

Empirical Observations and Interpersonal Engagements Ethnography

Abdullah khan

PhD scholar of psychology D I Khan University at abdullah4584@gmail.com

Saqib Khattak

Professor University of DI Khan at Saqib545@gmail.com

Abstract

The geographical discipline is failing to capitalize on certain promising opportunities due to its ongoing neglect of ethnography. The discipline is profoundly harmed by the marginalization of ethnography, which offers unique insights into the motivations and processes that sustain social institutions. This neglect causes significant harm to the field. Landscapes are profoundly impacted and altered by the meanings and processes associated with the formation and transformation of specific localities, which differ from location to location. These processes and meanings significantly influence the formation and transformation of landscapes. As a result, ethnography provides a wealth of insights for geography researchers. There are three prevalent criticisms leveled against ethnography: its reliance on scientific principles, its inability to make generalizations, and its disregard for its own representational methods. These factors might potentially contribute to the elucidation of the frequent animosity observed towards ethnography within the academic sphere. It is essential to bear in mind, nevertheless, that incisive replies to these objections merely underscore the relevance of ethnography to the field of spatial studies.

Keyword: ethnography, meaning, place, process.

Introduction

According to this line of reasoning, ethnography can be of great assistance in elucidating the underlying meanings and processes that are responsible for the formation of sociospatial existence. In addition to this, it provides a succinct rationale for the increased significance of ethnography within the framework of Human Geography Research (HGR). Processes that are symbolically and semantically encoded are responsible for shaping the social and geographical situations in which humans find themselves. On a regular basis, human individuals participate in the reproduction and contestation of macrological structures through their localized acts, which are endowed with importance. This occurs as a result of the fact that human persons are social animals. Through shedding light on the inner workings of the complex relationship that exists between structure, agency, and the physical environment, ethnography sheds light on the significance of these occurrences as well as the dynamics that underlie them. The basic grounds for delivering this argument can be down into two categories. It is striking how little geography research is carried out through the use of participant observation.

Only three out of a total of eighty-five papers that focused on human geography topics and were published in the Annals of the Association of American Geographers between the years 1994 and 1998 included data that was acquired through ethnographic fieldwork. This was the case during the period that spanned from 1994 to 1998. Within the same time frame, a total of eight pieces were published in the academic magazine known as "Environment and Planning D: Society and Space." These

pieces accounted for around 5% of the overall corpus, which was comprised of 161 articles. It is important to highlight that the subject matter covered in this particular publication is limited to human geography, and the majority of the articles are devoted to qualitative research investigations. Even if human geography has been responsible for the production of a great number of important ethnographies, this method is still considered to be a supplementary one. The second justification relates to the fact that I am aware of the fact that earlier affirmations of ethnography (such as Smith, 1984; Jackson, 1985; Ley, 1981; 1988) did not place as much of an emphasis on the role of meanings and processes as this particular piece does. My concentration on processes and meanings is warranted within the context of the contemporary intellectual environment on account of the pervasiveness of many theoretical frameworks, including structuralism, feminism, postmodernism, and cultural studies.

In spite of the fact that they are different, each of these examples demonstrates the way in which social order is intricately woven into everyday practices and the way in which the meanings and discursive frameworks that accompany them affect both the understandings of persons inside social contexts and the behaviors that they engage in within those contexts. By conducting in-depth research into the routine activities of a culture's inhabitants, ethnography is able to provide light on the complex mechanisms that underlie social interaction, the upkeep of social order, and the emergence of unforeseen obstacles. A sequential process that may be broken down into three separate stages is what the individual goes through. To get things started, I'm going to give a detailed explanation of what exactly ethnography is. In this particular context, it is of the utmost importance to refrain from conflating ethnography with other qualitative approaches, such as interviews, and to exercise extreme caution whenever doing so. Ethnography is a different method that can be used to investigate the breadth and complexity of the experiences that individuals have had in their lives. In addition, I will investigate the possible contributions that ethnography could make to the study of human geography.

As was said in the introduction, the primary objective of this line of investigation is to investigate the various ways in which meanings and processes are involved in the production of sociospatial existence. Ethnography is a powerful research method that offers substantial advantages when it comes to shining light on the intricate interplay that exists between the internal dynamics of a social group and the physical reality that the group shapes. Its exhaustive examination and painstaking attention to detail make it particularly effective in illuminating this extensively debated connection. An in-depth examination of the ways in which different social groups demarcate, inhabit, regulate, and exert influence over physical locations can be an efficient method for gaining a better understanding of the dynamic link that exists between place and agency. In spite of the numerous benefits that are connected with ethnography, the validity and reliability of certain of its findings are occasionally called into question. In the following section, I will elaborate on three common criticisms of ethnographic research: first, the argument that its subjectivity makes it "unscientific"; second, the assertion that its limited scope impedes the formulation of broader theories and generalizations; and third, the observation that it disregards the contextual factors

surrounding its own creation, thereby uncritically perpetuating representational practices and power differentials that necessitate ethnographic research. While it is necessary to acknowledge the truth of these concerns, it is also important not to advocate for the entire elimination of ethnography. The field of ethnography can be given a new lease on life by providing thoughtful replies to these problems, which also serve to highlight the invaluable potential that ethnography possesses within the discipline of human geography.

What is ethnography?

Similar to other research methods, ethnography can take several forms (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1983). As a result, attempts to provide a clear definition of ethnography risk obscuring important methodological differences. However, it is widely understood that participant observation, a research method in which the researcher devotes considerable time to observe and participate with a social group, is the fundamental base of ethnography. The ethnographer gains a deep grasp of the group's social cohesion processes, including the intricate web of interpersonal connections and cultural frameworks, as a result of these empirical observations and interpersonal engagements. According to Ley (1988:121), this study's overarching goal is to better comprehend people's actions and motivations as rational decision-makers. In particular, it hopes to shed light on how people understand the many opportunities and setbacks they encounter on a daily basis.

Ethnographers can learn about the knowledge and underlying frameworks of meaning that shape and inform social behavior by conducting studies into the components of a society that are typically disregarded or assumed. Unlike other qualitative research methods, such as interviews, ethnography takes a more in-depth look at the group's day-to-day life. Ethnographers study cultural practices and symbolic systems to learn something new about humankind. Every group of people, whether they be criminals, members of primitive communities, pilots, or patients, builds a way of life that, as one learns more about it, becomes more meaningful, logical, and in line with societal norms. Goffman (1961:ix-x) argues that participating completely in the daily conditions that members of various social contexts face is the best way to learn about them. Researchers play a wide range of roles in the group's operations. Some researchers take into account the full scope of the social function under study to better grasp the viewpoints of the people they are studying. The authors Buroway (1979) and Rubinstein (1973) acted as factory workers and cops, respectively.

There will be some level of contact between researchers regardless of how much they try to keep their distance from one another (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1983). Most ethnographers, according to Van Maanen (1988), make an effort to find a happy medium between these two poles. In order to do this, they shift between taking an insider's and an outsider's perspective, trying to understand the nuances of the observed setting by using theoretical frameworks (Lofland, 1976). Researchers in the area of ethnography must take on a dual perspective, listening to and learning from the people they are studying while also viewing their findings through the analytical lens of a theoretically sophisticated and methodologically savvy social scientist. Ethnographers typically opt for a broad approach when conducting research in the

field (Atkinson and Hammersley, 1994), which necessitates the use of empathy as well as a continuous and introspective discourse with theoretical frameworks that may appear detached or objective. Unstructured data, which is information that has not been sorted or filed according to predetermined criteria, is something with which ethnographers tend to be unusually at ease.

It is usual for theory to be built from the ground up when an ethnographer conducts significant fieldwork and helps a new social order emerge (Glaser and Straus, 1967; Eyles, 1988). As a result, the researcher needs a healthy dose of empathy to understand how people in the social realm view and value the phenomenon under study. It can be difficult for ethnographers to develop empathetic understanding when their work relies on the examination of discrete categories to arrive at a holistic picture of social action. When compared to methodologies like surveys and prearranged interviews, ethnography stands out for its emphasis on spontaneous, unscripted conversations between researchers and their subjects. Ethnographers argue that order in the field will emerge organically rather than be imposed from without. The assumption that ethnography is purely an inductive endeavor is, however, false and counterproductive (Bulmer, 1979). Buraway (1991) argues that before researchers can begin collecting data, they must first develop a conceptual framework.

The vast majority of ethnographers also spend time analyzing and interpreting their findings. However, most ethnographers avoid sensationalized interpretations that cloud the underlying mechanisms by which social life develops and acquires meaning. Their profound understandings come as a natural result of their incorporation into the community as a whole (Loftand, 1995). In addition, unlike surveys and interviews, ethnography relies heavily on seeing and evaluating the actions and words of its subjects. This allows for a thorough investigation of any discrepancies between ideas and actions (Eyles, 1988). In an in-depth investigation of an urban community, Liebow (1967) found that participants' self-reported perceptions differed significantly from objective fact. According to Liebow's research, this disagreement might be attributed to the impact of systemic influences on local interpersonal dynamics. Ethnography has a distinct advantage over other techniques, such as open-ended interviews, because of its ability to juxtapose actions and words. Ethnographic research stands out due to its capacity to appeal to the researcher's feelings and intuitions.

It is important to take into account and investigate the many sensory qualities, such as flavors, aromas, textures, and sounds, that contribute to a community's life in order to fully grasp and appreciate the group's lived experience (Adler & Adler, 1994). Nash and Wintrob (1972:532) argue that an ethnographer is a holistic scientist, whose reputation and rapport with study participants are crucial to determining the reliability of their findings. This phenomenon is especially important to geographers since it is via the existence of symbolic markers and the participation in sensory-based activities that humans create emotional connections to specific locales. The group has strong feelings about their location, thus it's important that the researcher respect and include those feelings in their study. Consider, too, that the researcher's own biases and feelings might color the results. In the course of my work with the Los Angeles

Police Department, I witnessed a firsthand instance of the emotional response described by Herbert (1997) at a suicide scene.

Law enforcement officers present their job as one best suited for emotionally tough people, and the mockery I received when I expressed my sadness and discomfort was indicative of this. The investigation of this event exemplifies yet another crucial feature of ethnography: the discipline's self-aware reliance on interpretation. In the following study, it will be argued that all techniques are open to interpretation, despite the fact that ethnographers are typically very forthcoming about their methods. This occurs because human interaction is inherently complicated and rarely follows a simple, predictable pattern. The meaning of things and situations are often communicated through routines, responses, cryptic remarks, and facial expressions. Ethnographers believe that interpretations of social existence will once again reveal themselves indirectly through the means of actions and verbal expressions, as opposed to persons who participate in surveys and interviews. As the ethnographer has a deeper understanding of the cultural milieu to which the observed behaviors belong, she is able to draw the aforementioned conclusions.

Why anthropology is important

The distinctive qualities of ethnography are not restricted only to the methods that it employs; rather, they stem from an in-depth grasp of the fundamental nature of social behavior. In the following discussion, I will concentrate on two primary facets. One has to begin by gaining a grasp of the ways in which normal social processes simultaneously maintain and undermine bigger societal institutions. The second section is comprised of collections of meanings that are the result of communal construction and are emblematic of daily activities. Within the framework of social and spatial existence, the significance and workings of the mechanisms underlying these meanings and activities are of the utmost importance. For this reason, ethnography ought to direct the majority of its focus toward the investigation of these aspects. There is a general acknowledgment, within the area of contemporary social theory, of the connectivity and mutual influence of human activity and social structures (Thrift, 1983; Giddens, 1984; Pred, 1986).

This recognition has been around for quite some time. Structures that are limited to day-to-day activities place barriers in the path of human agents, making it more difficult for them to gain access to new skills and opportunities. Because of this, the processes via which agents and structures come together to form unions and, on occasion, separate from one another are thrust into the spotlight. Abstract assessments of social structures could provide useful insights, but they frequently mask the specific ideas, language, acts, conventions, and beliefs that have a more localized influence on behavior. This is because abstract evaluations of social structures are typically more general in scope. Therefore, rather than engaging in ontological speculations, it is necessary to engage the continuous discourse surrounding the interplay between structure and agency within the arena of practical application (Smith, 1984: 364). However, a thorough compendium that covers everything from the most significant to the most insignificant aspects of regular life might not be entirely helpful.

However, it is essential to keep in mind that ethnography that is founded in theory and exhibits a grasp of social structures can provide insights into the processes by which these structures are generated as a result of the events and disruptions that occur in day-to-day life. These frameworks are put into action by human agents, who may, on occasion, call them into question and contest them based on the intersubjective understandings that ascribe meaning to the acts that they do. The significant significance of symbolic meaning within social transactions is best demonstrated through rituals. Some examples of such rituals include marriages, communions, and commencement ceremonies. However, seemingly meaningless behaviors like as shrugging one's shoulders or blinking one's eyes have significance. Diagrams are frequently utilized in the work of ethnographers as a means of analyzing the grammatical structure of meaning systems.

This is done with the intention of providing a better knowledge of the elements that are responsible for human activities. Human beings are fundamentally driven to engage in activities like as consumption, reproduction, and the maintenance of their well-being in order to satisfy the biological imperatives that govern their existence. However, the existence of shared cultural institutions is what gives these acts the required significance in order for them to be considered significant. Therefore, it is essential to conduct an in-depth study of the socio-geographic aspects of human existence, paying special attention to the influence that different meaning systems have on a variety of behaviors, such as the establishment of locations and the use of symbolic markers. In the following discussion, I will elaborate on each of these presumptions and provide examples to back up my points.

I Processes

Using ethnography, we can learn more about the relationships between large-scale and small-scale phenomena, such as the consistency of daily living and the orderliness of social life. Ethnographers focus almost exclusively on this aspect of the topic, with other academics choosing to ignore the topic at a more global level. However, a thorough investigation is necessary to adequately illustrate the dynamic mechanisms underlying structure generation, replication, and rejection (Katz, 1991). In addition to the structural study, a thorough examination of the flesh and tissue is required. According to Jackson (1985: 166), one advantage of ethnography is that it enables academics to look at how structures play out in concrete social actions. Take gender into account. There are observable patterns in gender roles, yet these patterns vary considerably.

There are strong cultural pressures on transgender people and those who don't fit into the binary to conform to masculine or feminine gender stereotypes. Gagne and Tewksbury (1998) found that transgender people are subjected to harsh criticism from a wide range of people, including their peers, employers, partners, and even other transgender people, as they work toward a new gender identity. In a nutshell, those who don't conform to traditional gender roles face discrimination and prejudice when they try to integrate into mainstream society. In addition, the fact that some people go through transitioning serves to highlight the broad successes of gender (West and Zimmerman, 1987). The speech standards, mannerisms, and activities associated with

these roles are all learned behaviors (Garfinkel, 1967) that are put into practice. Miller (1983) and Smith (1989) argue that many women follow a routine that is inextricably tied to the workplace, the home, and the classroom, and that serves to maintain their lower social position. Consciously and unconsciously, gender norms are maintained in the workplace through men and women's differing perspectives, reproduction, exploitation, and questioning of expected behaviors (Wright, 1997).

Jennifer Hunt's (1984) account of her efforts to break down gender barriers in the police force and gain acceptance from her male colleagues is illuminating. She expertly shifted between stereotypically masculine and feminine behaviors to win over her skeptical coworkers. Transgressions of gender norms in everyday life are possible because gender is a multidimensional notion that includes both performative behaviors and societal structures. The relevance of location in the formation and spread of gender norms cannot be overstated. Geographical setting influences the expression of gender roles, which in turn shapes the standards of male and female behavior that are considered appropriate in society. The already-large gender gap can widen much greater in a public setting, especially on the road. Women's views of men and their safety-related actions are profoundly affected by the issue under examination (Painter, 1992; Gardner, 1995). Women who behave in this way unwittingly contribute to the stereotype that men are in charge of public settings. Gender norms are reinforced and challenged through the manipulation of the built environment.

Ethnographies of rural areas, such as those by Carney and Watts (1991), Cooper (1997), and Schroeder (1997), show that gender politics and farming are often intertwined. The deployment of all-encompassing development methods has only increased the inherent instability of these dynamics. There may be pushback if people see that these programs are legitimizing women's roles as primary producers. The concerns over maintaining gender standards at home are exacerbated by the resistance shown here. Therefore, gender dynamics arise from, are challenged by, and become geographically evident in the course of daily actions that try to create a harmonious division of labor between the sexes at the local level and the broader economic development processes at the macro level. The study of social stratification, particularly class, has proven fruitful as well. There is no denying the structural structure of the underlying principles controlling class relations and the spectrum of possible class positions. While socioeconomic status is certainly a factor, it's crucial to recognize the cultural influences that play a role as well.

An individual's position within the economic system is significantly influenced by the process of acculturation, which includes the adoption of certain behaviors and the acquisition of specific information (Bourdieu, 1984). Willis (1977) performed a comprehensive study on a group of English teenage boys, which is considered a seminal analysis. The research showed that those who rejected affluent society had less employment and educational opportunities. They maintained and spread their social class positions by seemingly inconsequential behaviors, such as complaining about professors or skipping class. Winchester and Costello (1995) found that homeless youth had a propensity to oppose societal norms, despite the fact that their marginalization is demonstrated to perpetuate itself in both social and spatial contexts.

Finally, the state, widely regarded as a powerful and influential institution, must be taken into account.

The general conception of a state is that it is a collection of institutions with the authority to enforce order and the power to allocate resources and opportunities among its citizens. Border patrols, immigration controls, law enforcement, and censuses are only few of the many operations that fall under the purview of the state and are carried out regularly. By carefully examining these events, Calavita (1992) and Herbert (1997) show how state authority is conditional and how state institutions are riven by internal strife and inconsistent policies. External opposition and internal defects prevent state actors from achieving total authority (Scott, 1985), hence the state's aspirations frequently exceed its capabilities. Everyday governmental functions are shown to be as complex, dynamic, and ever-evolving as the removal of the skin of a pure and divine entity. Ethnography allows for the assessment of crucial moments where macro and micro forces cross, and where constraints and unforeseen occurrences sporadically alter and disturb everyday life, by undertaking a thorough investigation of these processes.

Those geographers who study the development and habitation of landscapes as well as the mechanisms by which structures are realized within the everyday motions and conditions of human behavior will find this study extremely instructive. Geographers have long held the view that both global and local scales of interaction are affected by the surrounding environment. Further, they claim that the actual instances of this mixing can be found by spatial analysis (Thrift, 1983; Pred, 1986). Scholars like Myers (1996) and Nigar (1997) highlight the importance of grassroots struggles over street names and commercial architecture in the geographical literature. Disputes emerge over the identification and development of geographical sites because persons or organizations with different levels of institutional power and different perspectives on the intended symbolism and purpose of the region engage in these discussions. When both major and minor issues converge on a given region, localized conflicts might develop.

Conclusion

The neglect of ethnography within the field of geography undermines the integrity of the discipline. If Gregory (1989:358) is accurate in his claim that "the devaluation of the unique characteristics of location and individuals was a significant betrayal within the field of modern geography," then the act of conducting further and improved ethnographic research would seem to be the sole means of making amends for this violation inside the discipline. No other research approach allows scholars to examine the complex connections between social groupings and the surroundings they inhabit, grow, promote, safeguard, govern, and revere. If the objective of geography is to examine the interconnection between sociality and space, then a greater emphasis on ethnography is necessary. This assertion holds particular relevance in contemporary times. The interplay between macro-level social phenomena and micro-level dynamics is a pivotal juncture in social existence, as posited by several contrasting viewpoints. In this particular case, ethnography serves as a notable methodological progression since it facilitates the examination of the mechanisms and interpretations that

underpin everyday existence. Hence, it offers valuable perspectives on the interconnectedness or divergence between everyday life and the overarching structural demands that define the spectrum of human possibilities.

Due to the contextual nature of these processes and meanings, the ethnographer possesses distinct expertise in elucidating the significance of place in the reconfiguration or dismantling of societal existence. It is important to note that the assertion being made does not purport ethnography to be the quintessential scientific approach. I have encountered three robust critiques of ethnography, which occasionally possess sound arguments. Nevertheless, upon careful examination of these criticisms, it becomes evident that they are not insurmountable. The diligent ethnographer has the ability to acknowledge these potential challenges and generate research that effectively encompasses both the macro and micro perspectives. This type of work not only enlightens us about the specific characteristics of a particular group, but also imparts valuable theoretical insights that can be derived from studying the group. Strathern (1991: xx) argues that when one is able to pose significant inquiries based on limited data, the dichotomy between large and small data becomes irrelevant.

The ethnographic effort delineated in this discourse is both indispensable and arduous. Focusing on the examination of structure or providing detailed descriptions of daily experiences is notably more manageable (Katz, 1991). Establishing links between the macro and micro levels necessitates the possession of two key attributes: the capacity to engage in empathetic observation and a high level of theoretical acumen. In addition, it is necessary to foster an interactive and ongoing discourse between theoretical frameworks and empirical evidence. Nevertheless, the advantages surpass the difficulties. In order to deepen our comprehension of the division and agitation of human agents and social structures in everyday geographical contexts, it is imperative for geography to integrate increasingly rigorous ethnographic methods.

REFERENCES

- Abbott, A. 1997: *Of time and space: the contemporary relevance of the Chicago school*. *Social Forces* 75, 1149–82.
- Adler, P. and Adler, P. 1994: *Observational techniques*. In Denzin, N. and Lincoln, S., editors, *Handbook of qualitative research*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 377–92.
- Anderson, E. 1999: *Code of the street: decency, violence and the moral life of the inner city*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Atkinson, P. 1990: *The ethnographic imagination: textual constructions of reality*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Atkinson, P. and Hammersley, M. 1994: *Ethnography and participant observation*. In Denzin, N. and Lincoln, S., editors, *Handbook of qualitative research*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 248–61.
- Basso, K. 1984: *Stalking with stories: names, places and moral narratives among the western Apache*. In Platter, S., editor, *Text, play and story: the construction and reconstruction of self and society*, Washington, DC: American Ethnological Society, 19–55.
- Bourdieu, P. 1984: *Distinction: a social critique of the judgement of taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Brown, M. 1997: *RePlacing citizenship*. New York:

- Guilford Press. Bulmer, M. 1979: Concepts in the analysis of qualitative data. *Sociological Review* 27, 651–77.
- Buroway, M. 1979: *Manufacturing consent: changes in the labor process under monopoly capitalism*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.———1991: *Ethnography unbound: power and resistance in the modern metropolis*. Berkeley, CA, and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Calavita, K. 1992: *Inside the state: the Bracero Program, immigration and the INS*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Carney, J. and Watts, M. 1991: Disciplining women: rice, mechanization, and the evolution of Mandinka gender relations in Senegambia. *Signs* 16, 651–81.
- Cicourel, A. 1964: *Method and measurement in sociology*. New York: Free Press.
- Clark, G.L. 1998: Stylized facts and close dialogue: methodology in economic geography. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 88, 73–87.
- Clifford, J. and Marcus, G. 1986: *Writing culture: the poetics and politics of ethnography*. Berkeley, CA, and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Cooper, B. 1997: Gender, movement and history: social and spatial transformation in 20th century Mardi, Niger. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 15, 195–227.
- Demeritt, D. 1996: Social theory and the reconstruction of science and geography. *Transactions, Institute of British Geographers* 21, 484–503.
- Denzin, N. 1997: *Interpretive ethnography: ethnographic practice for the 21st century*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Douglas, J. 1976: *Investigative social research: individual and team field research*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Eliasoph, N. 1996: Making a fragile public: a talkcentered study of citizenship and power. *Theoretical Sociology* 14, 262–89.
- Emerson, R., Fretz, R. and Shaw, L. 1995: *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Eyles, J. 1988: Interpreting the geographical world: qualitative approaches in geographical research. In Eyles, J. and Smith, D., editors, *Qualitative methods in human geography*, Totawa, NJ: Barnes & Noble, 1–16.
- Fetterman, D. 1998: *Ethnography step by step*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gagne, P. and Tewksbury, R. 1998: Conformity pressures and gender resistance among transgendered individuals. *Social Problems* 45, 81–101.
- Gans, H. 1967: *The Levittowners: ways of life and politics in a new suburban community*. New York: Pantheon.
- Gardner, C. 1995: *Passing by: gender and public harassment*. Berkeley, CA, and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Garfinkel, H. 1967: *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Giddens, A. 1984: *The constitution of society: outline of the theory of structuration*. Berkeley, CA, and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Gieryn, T. 1999: *Cultural boundaries of science: credibility on the line*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Glaser, B. and Strauss, A. 1967: *The discovery of grounded theory: strategies for qualitative research*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Goffman, E. 1961: *Asylums: essays on the social situation of mental patients and other inmates*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Gregory, D. 1989: *The crisis of modernity? Human geography and critical social theory*. In Peet, R. and Thrift, N., editors, *New models in geography: the political economy perspective*, London: Unwin Hyman, 348–85.
- Hammersley, M. and Atkinson, P. 1983:

- Ethnography: principles in practice. London and New York: Tavistock. Harraway, D. 1988: Situated knowledges: the science question in feminism as a site of discourse on the privilege of partial perspective. *Feminist Studies*14, 575–99.
- Herbert, S. 1997. Policing space: territoriality and the Los Angeles Police Department. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press. Holstein, J. and Gubrium, J. 1994: Phenomenology, ethnomethodology and interpretive practice. In Denzin, N. and Lincoln, S., editors, *Handbook of qualitative research*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 262–72.
- Hunt, J. 1984: The development of rapport through the negotiation of gender in field work among police. *Human Organization*43, 283–96.
- Jackson, P. 1985: Urban ethnography. *Progress in Human Geography*9, 157–76.----1991: The crisis of representation and the politics of position. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*9, 131–34.
- Katz, C. 1991: Sow what you know: the struggle for social reproduction in rural Sudan. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 81, 488–514.----1994: All the world is staged: intellectuals and the projects of ethnography. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*10, 495–510.
- Keith, M. 1994: Angry writing: (re)presenting the unethical world of the ethnographer. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 10, 551–68.
- Knorr-Cetina, K. 1981: The manufacture of knowledge: an essay on the constructivist and contextual nature of science. Oxford: Pergamon. Latour, B. 1987: *Science in action: how to follow scientists and engineers through society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Law, J. and Williams, R. 1982: Putting the facts together: a study of scientific persuasion. *Social Studies of Science* 12, 535–58.
- Leo, R. 1995: Trial and tribulations: courts, ethnography, and the need for an evidentiary privilege for academic researchers. *The American Sociologist* 26, 113–3.
- Ley, D. 1974: *The black inner city as frontier outpost*. Washington, DC: The Association of American Geographers.----1981: Behavioral geography and philosophies of meaning. In Cox, K. and Colledge, R, editors, *Behavioral problems in geography revisited*, New York and London: Methuen, 209–30.----1988: Interpretive social research in the inner city. In Eyles, J., editor, *Research in human geography*, Oxford: Blackwell, 121–38.
- Liebow, E. 1967: *Tally's Corner: a study of Negro streetcorner men*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown. Lofland, J. 1976: *Doing social life: the qualitative study of human interaction in natural settings*. New York: Wiley.----1995: Analytic ethnography: features, failings and futures. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*24, 30–67.
- Lynch, M. 1985: *Art and artifact in laboratory science: a study of shop work and shop talk in a research laboratory*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul. Marcus, G. 1994: What comes (just) after 'post'? The case of ethnography. In Denzin, N. and Lincoln, S., editors, *Handbook of qualitative research*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 563–74.----1999: *Ethnography through thick and thin*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Marcus, G. and Fisher, M. 1986: *Anthropology as cultural critique*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. Merry, S. 1981: *Urban danger: life in a neighborhood of*

- strangers. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press. Miller, R. 1983: *The Hoover in the garden: middle-class women and suburbanization, 1850–1920*. Environment and Planning D: Society and Space 1, 73–87. Mitchell, C. 1983: Case and situation analysis. *Sociological Review* 31, 187–211. Myers, F. 1988: Locating ethnographic practice: romance, reality, and politics in the Outback. *American Ethnologist* 15, 609–24.
- Myers, G. 1996: Naming and placing the other: power and the urban landscape in Zanzibar. *Tijdschrift Voor Economische en Sociale Geografie* 87, 237–46. Nash, D. and Wintrob, R. 1972: The emergence of self-consciousness in ethnography. *Current Anthropology* 13, 527–42. Nigar, R. 1997: The making of Hindu communal organizations, places and identities in postcolonial Dar Es Salaam. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 15, 707–30.
- Oliver, W. 1994: *The violent social world of black men*. New York: Lexington Books. Painter, K. 1992: Different worlds: the spatial, temporal and social dimensions of female victimization. In Evans, D., Fyfe, N. and Herbert, D., editors, *Crime, policing and place*, London and New York: Routledge, 164–95.
- Pile, S. 1991: Practising interpretative geography. *Transactions, Institute of British Geographers* 16, 458–69.
- Pratt, M.L. 1992: *Imperial eyes: travel writing and transculturation*. London and New York: Routledge. Pred, A. 1986: Place, practice and structure: social and spatial transformation in southern Sweden, 1750-1850. Totowa, NJ: Barnes & Noble. Rengert, G. 1997: Review symposium. *Urban Geography* 18, 468–69. Rubinstein, J. 1973: *City police*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux.
- Runstrom, R. and Kenzer, M. 1989: The decline of fieldwork in human geography. *The Professional Geographer* 41, 294–303.
- Sangren, P.S. 1988: Rhetoric and the authority of ethnography. *Current Anthropology* 29, 405–24.
- Sayer, A. 1991: Behind the locality debate: deconstructing geography's dualisms. *Environment and Planning A* 23, 283–308. Schoenberger, E. 1991: The corporate interview as a research method in economic geography. *The Professional Geographer* 43, 180–89. Schroeder, R. 1997: 'Re-claiming' land in The Gambia: gendered property rights and environmental intervention. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 87, 487–508.
- Scott, J. 1985: *Weapons of the weak: everyday forms of peasant resistance*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. Sewell, W. 1992: A theory of structure: duality, agency and transformation. *American Journal of Sociology* 98, 1–29.
- Short, J. 1998: The level of explanation problem revisited. *Criminology* 36, 3–36.
- Silverman, D. 1985: *Qualitative methods and sociology*. Aldershot: Gower. Smith, D. 1987: *Everyday world as problematic: a feminist sociology*. Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press. Smith, D. 1989: Women's work as mothers: a new look at the relation of class, family and school achievement. *Perspectives on Social Problems* 1, 109–25.
- Smith, S. 1984: Practising humanistic geography. *Annals of the Association of the American Geographers* 74, 353–74. ---1988: Constructing local knowledge: the

- analysis of self in everyday life. In Eyles, J. and Smith, D., editors, *Qualitative methods in human geography*, Totawa, NJ: Barnes & Noble, 17–38.
- Stacey, J. 1988: Can there be a feminist ethnography? *Women's Studies International Forum* 11, 21–27.
- Staeheli, L. and Lawson, V. 1994: A discussion of women in the field: the politics of feminist fieldwork. *The Professional Geographer* 46, 96–102.
- Stanley, L. and Wise, S. 1990: Method, methodology and epistemology in feminist research. In Stanley, L., editor, *Feminist praxis*, London and New York: Routledge, 20–60.
- Strathern, M. 1991: *Partial connections*. Savage, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Thomas, J. 1993: *Doing critical ethnography*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Thrift, N. 1983: On the determination of social action in space and time. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 1, 23–57.
- Van Maanen, J. 1988: *Tales of the field: on writing ethnography*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Walton, J. 1992: Making the theoretical case. In Ragin, C. and Becker, H., editors, *What is a case? Exploring the foundations of social inquiry*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 121–37.
- Wax, M. 1980: Paradoxes of 'consent' to the practice of fieldwork. *Social Problems* 27, 272–83.
- Weider, D. 1974: *Language and social reality: the case of telling the convict code*. The Hague: Mouton.
- West, C. and Zimmerman, D. 1987: Doing gender. *Gender and Society* 1, 125–51.
- Western, J. 1992: *A passage to England: Barbadian Londoners speak of home*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Willis, P. 1977: *Learning to labor: how working class kids get working class jobs*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Winchester, H. and Costello, L. 1995: Living in the street: social organization and gender relations of Australian street kids. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 13, 329–48.
- Wright, M. 1997: Crossing the factory frontier: gender, place and power in the Mexican maquiladora. *Antipode* 29, 278–302.