessandro. (1991). What Makes Oral History Different. In Robert Perks and Alistair Thomson (eds.) *The Oral History Reader* (2006) (2nd Ed.), 578 pp. London / New York: Routledge. Pp. 32-42. [A specialist in oral histories describes features of oral history gathering—orality, the relation between interviewer and interviewee, narrative form, and working with memory—as lending strength to the research process.]

Pink, Sarah. (2011). Images, Senses and Applications: Engaging Visual Anthropology. *Visual Anthropology* 24(5):437-454. [A sensory ethnographer makes a case for recent practices in visual research as particularly valuable to addressing issues in public and applied anthropology.]

Plemmons, Dena and Alex Barker (eds.). (2015). A Short History of American Anthropological Ethics, Codes, Principles, Responsibilities—Professional and Otherwise. In Dena Plemmons and Alex Barker (eds.) *Anthropological Ethics in Context: An Ongoing Dialogue*, 249 pp. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press. Pp. 23-34. [A historical look at the development and application of codes of research ethics in American anthropology.]

Porcello, Thomas et al. (2010). The Reorganization of the Sensory World. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 39:51-66. [Reviews the rise of the sensory as a method of inquiry, providing detailed discussion of approaches to materiality, phenomenology and sense as advanced by noted scholars in this field.]

Povinelli, Elizabeth and Peter Cho. (2008). Digital Futures. *Vectors Journal*, Vectors.ucs.edu [An online interactive and collaborative project of mapping, storytelling and knowledge gathering offers an innovative approach to the potentials of digital anthropology.]

Povinelli, Elizabeth A. (2011). The Woman on the Other Side of the Wall: Archiving the Otherwise in Postcolonial Digital Archives. *Differences* 22(1):146-171. [Envisioning a postcolonial media archive in

northwestern Australia, Povineeli argues that it must sustain the 'otherwise' against structures of colonial power and its organization of knowledge and social life.]

Powdermaker, Hortense. (1966). *Stranger and Friend: The Way of an Anthropologist*. 315 pp. New York: WW Norton & Company. [Examines in detail the experience of conducting fieldwork in its interpersonal, subjective and objective aspects, commenting on the role of the anthropologist through fieldwork in Hollywood, Mississippi and the Rhodesian Copperbelt.]

Price, David. (2013). *Militarization and Anthropology*. Annotated bibliography, Oxford Bibliographies. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [A collection of sources relevant to the study of militarization in anthropology and discussion about their significance.]

Price, Richard. (1990). *Alabi's World*, 444 pp. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. [An ethnographic history examining the Dutch colony in Suriname and the slave trade, contrasting four distinct perspectives, their voices and their experiences.]

Price, Richard. (2011). *Travels with Tooy: History, Memory, and the African American Imagination*, 448 pp. Chicago / London: University of Chicago Press. [An innovative ethnographic exploration of the descendants of rebel African slaves who live in the rainforest of South America, focusing on the relationship with one individual in French Guiana.]

Rabinow, Paul. (1985). Discourse and Power: On the Limits of Ethnographic Texts. *Dialectical Anthropology* 10(1) and (2):1-14. [Engages contemporary disciplinary concerns about the ethnography as an authoritative representational tool, discussing in detail the ethnography as text and engaging scholarly critiques circulating around this fact.]

Rapport, Nigel. (2014). *Social and Cultural Anthropology: The Key Concepts*, 560 pp. (3rd Ed). Abingdon, Oxon / New York: Routledge. [A handbook and useful guide for students outlining major concepts relevant to theory and practice in anthropological research.]

Reed-Denahay, Deborah E. (ed.). (1997). *Auto/Ethnography: Rewriting the Self and the Social*, 277 pp. Oxford / New York: Berg. [Drawing from recent directions in postmodern, feminist and postcolonial theory, this collection discusses ethnographic practices in which the focus shifts to representing the self.]

Robertson, Leslie A and Kwagul Gixsam (2012). *Standing Up with Ga'axsta'las: Jane Constance Cook and the Politics of Memory, Church, and Custom*, 596 pp. Vancouver: UBC Press. [A collaboratively produced, ethnographic account of the life of a controversial Kwakwaka'wakw activist, told by her descendants through diverse genres of memory and contextualized within colonial histories.]

Rosaldo, Renato. (1980). Doing Oral History. *Social Analysis* 4:89-99. [Demonstrates the researcher's process of compiling partial truths from a range of perspectives in order to reconstitute past events in narrative form. The researcher's approaches to historical writing, to interpretation, and to employing oral sources as evidence each play their role in 'doing oral history.']

Ross, Fiona. (2003). On Having Voice and Being Heard: Some After-effects of Testifying Before the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission. *Anthropological Theory* 3(3): 325-341. [Article examining the roles of voice and memory in providing testimony to violent histories within the Truth and Reconciliation Commission in South Africa. The author demonstrates that control over personal histories and notions of selfhood are impacted by the circulation of testimonies in the public sphere.]

Riaño-Alcalá, Pilar. (2015). Emplaced Witnessing: Commemorative Practices among the Wayuu in the Upper Guajira. *Memory Studies* 8(3): 282-297. [This paper focuses on the powerful roles of witnessing and the restorative nature of commemorative practices of Wayuu people, following a massacre and mass displacement from their community in the Guajira region of Colombia.]

Rich, Adrienne. (1984). Notes Toward a Politics of Location. In Reina Lewis and Sara Mills (eds.) *Feminist Postcolonial Theory: A Reader*. 754 pp. (2003). New York / Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge. Pp. 29-42. [Text of a speech in which Rich introduces ideas about physical location and the individual body as positionalities from which subjectivity is experienced, categories such as race, sex and gender are identified.]

Rogers, Douglas. (2015). Oil and Anthropology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 44:365-80. [A review of anthropological and other disciplinary approaches to the broad subject of oil in all of its social

environmental, legal, and economic facets. The author identifies temporality and materiality as two analysis-shaping frames.]

Rutherford, Danilyn. (2012). Kinky Empiricism. *Cultural Anthropology* 27(3):465-479. [James Clifford and George E. Marcus's widely known book *Writing Culture* provides an impetus for this paper's interrogation of empiricism as it plays out in anthropological fieldwork and in formulations of the discipline, its past and future trajectories.]

Said, Edward W. (1978). *Orientalism*, 368 pp. New York: Pantheon Books. [A widely cited work describing a western fascination with observing an "Oriental Other"—those colonized, oppressed or otherwise subjugated by western imperial hegemony. The book has informed discussions of cultural representation, geographic imaginaries, and appropriation in scholarly and popular discourse.]

Said, Edward W. (1989). Representing the Colonized: Anthropology's Interlocutors. *Critical Inquiry* 15(2):205-225. [Details wider contemporary discussions about anthropology's crisis of representation and delivers a detailed outline of contemporary concerns about ethnographic research with "colonized" groups.]

Sangren, P. Steven. (1988). Rhetoric and the Authority of Ethnography: "Postmodernism" and the Social Reproduction of Texts. *Current Anthropology* 29(3):405-35. [Engages several concepts that within anthropology's postmodern turn. 'Reflexivity,' 'polyphony' and 'dialogue' are directly identified and critiqued for perceived limitations.]

Seguin, Margaret Anderson and Tammy Anderson Blumhagen. (1995). Memories and Moments: Conversations and Re-collections. *BC Studies* 104:69-83. [A portrait of social relations within a Tsimshian community arising from the collaboration of two women whose lives intersected in Hartley Bay, British Columbia. Research from the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (RCAP) 1996.]

Sanjek, Roger. (1990). A Vocabulary for Fieldnotes. In Rojer Sanjek (ed.) *Fieldnotes: The Makings of Anthropology*, 429 pp. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. Pp. 92-121. [Provides a breakdown of common features and types of fieldnotes, as part of a collection in which contributors describe their own fieldnote taking practices and discuss them in relation to ethnography and other genres of writing.]

Sarris, Greg. (1993). *Keeping Slug Woman Alive: A Holistic Approach to American Indian Texts*, 214 pp. Berkeley: University of California Press. [A collection of essays drawing upon the author's research interest in written and oral American Indian texts, focusing on storytelling and highlighting issues of cross-cultural communication and understanding.]

Sarris, Greg. (1992). "What I'm Talking about when I'm talking about My Baskets," Conversations with Mabel McKay. In Sidonie Smith and Julia Watson (eds), *De/colonizing the Subject: The Politics of Gender in Women's Autobiography*, 517 pp. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. Pp. 20-33. [Chapter describing a Pomo Indian basket weaver's visit to a Stanford University classroom, her unpredictable demonstration and dialogue with the students, and how these events present a lesson in cross-cultural communication and understanding.]

Scheper-Hughes, Nancy. (2004). Parts Unknown: Undercover Ethnography of the Organs-Trafficking Underworld. *Ethnography* 5(1):29-73. [A discussion of research ethics in engaged research involving the author's investigation of the illegal global organ trade.]

Scheper-Hughes, Nancy (2000). Ire in Ireland. *Ethnography* 1(1):117-140. [The author revisits the rural community of Ballybran in Ireland where she conducted research on mental illness for an ethnography later criticized as an invasion of small town privacy. Acknowledging the effects of ethnographic representation, raises questions about responsibility and reciprocity that anthropologists must consider.]

Scheper-Hughes, Nancy (1995). The Primacy of the Ethical: Propositions for a Militant Anthropology. *Current Anthropologist* 36(3):409-440. [The author makes an argument for the problem of cultural relativism in anthropology, arguing that it amounts to weak stances of moral relativism at a time when anthropologists should be staking firm ethical ground as part of morally and politically engaged research.]

Schwartz, Joan M. and Terry Cook. (2002). Archives, Records, and Power: The Making of Modern Memory. *Archival Science* 2(1-2):1-19. [An introductory article for two journal issues outlining a history of archival practice and its tremendous power for influencing societal organization and values.]

Seymour-Smith, Charlotte (ed.). (1986). *Dictionary of Anthropology*, 305 pp. Boston: McMillan. [Catalogue of terms relating to anthropology.]

Sillitoe, Paul (ed.). (2007). *Local Science vs. Global Science: Approaches to Indigenous Knowledge in International Development*, 288 pp. New York: Berghahn Books. [Drawing from a range of ethnographic examples and contexts and supported by discussions in science studies and environmental anthropology, this collection makes a case for the incorporation of local science and ways of knowing in power laden global international development projects.]

Singleton, Royce A. and Bruce C. Straits. (2002). Survey Interviewing. In Jaber F. Gubrium and James A. Holstein (eds.), *The Handbook of Interview Research: Context and Method*, 981 pp. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Pp. 59-82. [Chapter focusing on surveys conducted during in-person and telephone interviews, outlining concerns and considerations researchers should take into account in working with this method.]

Sissons, Jeffrey. (ed.). (2005). Oppressive Authenticity. In *First Peoples: Indigenous Cultures and Their Futures*, 173 pp. London: Reaktion Press. Pp. 37-59. [Chapter about the dynamic vitality of indigenous identities in Canada, New Zealand and USA, addressing the notion of 'authenticity' as applied to indigenous peoples and embedded in racist colonial attitudes and assumptions.]

Sider, Gerald M. (2009). Can Anthropology Ever be Innocent? *Anthropology Now* 1(1): 43-50. [Commentary on the benevolent intentions of anthropological researchers and the disciplinary and methodological impetus that typically drives research on human subjects—In anthropology, these are often less powerful groups experiencing inequality or conditions of struggle.]

Simpson, Audra. (2010). *Mohawk Interruptus: Political Life across the Borders of Settler States*, 260 pp. Durham: Duke University Press. [A political ethnographic study of Mohawk resistance to present day settler society governance, national identity and sovereignty, explicating a lengthy and unsettled colonial relationship between indigenous peoples of North America and the state.]

Sluka, Jeffrey and Antonius Robben (eds.). (2007). Fieldwork in Cultural Anthropology: An Introduction. In *Ethnographic Fieldwork: An Anthropological Reader*, 616 pp. Malden: Blackwell Publishing. Pp. 1-28. [Chapter describing the development and core concepts relating to anthropological fieldwork, its methods and practices.]

Smith, Rankin and Bertrand. (2005). University of Toronto, Social Sciences and Humanities Research Ethics Board (SSH REB). Guidelines for Ethical Conduct in Participant Observation, 5 pp. Accessed 24 May 2016 <http://www.research.utoronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/documents/2013/05/Participant-Observation-Guidelines.pdf> [The University of Toronto's online published guidelines for conducting participatory qualitative research with human subjects.]

Srinivasan, Ramesh, Robin Boast, Jonathan Furner, Katherine Becvar (2008) Digital museums and diverse cultural knowledges: Moving past the traditional Catalog. *The Information Society* 25(4), Accessed March 9 http://www.intelyway.com/administrator/arhivi/Vid_GajsekMUZEJI/DigMuseumsDiverseCultKnowledges.pdf. [This article describes how the advent of Web 2.0 and its incorporation in museum practice has produced new forms of public engagement and collaboration.]

Stewart, Kathleen. (2007). *Ordinary Affects*, 133 pp. Durham: Duke University Press. [An innovative ethnographic exploration of the United States informed by affect theory and its philosophical precursors, shows how such frameworks can powerfully access human social and material experience.]

Stocking, George Jr. (ed.). (1974). *A Franz Boas Reader: The Shaping of American Anthropology, 1883-1911*. 354 pp. Chicago: University of Chicago. [A collection of papers historically detailing the career of pioneering anthropologist Franz Boas, and his major influence on the development of American anthropology as an academic discipline.]

Stoler, Ann Laura. (2002). Colonial Archives and the Arts of Governance. *Archival Science* 2:87-109. [Using the example of Dutch East Indies document production, this article prompts interrogation of the power of the archive. The author argues researchers' engagement with archives should move beyond mere data mining or knowledge gathering to the study of the form of the archive itself as knowledge producer.]

Stoler, Ann Laura (2010). *Along the Archival Grain: Epistemic Anxieties and Colonial Common Sense*, 314 pp. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. [Describes the exercise of colonial power, its

knowledge producing, ordering and governance, through the production of the archive and its conventions.]

Stoler, Ann Laura (ed.). (2013). *Imperial Debris: On Ruins and Ruination*, 378 pp. Durham / London: Duke University Press. [Through a focus on materials that make up lived landscapes with violent histories of conflict, the editor of this collection moves beyond the study of ruins to develop a concept of ruination: a material/affective process by which imperial power is continually exercised in the present.]

Stoll, David. (1998). Life Story as Mythopoesis. *Anthropology News* 39(4):9-11. [Article exploring the concept of mythopoesis (the creation of stories that justify particular interpretations of world), as it applies to the case of Rigoberta Menchu, whose account blurred boundaries between fact and fiction.]

Strathern, Marilyn. (1987). An Awkward Relationship: The Case of Feminism and Anthropology. *Signs* 12(2):276-292. [Explores how feminist scholarship and its goals of upending conventions and structures of power presents a challenge. In particular, the relationship between feminism and anthropology is discussed.]

Sverker, Finnström. (2015). War Stories and Troubled Peace: Revisiting Some Secrets of Northern Uganda. *Current Anthropology* 56(12):222-230. [The author discusses participant observation in his field site of northern Uganda, where so often the realities of war remained unspoken, to demonstrate the challenges such situations present to an ethnographer's efforts to gather, interpret, and represent the story of a people and place.]

Tedlock, Barbara. (1991). From Participant Observation to the Observation of Participation: The Emergence of Narrative Ethnography. *Journal of Anthropological Research* 47(1): 69-9. [The author discusses a shift within the process of participant observation in which ethnographers have become more attentive to themselves as active participants in research situations.]

Tedlock, Barbara.. (2003). Ethnography and Ethnographic Representation. In Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln (eds.). *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry* (2nd Ed.), 460 pp. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Pp. 165-213. [The author discusses the process of writing ethnography as a representational practice, outlining its history and demonstrating its significance beyond its role as an end product of research. Ethnography is itself a method.]

Thompson, Paul. (2000). *Voice of the Past: Oral History*, 368 pp. Oxford / New York: Oxford University Press. [Discusses the rise of oral history methods, explores issues faced by scholars who adopt them, and offers general guidance on conducting oral history projects.]

Tremblay, Marc-Adélar (1983) Anthropology in Question: What Knowledge and Knowledge for What?, In F. Manning (édit.), *Consciousness and Inquiry : the Ethnology of Canadian Realities*, Ottawa, The National Museum of Man, The Mercury Series, p. 332-347. [An essay examining ethical choices in the process of applying anthropology.]

Trinh, Minh-ha T. (1989). *Women, Native, Other: Writing Postcoloniality and Feminism*, 173 pp. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press. [A literary-focused exploration of how women, and especially women of non-western societies, are studied and represented in scholarly research.]

Trouillot, Michel-Rolph. (1995). *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History*, 191 pp. Boston, Mass.: Beacon Press. [A critical analysis of historical narrative. Demonstrates ways that power is enacted in the making of history as some perspectives are elevated while others are 'silenced' or go unreported. The author provides examples of major global events.]

Trouillot, Michel-Rolph. (1990). Good Day Columbus: Silences, Power and Public History (1492–1892). *Public Culture* 3(1):1-24. [Using the example of the invention of the historical narrative of Columbus in the Americas, this article points to the workings of power that produce and naturalize particular versions of history.]

Trouillot, Michel-Rolph.. (1991). Anthropology and the Savage Slot: the Poetics and Politics of Otherness. In Richard Gabriel Fox (ed.). *Recapturing Anthropology Working in the Present*, 248 pp. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press. Pp. 17-44. [Addresses major shifts in anthropology's relationship with otherness (particularly indigeneity), and challenges the 'grand narratives' of modernism within anthropology's crisis of representation.]

Tuhiwai-Smith, Linda. (1999). *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*, 208 pp. London / New York: Zed Books. [A groundbreaking work aimed at upending the authoritative hold of the western academe, its philosophical underpinnings, conventions and its language, in order to redefine and reclaim engagements with indigenous issues.]

Underberg, Natalie and Elayne Zorn. (2013). *Digital Ethnography: Anthropology, Narrative, and New Media*. 128 pp. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press. [A collection about the use of digital media in anthropology and the humanities. Contributors discuss the application of digital methods in their projects.]

Varese, Stefano. (1997). Memories of Solidarity: Anthropology and the Indigenous Movement in Latin America. *Cultural Survival Quarterly* 21:3. [Historically traces the colonial relationship between European and American humanitarian scholars and indigenous peoples of Latin America, noting asymmetries and cultural misunderstandings that have been so difficult to surmount for scholars and activists, indigenous and non-indigenous alike].

Vidali, Debra Spitulnik. (2016). Multisensorial Anthropology: A Retrofit Cracking Open of the Field. *American Anthropologist*.
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com.ezproxy.library.ubc.ca/doi/10.1111/aman.12595/full> Accessed 16 May 2016. [An original article on the topic of multisensorially-focused anthropology, providing nine points which describe major insights, questions and directions this approach brings to the field.]

Wickwire, Wendy. (2005). Stories from the Margins: Toward a More Inclusive British Columbia Historiography. *Journal of American Folklore* 118(470):453-474. [Challenges popular understandings about First Nations histories in British Columbia as shaped by influential figures such as Franz Boas, drawing on the insights of Okanagan storyteller Harry Robinson (1900-1990) and incorporating insights from scholars emphasizing indigenous interpretations of the past.]

Weller, Susan C. (1998). Structured Interviewing and Questionnaire Construction. In H. Russell Bernard (ed.), *Handbook of Methods in Cultural Anthropology*, 785 pp. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press. Pp. 365-409. [Presents a discussion and guidelines for conducting qualitative research utilizing structured interviews and questionnaires.]

Wachowich, Nancy. (1999). In collaboration with Apphia Agalakti Awa, Rhoda Kaukjak Katsak and Sandra Pikajak Katsak, *Saqiyuq. Stories From The Lives of Three Inuit Women*, 301 pp. Montreal / Ithaca: McGill-Queen's University Press. [An anthropologist describes her life history project conducted in the Baffin Region of Canada's north and presents three generations of Inuit women's detailed life history accounts.]

Wachtel, Nathan. (1990). Introduction. In Marie-Noelle Bourget et al. (eds.) *Between Memory and History*, 196 pp. Harwood. Pp. 1-18. [Introduces the topic of oral history research projects and discusses issues surrounding historians' turn to oral testimony and living memory as sources.]

Weidman, Amanda (2014). Anthropology and Voice. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 43:37-51. [A review of the concept of voice in scholarship of the last several decades. The author explores how attention to voice has related to anthropological approaches to identity and subjectivity, and argues this emphasis affords particular access to intimate, sensory and affective revelations about social life.]

Wolf, Diane. (1996). Situating Feminist Dilemmas in Fieldwork. In Diane L. Wolf (ed.), *Feminist Dilemmas in Fieldwork*, 226 pp. Boulder: Westview Press. Pp. 1-55. [An introductory chapter in a volume about relations of power and politics of representation in research practice, especially as they relate to issues in feminism and feminist scholarship.]

Wolf, Eric R. (1982). *Europe and the People without History*, 503 pp. Berkeley: University of California Press. [Widely cited book by a political-economic anthropologist presenting a history of globalization and challenging entrenched colonial and capitalist ideologies that have shaped views of non-western societies and peoples in scholarship.]

Wolf, Margery. (1992). *A Thrice-Told Tale: Feminism, Postmodernism, and Ethnographic Responsibility*, 153 pp. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. [The author engages postmodern and feminist critiques leveled at ethnographic practice and representation of women in text, juxtaposing fieldnotes, fiction and a scholarly article produced from one incident in her research in Taiwan.]

Wax, Rosalie. (1971). *Doing Fieldwork: Warning and Advice*, 395 pp. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. [Presents an overview and guide to navigating the relational and methodological complexities of participant observation and fieldwork in general, recounting examples from the author's own research projects.]

Zeitlyn, David. (2012). Anthropology in and of the Archives: Possible Futures and Contingent Pasts. Archives as Anthropological Surrogates. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 41:461-480. [References major philosophical thinkers Derrida and Foucault to engage critiques of the archive as a knowledge creating tool. The author demonstrates power is exercised toward both hegemonic and subversive ends in productions and readings of the archive.]

Biographical Sketch

Leslie Robertson is an Associate Professor at the University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada. Broadly, Robertson's research examines the circulation of forms of social knowledge (public histories, academic theories and representations, colonial legends, medical discourses), in sensitive political and cultural contexts (settler colonialism, medical crises, resource extraction, tourism development). Recent research focuses on the afterlife of historical colonialism, how people from diverse cultural and social locations inhabit their histories, the imaginative resources they draw upon to speak about them, and the role of anthropology in translating and interpreting them. This includes attention to social projects linked to First Nations' goals of self-determination: the re-inhabitation of histories and territories, naming practices, traditional food activism, and cultural impact research. Dr. Robertson has developed a critical interest in community-generated and collaborative methodologies.