Chapter 9

ETHNOGRAPHY IN PSYCHOLOGICAL RESEARCH

Elizabeth Fein and Jonathan Yahalom

Copyright American Psychological Association. Not for further distribution.

WHAT IS ETHNOGRAPHY?

Our psychological lives are profoundly intertwined with our surrounding worlds. Similar child-rearing techniques produce very different outcomes, depending on the broader values of the community within which they are used (Chao, 1994; Chapin, 2014). Psychotherapies that encourage cathartic displays of feeling can be healing in societies privileging emotional self-expression but damaging in societies that prioritize emotional composure (Christopher et al., 2014). Even our vulnerability to optical illusions is influenced by the kinds of spaces we've lived in throughout our lives (Henrich et al., 2010). *Ethnography* is a research sensibility and method that attends to these processes: to the ways that the structures, materials, expectations, and beliefs around us inevitably shape our ways of being in the world.

The word "ethnography" derives from the Greek words *ethnos* (meaning people, nation, class, caste, or tribe) and *graphia* (meaning to write). Contemporary use of the term *ethnography* involves the immersion of the researcher into the everyday, natural, ordinary environments of other people—however people might be distinguished according to nationality, culture, age, profession, experience, disability, etc.—in order to better understand and convey something about the perspectives of insiders within that world. The term is used for both a common set of research practices—field work, participant observation, interviews that range from casual conversations to in-depth explorations, note-taking, and write-up—and their outcome: an "ethnography of" a particular place, topic, and/or phenomenon. The word can be used to describe both a method and a methodology, a set of techniques and an overall sensibility about how scientific knowledge is embedded within particular ways of life. For psychologists, ethnography allows us to build an evidence base that appreciates how human experience is contingent on time and place, past and future, and larger social horizons.

Attention to the social context and meaning of psychological phenomena is fundamental to psychology as a scientific practice (Gone, 2011), an observation that dates back to the foundations of the field. Wilhelm Wundt (1916/2018) defended studying "folk [or cultural] psychology" after observing that instrumentation he used in his pioneering work in experimental psychology was limited when addressing questions about meaning, language, and social values. William James (1912/1976) defended a "radical empiricism" that called upon researchers to prioritize human

The authors would like to thank both Thomas S. Weisner and Linda McMullen for comments on an earlier draft of this manuscript.

https://doi.org/10.1037/0000319-009
APA Handbook of Research Methods in Psychology, Second Edition: Vol. 2. Research Designs: Quantitative, Qualitative, Neuropsychological, and Biological, H. Cooper (Editor-in-Chief)
Copyright © 2023 by the American Psychological Association. All rights reserved.

APA Handbook of Research Methods in Psychology: Research Designs: Quantitative, Qualitative, Neuropsychological, and Biological, edited by H. Cooper, M. N. Coutanche, L. M. McMullen, A. T. Panter, D. Rindskopf, and K. J. Sher
Copyright © 2023 American Psychological Association. All rights reserved.

experience in itself and to stop treating psychological constructs as naturally existing. Alexander Luria (1976) found in Uzbekistan that even something as fundamental as perception is shaped by social conditions. And Lev Vygotsky (1978) argued that all human mental functioning is mediated through cultural tools and artifacts; from this perspective, "society is the bearer of the cultural heritage without which the development of mind is impossible" (Cole & Wertsch, 1996, p. 253).

Today, researchers recognize that what we know of mental illness and its treatment is inherently steeped in social factors, a perspective recognized in the *DSM-5*, which states that "all forms of distress are locally shaped—including DSM disorders" (American Psychiatric Association, 2013, p. 758). There is increasing awareness that psychology research must move beyond taken-for-granted assumptions about cognition, perception, reasoning, and the self arising out of the WEIRD (Western, educated, industrial, rich, and democratic) contexts within which much previous research has been conducted (Henrich et al., 2010), especially as transnational migration and globalization destabilize the presumption of fixed relationships between space, nations, cultures, and identities (Bhatia, 2007). These historical trends are consistent with viewing psychology as a human science, avoiding reductionist depictions of experience, meaning, and values by accounting for life as inextricably situated in the broader world (Brooke, 2016; Burston & Frie, 2006; Fischer, 1977; Giorgi, 2014; Laubscher, 2016).

Many psychologists may not be familiar with ethnography because its traditional disciplinary home is in anthropology and sociology. Psychologists have also noted that time constraints, lack of training in ethnographic methods, and the discipline's general adherence to experimental and statistical methods that foreground the individual and the universal over cultural and contextual specificity all contribute to ethnography's underutilization for addressing psychological topics (Bartholomew & Brown, 2019). Nevertheless, ethnography provides critical access to many of psychology's most pressing questions about culture, development, and social life—dimensions of human experience that are fundamentally embedded in broader worlds.

WHY DO ETHNOGRAPHY?

Scholars might conduct ethnographic research for a number of reasons: out of an interest in the kinds of psychological phenomena that can only be understood in their cultural contexts—as, for example, Patricia Greenfield (2004) and Barbara Rogoff (2011) did in their decades studying Mayan women in southern Mexico and Guatemala to understand cognitive and socialization processes involved in transmitting knowledge across generations, or as Gaskins et al. (1992) did in their approach to children's play and its impact on development in specific social settings. Or they may be seeking to develop psychological concepts that are closer to those that are lived and local, as Catherine Lutz (1988) did when she studied the particular words for emotions—and the particular emotions those words describe—on the Micronesian atoll of Ifaluk. Perhaps they want to understand how "people's participation in cultural practices is essential to the scientific study of learning" (Lee et al., 2020, p. xvii), given that "psychological development . . . reflects the incorporation and embodiment—literally, 'taking into the body'—of blueprints for psychological experience deposited over historical time in the structure of everyday cultural worlds" (Adams & Kurtiş, 2018, p. 162).

Ethnography can help us get a better sense of the relationship between what people say and what they do, as Hartmann et al. (2018) did when they observed the relationship between "culture talk" and cultural practice (i.e., the difference between explicitly articulated understandings of culture and the tacit, value-laden assumptions that shape everyday practice) in a Native American behavioral health clinic (see also Gone & Alcántara, 2010). As Gobo and Marciniak (2016) pointed out, ethnography provides opportunity for "observing actions and behaviours instead of opinions and attitudes only" (p. 113). When we are able to do so,

Copyright American Psychological Association. Not for further distribution.

> the consequences are not only theoretical . . . but also practical, because a closer view of the routines and practices of social actors facilitates the crafting of remedies and solutions to social problems. In other words, it is easier to outline proposed social, political, or organizational changes after having directly observed participants' actual social actions. (p. 113)

Thus, another reason to do ethnography is because it helps us to get something done, to make some kind of difference in the world: to bear witness, shape policy, or seek justice. When incorporated into intervention research, ethnography can provide evidence about why the predicted impacts did and did not occur, what participation in the intervention meant to participants, and how to design and implement changes for better policy and practice (Duncan et al., 2007). Ethnography can be transformative, informing action towards social and political change in a way that is responsive to the particular conditions and priorities of those most directly affected. When McGranahan (2014) asked anthropologist Kirin Narayan the question "Why ethnography?" Narayan responded,

> For the discipline of paying attention; for becoming more responsibly aware of inequalities; for better understanding of the social forces causing suffering and how people might somehow find hope; and most generally, for being perpetually pulled beyond the limits of one's own taken-for-granted world. (p. 33)

Ethnography can also be personally transformative, leading the researcher to cultivate their own adaptivity and responsiveness in confrontation and/or collaboration with unfamiliar social lifeways. Such confrontations with other ways of doing, thinking and knowing can shake up fixed disciplinary assumptions or practices in a constructive and generative way. Ethnography also allows us to communicate these new insights, as Adler and Adler (1987) pointed out, with a vividness available to few other scholarly techniques: ". . . no surprise, then, that the books that students overwhelmingly remember, that touch closest to their emotional chords, are usually ethnographies" (p. 17).

RESEARCH DESIGN IN ETHNOGRAPHY

Research design in ethnography requires careful planning alongside an openness to the unexpected. The ethnographer needs to select and hone a research question or topic; locate a situation through which to investigate that question or topic; and arrange, in collaboration with the people who are in that situation, how they will participate in it. In what follows, we discuss each of these steps. While we have organized this chapter in a roughly chronological way—starting by formulating a research question, moving on to choosing a site and situating oneself there, then gathering the data, analyzing the data, and finally writing them up—the actual process of doing ethnography is often somewhat less linear and more reflexive and iterative. Ethnographers may refine their research question while in the field; the writing process really begins with the taking of notes during data collection; the researcher may alternate between data collection and analysis, and the two may not feel like distinctly separate phases, as the ethnographer's growing sense of what's going on in the field shapes their attention to what is taking place around and through them.

Developing a Question

Ethnographic projects often begin with a question: a specific curiosity informed both by what the researcher knows (or thinks they know) and by what they do not already know and want to understand better. Elizabeth's research project (Fein, 2020) with youth on the autism spectrum, for example, was inspired by debates in the autism community about whether autism should be considered a disease to be eradicated or a minority identity to be protected. These alternatives were often presented as radically incompatible, fundamentally irreconcilable. Yet the young people on

Copyright American Psychological Association. Not for further distribution.

the spectrum that she encountered in her clinical practice grew up steeped in both of these understandings and seemed to be drawing on both in their understandings of autism—so how did they do that? Jonathan's (Yahalom, 2019) ethnography on caregiving in Oaxaca, Mexico, started with his observation that in the United States Alzheimer's disease was often a solitary experience that threatened the core of personhood, as defined by values centered on cognition, autonomy, and self-determination. How might a similar set of mental changes be experienced elsewhere, like Oaxaca—a more collectivistic setting known for its social cohesion?

Ethnographic research often starts with a moment of informed perplexity—what Miller and her colleagues (2003) called an "interpretive puzzle." For Miller, it was the question of why middle-class parents in Chicago avoid telling stories about their children's transgressions when parents in other settings, like Taiwan, consider this a valuable tool in child socialization (Miller et al., 2003). For Luhrmann (2012), it is the "puzzle of belief": How do we sustain religious faith in entities whose existence we cannot confirm with our senses? Or perhaps the researcher wants to use ethnography to question popular assumptions about the meanings and manifestations of behavior. For example, Alper (2018) contested depictions of "screen time" as passive consumption by observing (and playing, twirling, spinning, and jumping with) youth with disabilities as they engage actively with a wide range of digital technologies—a process that involved showing up with her whole body in an "inclusive sensory ethnography."

Regardless of their motivation, the most useful ethnographic research questions are both flexible and focused. Such questions allow the researcher to adapt to the unexpected discoveries that can be the greatest gift and challenge of field work, while also protecting them from being overwhelmed by floods of data as they learn to focus their attention on what is most relevant. If Elizabeth had gone into the field merely thinking, "I want to understand how young people on the spectrum talk and think about autism," she would have been unsure what to record, attend to, and analyze. Centering her project on how youth use two models of autism that she had previously identified through analyzing popular discourse—autism as disease and autism as identity—helped focus her observations around the terms and concepts that constitute those models. Surprisingly, partway into her field work, Elizabeth began to notice that her young informants were providing rich, vivid accounts of embodied differences that were both disease-like and identity-like—yet they were doing so not when talking about autism but when imaginatively depicting themselves as the demon-possessed antiheroes of fantasy literature during their informal creative play. Listening for these particular themes, and their coexistences, helped her find them somewhere unexpected.

The ethnographer engages in a careful balancing act when developing a research question: preparing for the field by studying previous related research; identifying what might be misperceived, missing, or overlooked from current understandings; and reflecting on one's own biases. Developing a research question is enhanced by the degree to which one is informed by previous studies and aware of implicit social dynamics. While the ethnographer's expectations are likely to be revised in the course of doing research, they also provide a preliminary roadmap.

Delineating a Site

Choosing a research site—a particular situation through which to attend to the phenomenon in question, in some situation-specific manifestation—is one of the most consequential decisions an ethnographer faces. And yet, for all its importance, the nature of "what is the field" is far from obvious (Gupta & Ferguson, 1997). People often lead multicultural lives, belonging to communities that traverse traditional geographic, ethnic, and linguistic boundaries. For example, upon starting his field work in Oaxaca, Jonathan learned that Oaxacans experienced what Stephen (2007) terms *transborder life*—speaking Zapotec at home but Spanish to outsiders, crossing the U.S.–Mexico border for business, and maintaining local traditions while living abroad. Indeed, to his

Copyright American Psychological Association. Not for further distribution.

surprise, Jonathan was able to converse about his own U.S. background and hometown streets with relative ease after learning that a large contingency of Oaxacans had migrated to a town near where he grew up. The way in which Jonathan's research participants traversed cultural, linguistic, economic, and geographic boundaries exemplifies the multicultural nature of many contemporary ethnographies (e.g., Duncan, 2018; Holmes, 2013; Tsing, 2015).

Contemporary ethnographers commonly observe that local culture is often woven within global trends (Wilk, 2006) and that there are multiple and seemingly exclusive factors that comprise an individual's everyday lived experience (Holstein & Gubrium, 2000). Hence, in conducting ethnography, there exists an implicit awareness of the "arbitrariness of boundary making" when deciding what, whom, or where to study (Connor, 2001) and that the ethnographer might instead be "concerned with articulation of the global and local, [that is to say] how globalizing processes exist in the context of realities of particular societies" (Inda & Rosaldo, 2002, p. 7). For this reason, contemporary ethnography can also be—indeed, often becomes—multisited, taking place in different locations, across different modes of communication (including online interaction), among nominally different groups of people, settings, and ways of life. Ethnographers may follow or "trace" the topic of their research extemporaneously, wherever it manifests, across different locations, among different people, and through various traditionally defined boundaries (Packer, 2017; Wacquant, 2011). Elizabeth's current research project, at the time of this writing, is on autism in the furry community, an international subculture drawn together by appreciation for anthropomorphic animals. The work takes place not only at conventions and other social events where furries come together but also on the internet and social media apps like Telegram, through art commissions, and within other such geographically dispersed symbolic exchanges; the movement between these different kinds of social spaces opens up new possibilities for sociability (Magnifico et al., 2018).

Digital technologies are transforming shared social spaces and with them, ethnographic theory and practice. "Ethnography *in, of*, and *through* the virtual" (Hine, 2000, p. 65) requires us to rethink our ideas about space, place, location, and embodiment; the nature of phenomena under study; and the methods through which we work. New technologies shape our experiences of self and relationship (Gergen, 1991). Digital spaces are themselves varied in their nature and in the connections between them: studying "virtual worlds" designed to be immersive will call for different ethnographic approaches than studying participation in loosely linked systems of apps and digital platforms (Góralska, 2020).

Place matters, of course. Geography continues to have an impact on lifeworlds: Ecologies and their multispecies coexistences are shaped by contours of land and water; federal, state, national, and international policies constrain and facilitate opportunity; the way built structures are arranged shapes the way in which people engage with and within them (Adams, 2016; Fullilove, 1996; Simms, 2008; Snyder, 2020). But community can be constituted in many ways—through geography, perhaps, but also through affinity, as with furries, or with players drawn to a particular online game world (Gee, 2004), or through communities of practice characterized by "situated learning," such as the tailors and butchers described by Lave and Wenger (1991), or through "processes involving configurations of relations among different actors or institutions" involved in mutual dependence, struggle or conflict, as in the "relational ethnographies" proposed by Desmond (2014, p. 547), or through contested and even invisible claims to kinship, as Leite (2017) described in her study of Marrano ("hidden Jews") in Portugal. Meanwhile, individual participants are likely to occupy an intersectional array of identities, positions, and places, as (for example) Jenkins and Csordas (2020) observed in their study of the varied experiences of adolescents receiving psychiatric treatment in the American Southwest.

So the ethnographer has some nonobvious questions to ask themselves, along the lines of: Where

Copyright American Psychological Association. Not for further distribution.

is the thing happening? What is the situation through which the process of interest is taking place, and how is it situated? Figuring this out can require some immersion in and of itself. At one of her first furry get-togethers, Elizabeth had to be told repeatedly by one of her furry interlocutors to join the social media platform Telegram before she actually finally did it, at which point a whole new dimension of the social world opened up to her. For the ethnographer, doing research that is defined by culture and place, these considerations constitute much of the research process.

Arranging Access

Negotiating access to a community for research purposes is among the more delicate opening stages of the long-lasting and often complicated relationships that make up ethnographic practice. Prior to commencing field work, and after identifying what participants and settings the ethnographer wants to study, the ethnographer begins to develop relationships and introduce themselves to the community of interest. Depending on the setting, making initial contact can occur remotely, although the ethnographer can benefit from physically visiting the field as well. Initial access can take the form of emailing or calling possible participants, working through existing social connections, or reaching out to previous researchers who have already established themselves in the field. Arranging ethnographic field work also often involves obtaining official permission from institutions that may constitute part of the field site, such as schools, clinics, churches, or other organizations. Although this stage might be considered preparatory, in reality it is already a part of field work—even remote contact with participants gives the ethnographer a preliminary, firsthand perspective of the social dynamics inherent to the field.

There is no single approach to establishing contact, but it is advantageous for the ethnographer to initiate contact in a manner that is congruent with local social practices. When, for example, Jonathan was still in Pittsburgh, he initially emailed Oaxacan community centers, only to find they were not responsive. He later came to understand that community members were uncomfortable collaborating with foreigners about an intimate family topic like Alzheimer's. Eventually, Jonathan was introduced to a local resident who expressed interest in his research. They developed a correspondence and later formed a working relationship that became central to his project. Within a community that would have otherwise viewed him with reservation, Jonathan was introduced as a friend of a trusted neighbor, and this gradually allowed other individuals to develop trust in him as well.

Common challenges to maintaining access often involve logistics (e.g., maintaining physical presence), language (e.g., understanding linguistic differences, including differences between professional and lay language), and social norms (e.g., stigma, discomfort talking, and discomfort being observed). For this reason, the ethnographer must maintain awareness of their own position in relation to cultural norms and how others perceive them. When Jonathan arrived in Oaxaca intent on studying Alzheimer's, he was told that not a single case existed in the community. He later came to appreciate that Alzheimer's was highly stigmatized in the community, as it was understood to be caused by family negligence and the abandonment of cultural traditions. He readapted his focus to this social reality, inquiring instead about families who cared for forgetful elders.

The ethnographer strives to observe the ordinary routines and practices that constitute a given way of life—to be in sync with the social rhythms of participants—and to develop insight into the implicit thoughts, emotions, and experiences that underlie experience. However, people also change what they say or do when they know they are being observed (Suchman & Jordan, 1990). Indeed, as Packer (2017) noted, the ethnographer is not an inconspicuous observer of everyday life but, at best, strives to achieve "obtrusive access"—their very presence as researcher is disruptive, a departure from ordinary affairs. Over time, though, the researcher's presence can become routinized, accepted, and even woven into the fold of everyday lived experience. Hence,

Copyright American Psychological Association. Not for further distribution.

Copyright American Psychological Association. Not for further distribution.

the ethnographer at once strives to collect data that are as congruent as possible with everyday life, while remaining aware of how conducting research might alter the phenomena under study.

Access concerns not only how data are logistically acquired but also a larger epistemological stance about the type of data the ethnographer is collecting. Instead of being concerned that data are sampled to represent a given population (as would be the case for researchers who conduct studies by random sampling), the ethnographer also deliberately makes choices about whom to study, knowing that the data they collect is specific to people engaged in specific activities. As Miller et al. (2003) wrote on this point, "Each ethnographer will come to an understanding that is inevitably partial. The rigor of this approach lies partly in delineating that partiality, which itself contains clues as to how local meanings are constructed" (p. 226). Rigor can also be found through triangulating multiple sources of data and multiple perspectives from local allies, family members, and people throughout the community. In her study, Elizabeth listened closely to people on the autism spectrum, their families, and the professionals who worked with them in order to get a sense of how their perspectives on the topic differed and converged. The decision about whom and what to study can be informed by the ethnographer's research question, through identifying which participants, social settings, and behaviors are most relevant to that topic of interest.

CONDUCTING THE RESEARCH

What does an ethnographer actually do when doing research? And how long does an ethnographer remain in the field? There are varying answers to these questions. For some research topics, a "focused" or "mini" ethnography might make sense and occur within a few weeks or months (Simonds et al., 2012; Weinstein & Ventres, 2000); for other topics, especially those invested in varying nuances of social life, a more sustained year or multiyear commitment to the field is justified.

In what follows, we focus on three components of ethnographic data collection: participant observation, field note writing, and interviews. Though we focus this section on these areas, numerous other techniques can contribute to the fidelity and utility of an ethnographic project (Levitt et al., 2017). As Weisner (2012), Hay (2016), and Small (2011) argued, ethnographic research can be strengthened through the integration of mixed methods hailing from both traditions that have been called *quantitative* and those called *qualitative*, foregrounding their common questions and goals. Surveys and questionnaires, assessment tools, and structured activities such as sorting techniques can be constructively synthesized with interview narratives, observations, and arts-based methods. Multiple sources of data can be brought together with a variety of intentions, such as to confirm findings or to make them more robust, to expand those findings into new domains, or to elucidate some of their underlying mechanisms of action. Creswell and Clark (2017) provided a series of step-by-step roadmaps for thinking through the process of triangulating various sorts and sources of data (see also Webb et al., 1981).

Participant Observation

Participant observation is usually considered to be the cornerstone of ethnographic research, the standard practice through which the bulk of ethnographic data gathering takes place. The ethnographer immerses themselves in the daily life of a community (however that community is defined), hanging out among members in the spaces where that life takes place. Through participant observation, the researcher seeks to gain a sense of the actions and activities, rituals and routines, and daily practices that constitute that life and their meanings for participants. To the extent possible, the ethnographer takes part in these activities, learning through experience and sometimes through mentorship what insiders to the community already know, and adding to that knowledge their own unique perspective as a sensitive and theoretically informed guest. Sometimes the ethnographer sits on the sidelines observing these activities; other times the ethnographer is in the thick of it, doing their best to do (that is, participate in) the way of life they want

to understand. In either case, the researcher is a part of the field that they are learning from and about and is contributing to the scene by being present within it.

Here are some things that Elizabeth has done under the umbrella of participant observation: attended classes at a junior high school; played a mad scientist in a futuristic, live-action role-playing game; helped to lead an "exploring the city" social group for young adults on the autism spectrum; sat around the waiting room of a research lab; filled out paperwork; attended support groups; presented at a conference for autism researchers; participated in a collective reading aloud of the phone book; danced in costume at a rave party; met with a lawyer; drank beer at a makeshift outdoor bar; had blood drawn; and attended a workshop on writing erotic fiction. Here are some things that Jonathan has done under the umbrella of participant observation: shared meals with families as they kept a watchful eye on their elders; visited markets and ran errands for families; studied Zapotec in language class; danced at an event celebrating Oaxacan elders; attended community lectures about healthy aging; witnessed hospital intake processes; visited local healers; engaged locals about the local news; attended a local psychiatry conference on aging; and raised a cup of mezcal to cheer life and health at religious, family, and wedding parties. What all these diverse activities have in common is that they allowed us to gain a better understanding of how the participants in our respective communities enact, experience, and negotiate the meanings of their lives.

Writing Field Notes

What differentiates ethnography from everyday hanging out? One of the key steps to move from experience to ethnographic data is the careful documentation of that experience through the writing of field notes. Writing is an intrinsic element of the ethnographic process, and it begins in the field, as the ethnographer keeps written records of their experiences, observations, and emergent sense-making. Keeping detailed notes is a key component of maintaining rigor, fidelity, and veridicality in ethnographic data collection. As psychologists know, our memory is a fickle place. Moments that feel so intense and significant as to be unforgettable fade from memory with astonishing speed, their details blurring together and our minds filling in the blanks with our own assumptions and expectations. Careful, thorough, and attentive note-taking keeps us honest and aware of our own constructive and reconstructive work as we strive to represent and report our experiences in the field. Writing up events as they occur (rather than trying to reconstruct them far after the fact) allows the researcher to capture their own unfolding understanding of events, benefitting from the insights that come with encountering the previously unfamiliar. Field notes are integral to the data set that the ethnographer weaves into the analysis, as much or more so than the interview data. The researcher should allow several hours per day to this part of the process—sometimes a difficult commitment to honor when it involves stepping away from the fascinating doings of one's field site.

The most comprehensive guide to field note writing is Emerson et al.'s (2011) *Writing Ethnographic Field Notes* (see also Sanjek, 1990). They divide the process of writing field notes into three phases: quickly scribbling "jottings" in the field, turning those jottings into filled-out written accounts "at the desk," and then transforming those field notes into "scenes on the page" for publication. As they observe, taking notes in public is one of the clearest performances of the ethnographer's role. Visible note-taking immediately differentiates the ethnographer from others as someone who is there not only to participate but also to observe and document in writing. It can produce a range of situation-specific consequences, ranging from awkwardness, embarrassment, and fear on the part of research participants to a deeper understanding and fuller support of the ethnographer's role and purpose. Furthermore, the very act of writing itself has different meanings in different communities. The ethnographer needs to be sensitive to the ways in which note-taking is perceived by members of the community in

Copyright American Psychological Association. Not for further distribution.

which they work. There are some places, like a classroom, where it's easy to write notes all day. There are other situations, like when cooking or doing other hands-on activities, where it's harder. At such moments, Elizabeth's technique is to keep a running mental list of single reminder words or brief phrases (*keyhole; too abstract; who's a derp; wolverine*) that she repeats in her mind until she can write them down in a quick list on the small pad she carries in her pocket—perhaps during a brief visit to a private place such as a bathroom or empty hallway. Those lists then serve as prompts to elaborate at the end of the day—she likes to stop at a diner on the way home and write notes over dinner, then return home to finish them up.

When inscribing the day's events in a longer set of field notes, the researcher writes them down in as much detail as possible as soon as possible—the same day if at all possible, before sleeping, before processing the day's events with a friend or partner. The most useful field notes foreground description over evaluation: "Jennifer got angry in a really inappropriate way" will be less helpful in the long run than a description of what in Jennifer's behavior suggested she was angry and what responses this behavior provoked from community members. That being said, the ethnographer's own appraisal of Jennifer's expression of anger is useful data as well. Many ethnographers hold deliberate spaces within their notes to track their own feelings, reactions, and emerging assessment of phenomena in the field. When psychological anthropologist Jean Briggs (1970) was living with and learning from an Inuit community, her first indication that she had grievously violated social norms against expressing anger came when she noticed herself feeling cold, sad, and under the weather. Only with time did she realize that she was being ostracized by community members, and with that realization came a new understanding of the subtlety and power of their emotional expression. Attention to the ethnographer's own positions, actions and behaviors, their "activities, circumstances, and emotional responses" (Emerson et al., 2011, p. 15) constitute an important part of ethnographic documentation.

Copyright American Psychological Association. Not for further distribution.

Interviewing

Ethnographic studies often also involve interviews with members of the community being studied. These interviews may be very structured, with the same or similar sets of questions and follow-up probes being asked of all participants. They may be semistructured, with a list of topics guiding the interview while also giving space for the conversation to travel in unexpected directions. Or they may be quite open-ended, allowing the interviewee to take up the topic of the interview however they see fit—or to suggest topics that matter to them. Participants may be interviewed multiple times over the course of a given project. Formal interviews might mix with informal conversations and other interactions.

Interviews can serve many different purposes. They can help the ethnographer to gather information about a setting and its parameters and everyday practices, to assess the reasoning, motivations, beliefs, desires, and intentions of participants, and to infer the implicit cultural models and the mental tools people are using to make sense of their surroundings. In their work on "person-centered interviewing," Levy and Hollan (1998) observed the ways that these interviews engage the interviewee as both an informant, "that is, as a knowledgeable person who can tell the anthropologist-interviewer about culture and behavior in a particular locale" and also as a respondent, by which they mean "as an object of systematic study and observation in him- or herself" (pp. 335–336). Ethnographic interviewing can also provide key information regarding which beliefs and practices are shared as part of cultural models and schemas, and which are more idiosyncratic to individuals or subgroups in a community.

Whatever their purpose, interviews are rarely a transparent transmission of the internal state of an interviewee; they are complex communicative events that are powerfully shaped by the developing relationship between the ethnographer and the interview coparticipant(s). In addition to ensuring that interviews align with the research question, interview techniques should also align as closely as possible to participants' cultural

norms around interaction, mentorship, and information sharing (Briggs, 1986). The ethnographer must not only strategize about whom to interview but also make important decisions about conducting individual versus group interviews and single occurrence versus longitudinal interviews, the setting where interviews take place, and language. Prior to arriving to Oaxaca, Jonathan anticipated conducting individual interviews with dementia caregivers in Spanish. Yet upon engaging with locals, he recognized that his research plan did not align with Oaxacan social life: People did not feel comfortable talking about intimate family life to a person outside the community, they were more familiar speaking in Zapotec than Spanish, and they understood themselves in the context of their membership to the larger household. Jonathan adapted to these circumstances by conducting focus group interviews with entire households (rather than individual interviews), by having those interviews be guided by a local research assistant (rather than conducting them himself), and by inviting participants to speak in Zapotec. Interview strategies are ideally developed prior to field work, based on previous review of relevant research, and subsequently adapted to the realities encountered firsthand, but they may also require revision based on the realities the ethnographer encounters.

Embracing the Unexpected

At least implicitly, the ethnographic approach to conducting research understands data much like Michel Foucault (1972) characterized “discourse”—what is interesting for the ethnographer exceeds the explicit things said or observed and includes the broader social practices, implicit power relations, and forms of subjectivity that constitute human experience. This approach to data invites the ethnographer to benefit from embracing the unexpected hurdles, surprises, and blunders that so often arise during field work.

Ethnographic lore is full of stories of ethnographers who arrive at a site only to discover that the site, as they envisioned it, has become inaccessible: it has closed, or changed, or the imagined phenomenon-site relationship is actually completely different from what they expected. The practice has gone out of style and nobody does it anymore; the belief cannot be discussed with outsiders; the religion has been eradicated by evangelical missionaries. For her dissertation research, Elizabeth had planned a year-long comparison of two treatment sites taking different approaches to autism, had made arrangements with each to conduct the field work, and had moved halfway across the country to do so. Each of them closed down (for reasons unrelated to the project!) within a month of her arrival. Having formed some strong relationships during that first month with some people who were then willing to help her out, she wound up arranging a multisite ethnography that brought her to a variety of classrooms, support groups, research laboratories, and clinics. In doing so, she gained a fuller picture of the confusing journeys youth on the spectrum and their families go through as they seek both help and a sense of belonging.

In contrast to viewing these experiences as something to minimize or overcome during research, we encourage researchers to embrace a type of “methodological agility” wherein methods accommodate to the contingencies of a given field site (Yahalom, 2020). This approach posits that unexpected setbacks to research can be advantages in themselves; they serve as invitations to strengthen design rigor by directly addressing, embracing, and understanding the broader structures that contextualize the data the ethnographer seeks to acquire. Further, remaining agile helps redefine research categories to become more congruent with local realities. Of course, there is a limit to agility, and some external constraints and research setbacks can simply be losses. Agencies can refuse access, key community members might decline to participate, or the institutional review board of an ethnographer’s institution could reject a research proposal. While this fact is true of most research, ethnography renders the parameters of research more explicit by attending to the way data are situated in broader social dynamics.

While immersed in the field, the ethnographer continuously encounters additional information

Copyright American Psychological Association. Not for further distribution.

on local culture—that is to say, data that might not have been anticipated but nevertheless come to be valuable. During one of the first weeks of his year of field work, Jonathan stumbled upon a local newspaper with a front-page headline that announced, "20 ALZHEIMER'S CASES HAVE BEEN DETECTED." He was struck by the way Alzheimer's was here portrayed as an epidemic, in language that was similar to news stories about the Ebola virus. The story put into focus the way Alzheimer's was perceived locally as something new and alarming, a threat facing the Oaxacan community. There are many such things the ethnographer encounters in the course of data collection that are not solely based on interviews and field notes: the collection of a pamphlet, the texture of a piece of fabric, a child's drawing. The researcher is likely to collect a number of such cultural artifacts while in the field. They might also make detailed maps of the community: where do people live, work, and socialize? How are shared and private spaces arranged? How are different virtual spaces linked together, and how visible and accessible are these links? They may take field recordings, capturing the ambient sound in a space or a musical performance. They may take photographs, or encourage their participants to take photographs on topics of interest to the ethnographer or participants. Any of these materials can also be worked into interviews on these topics. Ethnographers may make drawings, both formal and informal—anthropologist Michael Taussig (2011) has written an entire book about the role of the drawings he made in his own field notes. As such, an ethnographic data corpus is often far more than a series of texts, requiring agility, thoughtfulness, and creativity from the researcher in both data collection and analysis.

PRODUCING RESULTS

Data Analysis

Alongside and after acquiring this mass of stuff—field notes, interview recordings and transcripts, photos, maps, surveys, field recordings, drawings, artifacts, perhaps a few scars—comes the task of making sense of it all. Ethnographic projects require a discrete, dedicated phase of working through the data, and the ethnographer should allow ample time for this phase of work in their research plan. Ethnographic data, and qualitative methods research more generally, now also have the advantage of a number of software tools to organize what often becomes a hefty data set. Moreover, computer software makes it possible to collaborate more efficiently and transparently with larger research teams (Deutsch & Tolan, 2018).

Compared to the vivid depictions of field work and the careful articulation of a research question that can be found in many ethnographic texts, the work of data analysis can seem somewhat murky and mysterious. There is little consensus around a single best approach to ethnographic data analysis; the techniques chosen by the researcher are guided instead by their own epistemological commitments. A researcher working within a constructivist grounded theory tradition should take a different approach from a researcher steeped in Foucauldian discourse analysis. However, in our opinion, there are a few guiding principles that all ethnographers would do well to keep in mind during this phase.

The first is to make these commitments as explicit and intentional as possible within one's own research design. In this, as in all phases of the research process, researchers should work toward what the American Psychological Association's Task Force on Resources for Qualitative Research Publication refers to as *methodological integrity*:

> Integrity is established when research designs and procedures (e.g., autoethnography, discursive analysis) support the research goals (i.e., the research problems/questions); respect the researcher's approaches to inquiry (i.e., research traditions sometimes described as world views, paradigms, or philosophical/epistemological assumptions); and are tailored for fundamental characteristics of the subject matter and the investigators. (Levitt et al., 2017, pp. 9–10)

Copyright American Psychological Association. Not for further distribution.

Copyright American Psychological Association. Not for further distribution.

From the very inception of the project, researchers should have a plan in mind for how they will work with the data they collect, including a plan for how to integrate data from multiple sources. Therefore, it is helpful for the ethnographer to familiarize themselves with a range of methodologies in order to design an approach that best fits the data and research question.

Secondly, this plan can, and in many cases should, include ample flexibility for adjustment in response to discoveries that take place both during and after field work. As Richard Shweder (1997) articulated,

> Ethnography is about discovery . . . It is about entering the field without totally predefining the domain of interest and without presuming that you already know what is universal, because most of the time those presumptive universals are generated out of one's own perspective-dependent, context-dependent, and hence local world. (p. 154)

Hence, when conducting data analysis, the ethnographer benefits from suspending or bracketing their own understanding of things, and attempts to glean understanding through, or "abduct" from, the data (Timmermans & Tavory, 2012). As Quinn (2005) observed, this quality of naturalistic research makes it difficult if not impossible to precisely specify analysis methods in advance, and researchers are often in a position to develop their own methods based on the particular requirements of the material they encounter; this makes it all the more important to think carefully and critically about the rationales that guide methodological decisions throughout the process.

Lastly, the plan should involve the opportunity for deep and iterative immersion into the data—multiple passes through interview transcripts and field notes, strategies for reconsidering prior conclusions in light of new perspectives, opportunities to become familiar with the full contents of what is likely to be a dauntingly rich and varied data set. For Elizabeth, for whom a 2-year period of field work left her with four large binders of field notes, over 100 lengthy interview transcripts, and numerous artifacts including newsletters from various organizations, copies of medical records, and drawings and comics created by participants, the first step was to create a numbered catalogue of each item. While this was somewhat helpful when she needed to find things later, its main benefit was to help her familiarize herself more deeply with what she had.

Ethnographic Writing

Toward the end of analysis, and after gaining a sense of findings, the ethnographer begins to formally organize and draft study results. The presentation of research findings can take many forms, both within and beyond written texts. While it remains commonplace to write a textual account of research findings, contemporary ethnographers have also begun to challenge conventional understanding of the nature of text, producing ethnographies in the forms of graphic novels (Hamdy & Nye, 2017; McMullin, 2016), film (Barnard & Borges, 2016; Lemelson & Tucker, 2017), and other creative forms.

Ethnographic writing is both a product of the social sciences that produces unique, valid, veridical, and scientific understanding, as well as a self-reflexive narrative about the development of that understanding. In one sense, the ethnographer is aware that no written account is complete in itself—that with more time in the field, additional experiences with a given group, and further research on history, language, and culture, the ethnographer would acquire greater (and perhaps different) understanding. That is why ethnographic writing is often told through narrating the story of research, reflecting on how findings are contingent (rooted in particular encounters with specific people, in distinct places), and conveying that those findings could have been different had the story of research been different. And yet, in another sense, ethnography is more than narrative. It systematically documents, analyzes, and builds upon our understandings of the nuanced facets of human experience. It expands previous empirical knowledge, and

engages with the broader scientific community. That is why ethnography is not experimental, but it is scientific—at its core, it is a systematic study of structure, behavior, and experience through sustained observation, inquiry and analysis. The best of ethnographic writing holds these tensions in place, producing text that is characterized by both reflexive humility and empirically minded rigor.

Perhaps the most defining feature of writing ethnography involves what Geertz (1973) famously popularized as *thick description*. This term refers to the ethnographer's goal of writing to provide a qualitatively nuanced (or *thick*) perspective of social life, combining observations drawn in the field (e.g., about behaviors) with deeper dimensions of lived experience (e.g., the meaning people imbue to things, the emotions they feel, and the strategies involved in decision making). With thick description, the ethnographer attempts to make sense of what is underneath the surface by attending to implicit power relations, subtle social practices, and other forms of subjectivity that constitute everyday life. This approach to writing avoids being reductionistic—that is to say, it does not reify or simplify inherently complex experience. Instead, in the words of Clifford (1988), ethnographic writing "struggle[s] self-consciously to avoid portraying abstract, ahistorical 'others'" (p. 23). One way to do that is by highlighting the agency behind decision making and what Kleinman (1997) described as being "at stake" in people's everyday lives. For example, the observation that Alzheimer's carries social stigma in Oaxaca is a thinner description than the observation that Jonathan made later in his field work that Alzheimer's is seen as the consequence of family neglect—and that neglect has particular meaning in a setting marked by social change due to poverty and migration. What was at stake about recognizing Alzheimer's was Oaxacans' acknowledging that their community is beginning to change.

Writing about other people is inherently complicated, and the ethnographer encounters questions about representation: how to describe people in a manner that is informative, honest, sensitive, and ethical. Any form of research on another cultural group risks engaging in what Said (1978) famously called the "politics of othering" (see also Abu-Lughod, 1991). The ethnographer faces many questions in writing about other people. Do I write with my participants in mind as a potential audience? Will I return to this community with my research findings—and if so, how, and when in the process? Am I concerned that what I observe of their experience is agreeable to them? What might other readers, outside the community, be led to do with the information I provide? There is no single way to answer these questions, but it is generally a best practice to remain ethically minded and maintain a strategy that avoids harm and maintains respect for the people one studies.

The ethnographer often faces difficult decisions about what to include for the purposes of advancing scientific understanding and what to omit out of concern for the privacy, well-being, and safety of others. Removing, altering, or creating composite character details is common practice in ethnographic writing; when authors describe their process of doing so, it contributes to the integrity and usefulness of their final product.

In addition to writing with thick description that highlights people's agency, the ethnographer also strives to represent people with respect and dignity. This means not only writing to describe the details of someone's lived experience but to do so with respect for their values and appreciation for how those values arose in the context of their lives. Equally important, the ethnographer writes in a manner that strives to bear witness and do justice to participants' everyday experience—chronicling with compassion the struggles, aspirations, losses, and stagnation that people experience. Behar (1996) asked of the central dilemma of writing on human tragedy, "If you can't stop the horror, shouldn't you at least document it?" (p. 2). Many ethnographers hold rhetorical questions like this to heart, viewing writing itself as a critical element of social justice and advancing awareness of potentially overlooked dimensions of human experience that can invite action for needed change (see also Case et al., 2014; Weis & Fine, 2012).

Copyright American Psychological Association. Not for further distribution.

Concerns about writing for the purposes of social justice also evoke the history of ethnography itself. Early ethnographic projects of the late 19th and early 20th century made claims to objectivity and transparent representation that occluded the ways in which these observations often distorted the lives of the people involved, supporting scientific racism and projects of colonial domination and exploitation. The latter half of the 20th century brought an increased focus on reflexivity,[1] interpretation, and the possibility of a more collaborative research ethic, characterized by the co-construction of knowledge, the importance of humility on the part of the researcher, and a recognition of the political potentialities of ethnographic findings. Efforts to "decolonize ethnography" (Bejarano et al., 2019) led to understanding research participants as "epistemic agents and interlocutors, rather than informants" (Nev Jones, quoted in Aftab, 2020): community partners who contribute theory and interpretation as well as data, whose practical and political interests shape the form and format of research products, and who could be involved and credited as coauthors. Ethnographers write with awareness of these historical trends and attempt to move toward a more equitable and honest way to represent the subject of their research.

A FEW FINAL THOUGHTS

This chapter has introduced some of the major issues and questions to consider for a psychology researcher thinking of embarking upon an ethnographic project. For those who want to learn more, there are many useful methods guides available: Hammersley and Atkinson's (2019) *Ethnography: Principles in Practice* and Angrosino's (2007) *Doing Ethnographic and Observational Research* for a general introduction to ethnographic techniques; Packer's (2017) *The Science of Qualitative Research* as a guide to further considering the epistemological and practical questions of ethnographic research; Creswell and Clark's (2017) *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research* on integrating qualitative and quantitative data into a thoughtful research design; Briggs' (1986) *Learning How to Ask: A Sociolinguistic Appraisal of the Role of the Interview in Social Science Research* and the volume *Finding Culture in Talk: A Collection of Methods* edited by Quinn (2005) for approaches to conducting and analyzing interviews in their cultural contexts; *The Routledge Companion to Digital Ethnography* (Hjorth et al., 2017) and *Ethnography and Virtual Worlds: A Handbook of Method* (Boellstorff et al., 2012) for those seeking guidance on conducting ethnographies that engage with virtual or digital spaces. Perhaps most importantly, we recommend that ethnographers read a lot of really good ethnographies, certainly including but also extending beyond their field site, drawing from across the many disciplines in which ethnography is actively used including anthropology, sociology, and psychology. In our own training and development as researchers, the ethnographic books and articles that most moved and inspired us have been important guides and accompaniments through the worlds we have explored.

A theme we have emphasized throughout this chapter is that psychological phenomena exist in a coconstitutive relationship with their contextual and relational surroundings. The decision to conduct ethnography and the decisions that go into its design are no exception. The very possibility of doing ethnographic research is itself constrained and supported by institutional policies (Bartholemew & Brown, 2019), as well as by the personal relationships of the ethnographer—particularly the spouses, children, and other family members and loved ones whose presence (or keenly felt absence) may accompany the ethnographer into the field (Yates-Doerr, 2020).

[1]We are using the term *reflexivity* here in the sense defined by Walsh (2003): a process of "turning back upon oneself or upon the subject of study" to take a "second look" (p. 51) at the otherwise taken-for-granted parameters of that research, including the attitudes and expectations of the researcher, the relationship between the researcher and their participants, the theoretical commitments undergirding methodological choices, and the cultural and historical milieu of the work.

Copyright American Psychological Association. Not for further distribution.

Ethnography is a research method that attends to the intersection of psychology and social life. From an ethnographic perspective, any piece of psychological knowledge is incomplete without recourse to the way in which broader communal practices, economic and political structures, shared values, histories, aspirations, and other dimensions of life constitute human experience. As such, ethnography is consistent with many trends within the contemporary field of psychology. Indeed, to quote the first of the American Psychological Association's (2017) *Multicultural Guidelines*,

> Psychologists seek to recognize and understand that identity and self-definition are fluid and complex and that the interaction between the two is dynamic. To this end, psychologists appreciate that intersectionality is shaped by the multiplicity of the individual's social contexts. (p. 6)

Ethnography is a primary way to pursue the multicultural goals of psychology, and we believe it will continue to enhance the scope, rigor, and sophistication of psychological inquiry.

References

Abu-Lughod, L. (1991). Writing against culture. In R. Fox (Ed.), *Recapturing anthropology: Working in the present*. School of American Research Press.

Adams, G., & Kurtiş, T. (2018). Context in person, person in context: A cultural psychology approach to social-personality psychology. In K. Deaux & M. Snyder (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of personality and social psychology* (pp. 161–188). Oxford University Press.

Adams, W. W. (2016). Ecopsychology by way of phenomenology. In C. T. Fischer, L. Laubscher, & R. Brooke (Eds.), *The qualitative vision for psychology: An invitation to a human science approach* (pp. 221–243). Duquesne University Press.

Adler, P. A., & Adler, P. (1987). *Membership roles in field research*. Sage. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412984973

Aftab, A. (2020, October 8). Phenomenology, power, polarization, and the discourse on psychosis: Nev Jones, PhD. *Psychiatric Times*. https://www.psychiatrictimes.com/view/phenomenology-power-polarization-psychosis

Alper, M. (2018). Inclusive sensory ethnography: Studying new media and neurodiversity in everyday life. *New Media & Society*, *20*(10), 3560–3579. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444818755394

American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (5th ed.).

American Psychological Association. (2017). *Multicultural guidelines: An ecological approach to context, identity, and intersectionality*. https://www.apa.org/about/policy/multicultural-guidelines

Angrosino, M. (2007). *Doing ethnographic and observational research*. SAGE. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781849208932

Barnard, S., & Borges, S. (Directors). (2016). *Maxamba* [Film]. Maxamba Film.

Bartholomew, T. T., & Brown, J. R. (2019). Entering the ethnographic mind: A grounded theory of using ethnography in psychological research. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *19*(2), 316–345. https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2019.1604927

Behar, R. (1996). *The vulnerable observer: Anthropology that breaks your heart*. Beacon Press.

Bejarano, C. A., Juárez, L. L., García, M. A. M., & Goldstein, D. M. (2019). *Decolonizing ethnography: Undocumented immigrants and new directions in social science*. Duke University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv11smmv5

Bhatia, S. (2007). Rethinking culture and identity in psychology: Towards a transnational cultural psychology. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology*, *27–28*(2–1), 301–321. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0091298

Boellstorff, T., Nardi, B., Pearce, C., & Taylor, T. L. (2012). *Ethnography and virtual worlds: A handbook of method*. Princeton University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.cttq9s20

Briggs, C. L. (1986). *Learning how to ask: A sociolinguistic appraisal of the role of the interview in social science research*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139165990

Briggs, J. L. (1970). *Never in anger: Portrait of an Eskimo family*. Harvard University Press.

Brooke, R. (2016). Some common themes of psychology as a human science. In C. Fischer, L. Laubscher, & R. Brooke (Eds.), *The qualitative vision for psychology: Invitation to a human science approach* (pp. 17–30). Duquesne University Press.

Burston, D., & Frie, R. (2006). *Psychotherapy as a human science*. Duquesne University Press.

Case, A. D., Todd, N. R., & Kral, M. J. (2014). Ethnography in community psychology: Promises

Copyright American Psychological Association. Not for further distribution.

and tensions. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *54*(1-2), 60–71. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-014-9648-0

Chao, R. K. (1994). Beyond parental control and authoritarian parenting style: Understanding Chinese parenting through the cultural notion of training. *Child Development*, *65*(4), 1111–1119. https://doi.org/10.2307/1131308

Chapin, B. L. (2014). *Childhood in a Sri Lankan village: Shaping hierarchy and desire*. Rutgers University Press.

Christopher, J. C., Wendt, D. C., Marecek, J., & Goodman, D. M. (2014). Critical cultural awareness: Contributions to a globalizing psychology. *American Psychologist*, *69*(7), 645–655. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0036851

Clifford, J. (1988). *The predicament of culture*. Harvard University Press.

Cole, M., & Wertsch, J. V. (1996). Beyond the individual-social antinomy in discussions of Piaget and Vygotsky. *Human Development*, *39*(5), 250–256. https://doi.org/10.1159/000278475

Connor, L. (2001). Healing powers in contemporary Asia. In L. Connor & G. Samuel (Eds.), *Healing powers and modernity: Traditional medicine, shamanism, and science in Asian societies* (pp. 3–21). Greenwood Publishing Group.

Creswell, J. W., & Clark, V. L. P. (2017). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. SAGE.

Desmond, M. (2014). Relational ethnography. *Theory and Society*, *43*(5), 547–579. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11186-014-9232-5

Deutsch, N. L., & Tolan, P. (2018). Qualitative methods. In M. Bornstein (Ed.), *The SAGE encyclopedia of lifespan human development* (pp. 1793–1796). SAGE.

Duncan, G. J., Huston, A. C., & Weisner, T. S. (2007). *Higher ground: New hope for the working poor and their children*. Russell Sage Foundation.

Duncan, W. L. (2018). *Transforming therapy: Mental health practice and cultural change in Mexico*. Vanderbilt University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv167560w

Emerson, R. M., Fretz, R. I., & Shaw, L. L. (2011). *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes*. University of Chicago Press. https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226206868.001.0001

Fein, E. (2020). *Living on the spectrum: Autism and youth in community*. NYU Press. https://doi.org/10.18574/nyu/9781479864355.001.0001

Fischer, C. T. (1977). Historical relations of psychology as an object-science and a subject-science: Toward psychology as a human science. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, *13*(4), 369–378. https://doi.org/10.1002/1520-6696(197710)13:4<369::AID-JHBS2300130409>3.0.CO;2-Z

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge*. Tavistock Publications.

Fullilove, M. T. (1996). Psychiatric implications of displacement: Contributions from the psychology of place. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, *153*(12), 1516–1523. https://doi.org/10.1176/ajp.153.12.1516

Gaskins, S., Miller, P. J., & Corsaro, W. A. (1992). Theoretical and methodological perspectives in the interpretive study of children. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, *1992*(58), 5–23. https://doi.org/10.1002/cd.23219925803

Gee, J. P. (2004). *Situated language and learning: A critique of traditional schooling*. Routledge.

Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays*. Basic Books.

Gergen, K. J. (1991). *The saturated self: Dilemmas of identity in contemporary life*. Basic Books.

Gobo, G., & Marciniak, L. (2016). What is ethnography? In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research* (pp. 103–120). SAGE.

Gone, J. P. (2011). Is psychological science a-cultural? *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *17*(3), 234–242. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023805

Gone, J. P., & Alcántara, C. (2010). The ethnographically contextualized case study method: Exploring ambitious achievement in an American Indian community. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *16*(2), 159–168. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013873

Góralska, M. (2020). Anthropology from home: Advice on digital ethnography for the pandemic times. *Anthropology in Action: Newsletter of the British Association for Social Anthropology in Policy and Practice (BASAPP)*, *27*(1), 46–52. https://doi.org/10.3167/aia.2020.270105

Greenfield, P. M. (2004). *Weaving generations together: Evolving creativity in the Maya of Chiapas*. School for Advanced Research.

Giorgi, A. (2014). Phenomenological philosophy as the basis for a human scientific psychology. *The Humanistic Psychologist*, *42*(3), 233.

Gupta, A., & Ferguson, J. (Eds.). (1997). *Anthropological locations: Boundaries and grounds of a field science*. University California Press.

Gubrium, J. F., & Holstein, J. A. (2000). *Aging and everyday life*. Blackwell.

Hamdy, S., & Nye, C. (2017). *Lissa: A story about medical promise, friendship, and revolution*. University of Toronto Press.

Copyright American Psychological Association. Not for further distribution.

Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (2019). *Ethnography: Principles in practice*. Routledge.

Hartmann, W. E., St Arnault, D. M., & Gone, J. P. (2018). A return to "the clinic" for community psychology: Lessons from a clinical ethnography in urban American Indian behavioral health. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *61*(1–2), 62–75. https://doi.org/10.1002/ajcp.12212

Hay, C. (Ed.). (2016). *Methods that matter: Integrating mixed methods for more effective social science research*. University of Chicago Press. https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226328836.001.0001

Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *33*(2–3), 61–83. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X0999152X

Hine, C. (2000). *Virtual ethnography*. SAGE. https://doi.org/10.4135/9780857020277

Hjorth, L., Horst, H., Galloway, A., & Bell, G. (Eds.). (2017). *The Routledge companion to digital ethnography*. Taylor & Francis. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315673974

Holmes, S. (2013). *Fresh fruit, broken bodies: Migrant farmworkers in the United States*. University of California Press.

Holstein, J. A., & Gubrium, J. F. (2000). *The self we live by: Narrative identity in a postmodern world*. Oxford University Press.

Inda, J. X., & Rosaldo, R. (Eds.). (2002). *The anthropology of globalization: A reader*. Blackwell Press.

James, W. (1976). *Essays in radical empiricism*. Harvard University Press. (Original work published 1912)

Jenkins, J. H., & Csordas, T. J. (2020). *Troubled in the land of enchantment: Adolescent experience of psychiatric treatment*. University of California Press.

Kleinman, A. (1997). *Writing at the margin: Discourse between anthropology and medicine*. University of California Press. https://doi.org/10.1525/california/9780520209657.001.0001

Laubscher, L. (2016). Introduction: Invitation to psychology as a human science. In C. Fischer, L. Laubscher, & R. Brooke (Eds.), *The qualitative vision for psychology: Invitation to a human science approach* (pp. 1–16). Duquesne University Press.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511815355

Lee, C. D., Nasir, N. S., Pea, R., & de Royston, M. (2020). Introduction. Reconceptualizing learning: A critical task for knowledge-building and teaching. In N. S. Nasir, C. D. Lee, R. Pea, & M. M. de Royston (Eds.), *Handbook of the cultural foundations of learning* (pp. xvii–xxxv). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203774977-0

Leite, N. (2017). *Unorthodox kin: Portuguese Marranos and the global search for belonging*. University of California Press. https://doi.org/10.1525/california/9780520285040.001.0001

Lemelson, R., & Tucker, A. (2017). *Afflictions: Steps toward a visual psychological anthropology*. Palgrave. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-59984-7

Levitt, H. M., Motulsky, S. L., Wertz, F. J., Morrow, S. L., & Ponterotto, J. G. (2017). Recommendations for designing and reviewing qualitative research in psychology: Promoting methodological integrity. *Qualitative Psychology*, *4*(1), 2–22. https://doi.org/10.1037/qup0000082

Levy, R. I., & Hollan, D. W. (1998). Person-centered interviewing and observation. In R. Bernard (Ed.), *Handbook of methods in cultural anthropology* (pp. 333–364). AltaMira Press.

Luhrmann, T. M. (2012). *When God talks back: Understanding the American evangelical relationship with God*. Knopf.

Luria, A. R. (1976). *Cognitive development: Its cultural and social foundations* (M. Lopez-Morillas, Trans.). Harvard University Press.

Lutz, C. A. (1988). *Unnatural emotions: Everyday sentiments on a Micronesian atoll and their challenge to Western theory*. University of Chicago Press.

Magnifico, A. M., Lammers, J. C., & Fields, D. A. (2018). Affinity spaces, literacies and classrooms: Tensions and opportunities. *Literacy*, *52*(3), 145–152. https://doi.org/10.1111/lit.12133

McGranahan, C. (2014). What is ethnography? Teaching ethnographic sensibilities without fieldwork. *Teaching Anthropology*, *4*(1), 23–36.

McMullin, J. (2016). Cancer and the comics: Graphic narratives and biolegitimate lives. *Medical Anthropology Quarterly*, *30*(2), 149–167. https://doi.org/10.1111/maq.12172

Miller, P. J., Hengst, J. A., & Wang, S. (2003). Ethnographic methods: Applications from developmental cultural psychology. In P. M. Camic, J. E. Rhodes, & L. Yardley (Eds.), *Qualitative research in psychology: Expanding perspectives in methodology and design* (pp. 219–242). American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/10595-012

Packer, M. J. (2017). *The science of qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108264907

Quinn, N. (2005). How to reconstruct schemas people share, from what they say. In N. Quinn (Ed.), *Finding culture in talk: A collection of methods* (pp. 35–81). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-137-05871-3_2

Copyright American Psychological Association. Not for further distribution.

Rogoff, B. (2011). *Developing destinies: A Mayan midwife and town*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195319903.001.0001

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. Vintage.

Sanjek, R. (1990). A vocabulary for fieldnotes. In R. Sanjek (Ed.), *Fieldnotes: The makings of anthropology* (pp. 92–121). Cornell University Press. https://doi.org/10.7591/9781501711954

Shweder, R. A. (1997). The surprise of ethnography. *Ethos*, *25*(2), 152–163. https://doi.org/10.1525/eth.1997.25.2.152

Simms, E. M. (2008). *The child in the world: Embodiment, time, and language in early childhood*. Wayne State University Press.

Simonds, L. M., Camic, P. M., & Causey, A. (2012). Using focused ethnography in psychological research. In H. Cooper (Ed.), *APA handbook of research methods in psychology: Vol. 2. Research designs: Quantitative, qualitative, neuropsychological, and biological* (pp. 157–170). American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/13620-010

Small, M. L. (2011). How to conduct a mixed methods study: Recent trends in a rapidly growing literature. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *37*(1), 57–86. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.012809.102657

Snyder, G. (2020). *The practice of the wild: Essays*. Counterpoint.

Stephen, L. (2007). *Transborder lives: Indigenous Oaxacans in Mexico, California, and Oregon*. Duke University Press.

Suchman, L., & Jordan, B. (1990). Interactional troubles in face-to-face survey interviews. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, *85*(409), 232–241. https://doi.org/10.2307/2289550

Taussig, M. (2011). *I swear I saw this: Drawings in fieldwork notebooks, namely my own*. University of Chicago Press. https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226789842.001.0001

Timmermans, S., & Tavory, I. (2012). Theory construction in qualitative research: From grounded theory to abductive analysis. *Sociological Theory*, *30*(3), 167–186. https://doi.org/10.1177/0735275112457914

Tsing, A. L. (2015). *The mushroom at the end of the world: On the possibility of life in capitalist ruins*. Princeton University Press.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). Interaction between learning and development. In M. Gauvain & M. Cole (Eds.), *Readings on the development of children* (4th ed., pp. 34–41). Worth Publishers.

Wacquant, L. (2011). Habitus as topic and tool: Reflections on becoming a prizefighter. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *8*(1), 81–92. https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2010.544176

Walsh, R. (2003). The methods of reflexivity. *The Humanistic Psychologist*, *31*(4), 51–66. https://doi.org/10.1080/08873267.2003.9986934

Webb, E., Campbell, D., Schwartz, R., Sechrest, L., & Grove, J. (1981). *Nonreactive measures in the social sciences* (2nd ed.). Houghton Mifflin.

Weinstein, J., & Ventres, W. (2000). Mini-ethnography: Meaningful exploration made easy. *Family Medicine*, *32*(9), 600–602.

Weis, L., & Fine, M. (2012). Critical bifocality and circuits of privilege: Expanding critical ethnographic theory and design. *Harvard Educational Review*, *82*(2), 173–201. https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.82.2.v1jx34n441532242

Weisner, T. S. (2012). Mixed methods should be a valued practice in anthropology. *Anthropology News*, *53*(5), 3–4.

Wilk, R. (2006). *Home cooking in the global village: Caribbean food from buccaneers to ecotourists*. Bloomsbury Academic. https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350047686

Wundt, W. (2018). *Elements of folk-psychology: Outlines of a psychological history of the development of mankind* (E. L. Schaub, Trans.). Macmillan Company. (Original work published 1916)

Yahalom, J. (2019). *Caring for the people of the clouds: Aging and dementia in Oaxaca*. University of Oklahoma Press.

Yahalom, J. (2020). Toward a methodology of chance: On obstacles to research and their advantages. *Qualitative Psychology*, *7*(2), 153–168. https://doi.org/10.1037/qup0000172

Yates-Doerr, E. (2020). Reworking the social determinants of health: Responding to material-semiotic indeterminacy in public health interventions. *Medical Anthropology Quarterly*, *34*(3), 378–397. https://doi.org/10.1111/maq.12586

Copyright American Psychological Association. Not for further distribution.