

BOARD

Collecting *and* Interpreting Qualitative Materials

Norman K. Denzin
Yvonna S. Lincoln
Editors



SAGE Publications

International Educational and Professional Publisher
Thousand Oaks London New Delhi

Copyright © 1998 by Sage Publications, Inc.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

For information:



SAGE Publications, Inc.
2455 Teller Road
Thousand Oaks, California 91320
E-mail@sagepub.com

SAGE Publications Ltd.
6 Bonhill Street
London EC2A 4PU
United Kingdom

SAGE Publications India Pvt. Ltd.
M-32 Market
Greater Kailash I
New Delhi 110048 India

Printed in the United States of America

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Main entry under title:

Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials / edited by Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-7619-1434-X (pbk. : acid-free paper)

1. Social sciences—Research—Methodology. 2. Qualitative reasoning. I. Denzin, Norman K. II. Lincoln, Yvonna S.

H62.C566 1998

300'.7'23—dc21

98-8868

98 99 00 01 02 03 04 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Acquiring Editor: Peter Labella
Production Editor: Astrid Virding
Production Assistant: Karen Wiley
Typesetter/Designer: Danielle Dillahunt
Indexer: Juniee Oneida
Cover Designer: Ravi Balasuriya
Print Buyer: Anna Chin

Cont

Preface

1. **Introduction: The Field of Qualitative Research**
Norman K. Denzin

Part I. Methods of Data Collection and Analyzing Data

2. **Interviewing: The Art of the Interview**
Andrea Fontana and Judith M. Wertz
3. **Observational Methods: Participant Observation**
Patricia A. Adler and John W. Wengert
4. **The Interpretation of Qualitative Data: Content Analysis and Discourse Analysis**
Ian Hodder
5. **On the Authority of Visual Methods**
Douglas Harper
6. **Personal Experience: The Ethnographic Interview**
D. Jean Clandinin and Michael J. Linscott

s perspective: A reaffirmation. *Sociological Inquiry*.
social inquiry. In G. Madaus, M. Scriven, & J. Stiggins (Eds.),
pp. 279-286). Boston: Kluwer-Nijhoff.
ible: The primacy of work in the writing process. In
*Social organization and social process: Essays in the history of
4*). New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
Recent folk: *Ethnographic narratives of Village and Town*.
New York Press.
Shadow. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
s of qualitative research: *Grounded theory in practice*.
ark, CA: Sage.
aca, NY: Cornell University Press.
outledge.
n writing ethnography. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
the social structure of an Italian slum. Chicago: University of
Chicago Press.
t Corner Society. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*.
Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
theory and method. In M. D. LeCompte, W. L. Miller, & J. M.
Handbook of qualitative research in education. Newbury Park,
CA: Sage.

12

Writing

A Method of Inquiry

Laurel Richardson

The writer's object is—or should be—to hold the reader's attention. . . . I want the reader to turn the page and keep on turning to the end.

—Barbara Tuchman,
New York Times, February 2, 1989

◆ In the spirit of affectionate irreverence toward qualitative research, I consider writing as a *method of inquiry*, a way of finding out about yourself and your topic. Although we usually think about writing as a mode of “telling” about the social world, writing is not just a mopping-up activity at the end of a research project. Writing is also a way of “knowing”—a method of discovery and analysis. By writing in different ways, we discover new aspects of our topic and our relationship to it. Form and content are inseparable.

I have composed this chapter into two *equally* important, but differently formatted, sections. I emphasize the *equally* because the first section, an essay, has rhetorical advantages over its later-born sibling. In the first

AUTHOR'S NOTE: I thank Ernest Lockridge for reading this chapter multiple times. I also thank Arthur Bochner, Norman Denzin, Carolyn Ellis, Michelle Fine, Yvonna Lincoln, Meaghan Morris, and John Van Maanen for their readings of earlier versions of this chapter and Barrie Thorne for her suggestions.

section, "Writing in Contexts," I position myself as a reader/writer of qualitative research. Then, I discuss (a) the historical roots of social scientific writing, including its dependence upon metaphor and prescribed formats, and (b) the postmodernist possibilities for qualitative writing, including experimental representation. In the second section, "Writing Practices," I offer a compendium of writing suggestions and exercises organized around topics in the text.

Necessarily, the chapter reflects my own process and preferences. I encourage researchers to explore their own processes and preferences through writing—and rewriting and rewriting. Writing from our Selves should strengthen the community of qualitative researchers and the individual voices within it, because we will be more fully present in our work, more honest, more engaged.

◆ Writing in Contexts

I have a confession to make. For 30 years, I have yawned my way through numerous supposedly exemplary qualitative studies. Countless numbers of texts have I abandoned half read, half scanned. I'll order a new book with great anticipation—the topic is one I'm interested in, the author is someone I want to read—only to find the text boring. Recently, I have been "coming out" to colleagues and students about my secret displeasure with much of qualitative writing, only to find a community of like-minded discontents. Undergraduates are disappointed that sociology is not more interesting; graduate students confess that they do not finish reading what has been assigned because it is boring; and colleagues express relief to be at long last discussing qualitative research's own dirty little secret: Our empire is (partially) unclothed.

Speaking of this, and in this way, risks identifying my thoughts with that dreadful genre, *putdownism*. But that is not the emotional core or intention of my remarks. Rather, I want to raise a serious problem. Although our topics often are riveting and our research carefully executed, our books are underread. Unlike quantitative work, which can carry its meaning in its tables and summaries, qualitative work depends upon people's reading it. Just as a piece of literature is not equivalent to its "plot summary," qualitative research is not contained in its abstracts. Qualitative research has to be read, not scanned; its meaning is in the reading.

Qualita
devotees o
and wholly
that ends u
the author
this chapte
That make
attention t

I write
something
perhaps yo
my points
model coh
I will argu
static soci
model has
creative p
researcher
writing m
is simply r
writers to

Qualita
individual
the survey
more hon
Students a
are traine
as a meth
validates t
down the

One re
diminish
through r
suppressic
omniscien
ourselves i
our own i
These are

yourself as a reader/writer of historical roots of social on metaphor and prescribed ies for qualitative writing, e second section, "Writing suggestions and exercises

process and preferences. I processes and preferences g. Writing from our Selves ve researchers and the indi- e fully present in our work,

ive yawned my way through studies. Countless numbers of d. I'll order a new book with ted in, the author is someone ecently, I have been "coming ret displeasure with much of of like-minded discontents. ogy is not more interesting; inish reading what has been xpress relief to be at long last little secret: Our empire is

tifying my thoughts with that e emotional core or intention ious problem. Although our efully executed, our books are t can carry its meaning in its nds upon people's reading it. dent to its "plot summary," bstracts. Qualitative research a the reading.

Qualitative work could be reaching wide and diverse audiences, not just devotees of the topic or the author. It seems foolish at best, and narcissistic and wholly self-absorbed at worst, to spend months or years doing research that ends up not being read and not making a difference to anything but the author's career. Can something be done? That is the question that drives this chapter: How do we create texts that are vital? That are attended to? That make a difference? One way to create those texts is to turn our attention to writing as a method of inquiry.

I write because I want to find something out. I write in order to learn something that I didn't know before I wrote it. I was taught, however, as perhaps you were, too, not to write until I knew what I wanted to say, until my points were organized and outlined. No surprise, this static writing model coheres with mechanistic scientism and quantitative research. But, I will argue, the model is itself a sociohistorical invention that reifies the static social world imagined by our nineteenth-century foreparents. The model has serious problems: It ignores the role of writing as a dynamic, creative process; it undermines the confidence of beginning qualitative researchers because their experience of research is inconsistent with the writing model; and it contributes to the flotilla of qualitative writing that is simply not interesting to read because adherence to the model requires writers to silence their own voices and to view themselves as contaminants.

Qualitative researchers commonly speak of the importance of the individual researcher's skills and aptitudes. The researcher—rather than the survey, the questionnaire, or the census tape—is the "instrument." The more honed the researcher, the greater the possibility of "good" research. Students are trained to observe, listen, question, and participate. Yet they are trained to conceptualize writing as "writing up" the research, rather than as a method of discovery. Almost unthinkingly, qualitative research training validates the mechanistic model of writing, even though that model shuts down the creativity and sensibilities of the individual researcher.

One reason, then, that our texts are boring is that our sense of self is diminished as we are homogenized through professional socialization, through rewards and punishments. Homogenization occurs through the suppression of individual voices. We have been encouraged to take on the omniscient voice of science, the view from every- everywhere. How do we put ourselves in our own texts, and with what consequences? How do we nurture our own individuality and at the same time lay claim to "knowing" something? These are both philosophically and practically difficult problems.

Postmodernist Context

We are fortunate, now, to be working in a postmodernist climate (see, e.g., Agger, 1990; Lehman, 1991; Lyotard, 1979). Postmodernism has affected all the disciplines and has gained ascendancy in the humanities, arts, philosophy, and the natural sciences. Disciplinary boundaries are regularly broken. Literary studies are about sociological questions; social scientists write fiction; sculptors do performance art; choreographers do sociology; and so on. (See, for literary criticism, Eagleton, 1983; Morris, 1988. For philosophy, see Hutcheon, 1988; Rorty, 1979; Nicholson, 1990. For physics, Gleick, 1984. For mathematics, Kline, 1980. For arts, Trinh, 1989. For communications, Carey, 1989. For social sciences, Clifford & Marcus, 1986; Clough, 1992; Denzin, 1986, 1991; Fiske & Schweder, 1986; Geertz, 1983; Marcus & Fischer, 1986; Richardson, 1991; Seidman & Wagner, 1991; Turner & Bruner, 1986. For education, Lather, 1991.)

The core of postmodernism is the *doubt* that any method or theory, discourse or genre, tradition or novelty, has a universal and general claim as the "right" or the privileged form of authoritative knowledge. Postmodernism *suspects* all truth claims of masking and serving particular interests in local, cultural, and political struggles. But postmodernism does not automatically reject conventional methods of knowing and telling as false or archaic. Rather, it opens those standard methods to inquiry and introduces new methods, which are also, then, subject to critique.

The postmodernist context of doubt distrusts all methods equally. No method has a privileged status. The superiority of "science" over "literature"—or, from another vantage point, "literature" over "science"—is challenged. But a postmodernist position does allow us to know "something" without claiming to know everything. Having a partial, local, historical knowledge is still knowing. In some ways, "knowing" is easier, however, because postmodernism recognizes the situational limitations of the knower. Qualitative writers are off the hook, so to speak. They don't have to try to play God, writing as disembodied omniscient narrators claiming universal, atemporal general knowledge; they can eschew the questionable metanarrative of scientific objectivity and still have plenty to say as situated speakers, subjectivities engaged in knowing/telling about the world as they perceive it.

A particular kind of postmodernist thinking that I have found especially helpful is *poststructuralism* (for an overview, see Weedon, 1987). Poststructuralism links language, subjectivity, social organization, and power. The

centerpiece is language, which produces meaning through discourses within and without, in ways that are shaped by social organization and a sense of selves, or by competing discourses of the world, makes

Language is not neutral; it constructs the individual in locally specific ways. Various discourses available to us have experienced different "marriages," "husbanded" as "wife battering" is tolerated. Experienced by social institutions and subject to multiple subjectivities is shared

Poststructuralism links *social science*; through knowing "about" various knowledges. Poststructuralism to reflect upon our

Specifically, poststructuralist writers: First, persons writing to free us from trying to please everyone. Nurture "science writing" in our psyche. We

Historical Context

Language, through reality and of the world, produce, what to

ing in a postmodernist climate (see, Lyotard, 1979). Postmodernism has gained ascendancy in the humanities, sciences. Disciplinary boundaries are about sociological questions; social performance art; choreographers do y criticism, Eagleton, 1983; Morris, 1988; Rorty, 1979; Nicholson, 1990. matics, Kline, 1980. For arts, Trinh, 1989. For social sciences, Clifford & in, 1986, 1991; Fiske & Schweder, er, 1986; Richardson, 1991; Seidman 1986. For education, Lather, 1991.) e *doubt* that any method or theory, lty, has a universal and general claim of authoritative knowledge. Postmod- skin and serving particular interests ggles. But postmodernism does not thods of knowing and telling as false ndard methods to inquiry and intro- then, subject to critique.

ubt distrusts all methods equally. No superiority of "science" over "litera- oint, "literature" over "science"—is ition does allow us to know "some- everything. Having a partial, local, . In some ways, "knowing" is easier, cognizes the situational limitations of off the hook, so to speak. They don't s disembodied omniscient narrators al knowledge; they can eschew the fic objectivity and still have plenty to engaged in knowing/telling about the

t thinking that I have found especially erview, see Weedon, 1987). Poststruc- social organization, and power. The

centerpiece is language. Language does not "reflect" social reality, but produces meaning, creates social reality. Different languages and different discourses within a given language divide up the world and give it meaning in ways that are not reducible to one another. Language is how social organization and power are defined and contested and the place where our sense of selves, our *subjectivity*, is constructed. Understanding language as competing discourses, competing ways of giving meaning and of organizing the world, makes language a site of exploration, struggle.

Language is not the result of one's individuality; rather, language constructs the individual's subjectivity in ways that are historically and locally specific. What something means to individuals is dependent on the discourses available to them. For example, being hit by one's spouse is experienced differently if it is thought of within the discourse of "normal marriage," "husband's rights," or "wife battering." If a woman sees male violence as "normal" or a "husband's right," then she is unlikely to see it as "wife battering," an illegitimate use of power that should not be tolerated. Experience is thus open to contradictory interpretations governed by social interests rather than objective truth. The individual is both site and subject of discursive struggles for identity. Because the individual is subject to multiple and competing discourses in many realms, one's subjectivity is shifting and contradictory, not stable, fixed, rigid.

Poststructuralism thus points to the *continual cocreation of Self and social science*; they are known through each other. Knowing the Self and knowing "about" the subject are intertwined, partial, historical, local knowledges. Poststructuralism, then, permits—nay, invites—no, incites us to reflect upon our method and explore new ways of knowing.

Specifically, poststructuralism suggests two important things to qualitative writers: First, it directs us to understand ourselves reflexively as persons writing from particular positions at specific times; and second, it frees us from trying to write a single text in which everything is said to everyone. Nurturing our own voices releases the censorious hold of "science writing" on our consciousness, as well as the arrogance it fosters in our psyche. Writing is validated as a method of knowing.

Historical Contexts: Writing Conventions

Language, then, is a constitutive force, creating a particular view of reality and of the Self. Producing "things" always involves value—what to produce, what to name the productions, and what the relationship between

the producers and the named things will be. Writing "things" is no exception. No textual staging is ever innocent (including this one). Styles of writing are neither fixed nor neutral but reflect the historically shifting domination of particular schools or paradigms.

Having some sense of the history of our writing practices helps us to demystify standard practices and loosen their hold on our psyches. Social scientific writing, like all other forms of writing, is a sociohistorical construction and, therefore, mutable.

Since the seventeenth century, the world of writing has been divided into two separate kinds: literary and scientific. Literature, from the seventeenth century onward, was associated with fiction, rhetoric, and subjectivity, whereas science was associated with fact, "plain language," and objectivity (Clifford, 1986, p. 5). Fiction was "false" because it invented reality, unlike science, which was "true," because it simply "reported" "objective" reality in a single, unambiguous voice.

During the eighteenth century, assaults upon literature intensified. John Locke cautioned adults to forgo figurative language lest the "conduit" between "things" and "thought" be obstructed. David Hume depicted poets as professional liars. Jeremy Bentham proposed that the ideal language would be one without words, only unambiguous symbols. Samuel Johnson's dictionary sought to fix "univocal meanings in perpetuity, much like the univocal meanings of standard arithmetic terms" (Levine, 1985, p. 4).

Into this linguistic world the Marquis de Condorcet introduced the term *social science*. He contended that "knowledge of the truth" would be "easy and error almost impossible" if one adopted precise language about moral and social issues (quoted in Levine, 1985, p. 6). By the nineteenth century, literature and science stood as two separate domains. Literature was aligned with "art" and "culture"; it contained the values of "taste, aesthetics, ethics, humanity, and morality" (Clifford, 1986, p. 6), and the rights to metaphoric and ambiguous language. Given to science was the belief that its words were objective, precise, unambiguous, noncontextual, non-metaphoric.

But because literary writing was taking a second seat in importance, status, impact, and truth value to science, some literary writers attempted to make literature a part of science. By the late nineteenth century, "realism" dominated both science and fiction writing (Clough, 1992). Honoré de Balzac spearheaded the realism movement in literature. He viewed society as a "historical organism" with "social species" akin to

"zoological s
investigate "th
upon which so
the novel was
Following Bal
In his famou
"return to nat
little by little
scientific patl
1965, p. 271'

Throughou
and acknowl
and literary v
tracing these
writing (see /
Clough, 199
Simons, 199
disciplines ha
such as proba

Each writi
only two of t
I believe the
of inquiry (so
about social
brake on our

Metaphor

A literary
Like the spir
surface, and
metaphor ak
riencing an
accomplishe
toad") or an

Social sci
depends upo
and underst
Metaphors

things will be. Writing "things" is no innocent (including this one). Styles do not but reflect the historically shifting paradigms.

Our writing practices helps us to understand their hold on our psyches. Social forms of writing, is a sociohistorical

World of writing has been divided into fiction. Literature, from the seventeenth century, fiction, rhetoric, and subjectivity, "plain language," and objectivity "because it invented reality, unlike imply "reported" "objective" reality

Results upon literature intensified. John Lyly's narrative language lest the "conduit" be obstructed. David Hume depicted the "phantom" proposed that the ideal language only unambiguous symbols. Samuel Johnson's equivocal meanings in perpetuity, much like "arithmetic terms" (Levine, 1985,

Condorcet introduced the term "knowledge of the truth" would be "easy to adopt precise language about moral values" (1785, p. 6). By the nineteenth century,

separate domains. Literature was maintained the values of "taste, aesthetic" (Clifford, 1986, p. 6), and the rights of language. Given to science was the belief in unambiguous, noncontextual, non-

making a second seat in importance, science, some literary writers attempted to do. By the late nineteenth century, and fiction writing (Clough, 1992). The realism movement in literature. He "naturalism" with "social species" akin to

"zoological species." Writers deserving of praise, he contended, must investigate "the reasons or causes" of "social effects"—the "first principles" upon which society is based (Balzac, 1842/1965, pp. 247-249). For Balzac, the novel was an "instrument of scientific inquiry" (Crawford, 1951, p. 7). Following Balzac's lead, Emile Zola argued for "naturalism" in literature. In his famous essay "The Novel as Social Science," he argued that the "return to nature, the naturalistic evolution which marks the century, drives little by little all the manifestation of human intelligence into the same scientific path." Literature is to be "governed by science" (Zola, 1880/1965, p. 271).

Throughout the twentieth century, crossovers—uneasy and easy, denied and acknowledged—have characterized the relationship between science and literary writing. Today, scholars in a host of disciplines are involved in tracing these relationships and in deconstructing scientific and literary writing (see Agger, 1989; Atkinson, 1990; Brodkey, 1987; Brown, 1977; Clough, 1992; Edmondson, 1984; Nelson, Megill, & McCloskey, 1987; Simons, 1990). Their deconstructive analyses concretely show how all disciplines have their own set of literary devices and rhetorical appeals, such as probability tables, archival records, and first-person accounts.

Each writing convention could be discussed at length, but I will discuss only two of them—metaphor and writing formats. I choose these because I believe they are good sites for experimenting with writing as a method of inquiry (see the section "Writing Practices," below). Thinking critically about social science's metaphors and writing formats helps break their brake on our pens and word processors.

Metaphor

A literary device, *metaphor*, is the backbone of social science writing. Like the spine, it bears weight, permits movement, is buried beneath the surface, and links parts together into a functional, coherent whole. As this metaphor about metaphor suggests, the essence of metaphor is the experiencing and understanding of one thing in terms of another. This is accomplished through comparison (e.g., "My love is like a green, green toad") or analogy (e.g., "the evening of life").

Social scientific writing uses metaphors at every "level." Social science depends upon a deep epistemic code regarding the way "that knowledge and understanding in general are figured" (Shapiro, 1985-1986, p. 198). Metaphors external to the particular piece of research prefigure the

analysis with a "truth-value" code belonging to another domain (James 1981). For example, the use of *enlighten* to indicate imparting or gaining knowledge is a light-based metaphor, what Derrida (1982) refers to as the "heliocentric" view of knowledge, the passive receipt of rays. Immanent in these metaphors are philosophical and value commitments so entrenched and familiar that they can do their partisan work in the guise of neutrality, passing as literal.

Consider the following statements about theory (examples inspired by Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 46):

- ◆ What is the *foundation* of your theory?
- ◆ Your theory needs *support*.
- ◆ Your position is *shaky*.
- ◆ Your argument is *falling apart*.
- ◆ Let's *construct* an argument.
- ◆ The *form* of your argument needs buttressing.
- ◆ Given your *framework*, no wonder your argument *fell apart*.

The italicized words express our customary, unconscious use of the metaphor, "Theory is a building." The metaphor, moreover, structures the actions we take in theorizing and what we believe constitutes theory. We try to build a theoretical structure, which we then experience as a structure, which has a form and a foundation, which we then experience as an edifice, sometimes quite grand, sometimes in need of shoring up, and sometimes in need of dismantling or, more recently, deconstructing.

Metaphors are everywhere. Consider *functionalism*, *role theory*, *game theory*, *dramaturgical analogy*, *organicism*, *social evolutionism*, the *social system*, *ecology*, *labeling theory*, *equilibrium*, *human capital*, the *power elite*, *resource mobilization*, *ethnic insurgency*, *developing countries*, *stratification*, and *significance tests*. Metaphors organize sociological work and affect the interpretations of the "facts"; indeed, facts are interpretable ("make sense") only in terms of their place within a metaphoric structure. The "sense making" is always value constituting—making sense in a particular way, privileging one ordering of the "facts" over others.

Writing Formats

In addition to the metaphoric basis of social scientific writing, there are prescribed writing formats: How we are expected to write affects what we

can write about. The re discourages the use of conjectures, and relat "problem" (hypothesis are extraneous. Induct tively; the argument is are to identify explicit favors—creates and su logical knowledge. T bolic power over soci one's work being acc *prima facie* evidence (social science writing

Additional social phies. Needful of dis ies' reports as well as impersonal, third-pe trumpet the authenti identifies four conve calls "realist tales." I "I" is mostly absent the author exists on researcher" credenti of concrete, particu pattern, or culture claimed to be prese language, cultural *interpretive omnipt* tions of the culture social sciences are *Its Path* (1976), Wi Liebow's *Tally's C*

Other genres of or in-depth intervi Mischler, 1991; I searcher proves h section, and write document snippet made, rather tha

can write about. The referencing system in the social sciences, for example, discourages the use of footnotes, a place for secondary arguments, novel conjectures, and related ideas. Knowledge is constituted as "focused," "problem" (hypothesis) centered, "linear," straightforward. Other thoughts are extraneous. Inductively accomplished research is to be reported deductively; the argument is to be abstracted in 150 words or less; and researchers are to identify explicitly with a theoretical label. Each of these conventions favors—creates and sustains—a particular vision of what constitutes sociological knowledge. The conventions hold tremendous material and symbolic power over social scientists. Using them increases the probability of one's work being accepted into "core" social science journals, but is not *prima facie* evidence of greater—or lesser—truth value or significance than social science writing using other conventions.

Additional social science writing conventions have shaped ethnographies. Needful of distinguishing their work from travelers' and missionaries' reports as well as from imaginative writing, ethnographers adopted an impersonal, third-person voice to explain an "observed phenomenon" and trumpet the authenticity of their representations. John Van Maanen (1988) identifies four conventions used in traditional ethnographies, or what he calls "realist tales." First, there is *experiential author(ity)*. The author as an "I" is mostly absent from the text, which talks about the people studied; the author exists only in the preface, establishing "I was there" and "I'm a researcher" credentials. Second, there is *documentary style*, with a plethora of concrete, particular details that presume to represent the typical activity, pattern, or culture member. Third, *the culture members' point of view* is claimed to be presented through their accounts, quotations, explanations, language, cultural clichés, and so on. And fourth, the author claims *interpretive omnipotence*. The ethnographer's "no-nonsense" interpretations of the culture are claimed as valid. Many of the classic books in the social sciences are realist tales. These include Kai Erikson's *Everything in Its Path* (1976), William Foote Whyte's *Street Corner Society* (1943), Elliot Liebow's *Tally's Corner* (1967), and Carol Stack's *All Our Kin* (1974).

Other genres of qualitative writing—such as texts based on life histories or in-depth interviews—have their own sets of traditional conventions (see Mischler, 1991; Richardson, 1990). In these traditional texts, the researcher proves his or her credentials in the introductory or methods section, and writes the body of the text as though the quotations and document snippets are naturally there, genuine evidence for the case being made, rather than selected, pruned, and spruced up for their textual

appearance. Like ethnography, the assumption of *scientific authority* is rhetorically displayed in these qualitative texts. Examples of traditional "life-story" texts include Lillian Rubin's *Worlds of Pain* (1976), Sharon Kaufman's *The Ageless Self* (1986), and my own *The New Other Woman* (Richardson, 1985).

Experimental Writing

In the wake of feminist and postmodernist critiques of traditional qualitative writing practices, qualitative work has been appearing in new forms; genres are blurred, jumbled. I think of them as *experimental representations*. Because experiments are experimental, it is difficult to specify their conventions. One practice these experiments have in common, however, is the *violation of prescribed conventions*; they transgress the boundaries of social science writing genres.

Experimental representation is an emergent and transgressive phenomenon. Although some people are uncomfortable with it both as an idea and as a practice, I highly recommend experimental writing as a method of knowing. Because experimentation is taking place in (because of?) the postmodernist context, experimentation can be thought about within that frame. Working within the "ideology of doubt," experimental writers raise and display postmodernist issues. Chief among these are questions of how the author positions the Self as a knower and teller. For the experimental writer, these lead to the intertwined problems of subjectivity/authority/authorship/reflexivity, on the one hand, and representational form, on the other.

Postmodernism claims that writing is always partial, local, and situational, and that our Self is always present, no matter how much we try to suppress it—but only partially present, for in our writing we repress parts of ourselves, too. Working from that premise, we are freed to write material in a variety of ways: to tell and retell. There is no such thing as "getting it right," only "getting it" differently contoured and nuanced. When experimenting with form, ethnographers learn about the topic and about themselves what is unknowable, unimaginable, using prescribed writing formats. So, even if one chooses to write a final paper in a conventional form, experimenting with format is a practical and powerful way to expand one's interpretive skills and to make one's "old" materials "new."

We can deploy different forms for different audiences and different occasions. Some experimentation can be accomplished simply by writing

the same piece of re
and the popular pr
forms of represent

Social scientists:
1993; Geertz, 1988
1986; I. K. Zola, 1
1992), poetry (e.g
1985; Richardson,
Richardson, 1993;
ence" (McCall & B
1991; Krieger, 1983
1992b), "aphorism
1986, 1988), visua
Dorst, 1989; Fine,
1992; D. Rose, 19
dine, 1990; Williar
of this chapter to o
Instead, I will add
devices to re-creat
these *evocative rep*
from these forms l
hope readers will i
texts, but I have n
than product is th

Evocative expe
demand analysis o
rendering the soci
seeing through an
tools in the "writin
forms reveals the
rhetoric, as well a
writing touches u
experience the sel
Trying out evocati
it differently. We fi
sequences, blurre
place for ourselve

One form of ev
personalized, rev

assumption of *scientific authority* is alternative texts. Examples of traditional in's *Worlds of Pain* (1976), Sharon and my own *The New Other Woman*

modernist critiques of traditional work has been appearing in new I think of them as *experimental* are experimental, it is difficult to these experiments have in common, and *conventions*; they transgress the genres.

emergent and transgressive phenomena comfortable with it both as an idea and experimental writing as a method of taking place in (because of?) the can be thought about within that of doubt," experimental writers raise among these are questions of how over and teller. For the experimental problems of subjectivity/authority/ and representational form, on the

is always partial, local, and situated, no matter how much we try to , for in our writing we repress parts premise, we are freed to write material There is no such thing as "getting it toured and nuanced. When experiment about the topic and about them- able, using prescribed writing for- final paper in a conventional form, and powerful way to expand one's old" materials "new."

different audiences and different be accomplished simply by writing

the same piece of research for an academic audience, a trade book audience, and the popular press (see Richardson, 1990). The potential for alternative forms of representation, however, go way beyond those stagings.

Social scientists are now writing "narratives of the self" (e.g., Ellis, 1992, 1993; Geertz, 1988; Kondo, 1990; Krieger, 1991; Ronai, 1992; Steedman, 1986; I. K. Zola, 1983), fiction (see Frohock, 1992; Stewart, 1989; Wolf, 1992), poetry (e.g., Brady, 1991; Diamond, 1981; Patai, 1988; Prattis, 1985; Richardson, 1992a), drama (Ellis & Bochner, 1992; Paget, 1990; Richardson, 1993; Richardson & Lockridge, 1991), "performance science" (McCall & Becker, 1990), "polyvocal texts" (e.g., Butler & Rosenblum, 1991; Krieger, 1983; Schneider, 1991), "responsive readings" (see Richardson, 1992b), "aphorisms" (E. Rose, 1992), comedy and satire (e.g., Barley, 1986, 1988), visual presentations (e.g., Harper, 1987), mixed genres (e.g., Dorst, 1989; Fine, 1992; hooks, 1990; Lather, 1991; Linden, 1992; Pfohl, 1992; D. Rose, 1989; Stoller, 1989; Trinh, 1989; Ulmer, 1989; Walkerdine, 1990; Williams, 1991; Wolf, 1992), and more. It is beyond the scope of this chapter to outline or comment on each of these experimental forms. Instead, I will address a class of experimental genres that deploy literary devices to re-create lived experience and evoke emotional responses. I call these *evocative representations*. I resist providing the reader with snippets from these forms because snippets will not do them justice and because I hope readers will read and experiment for themselves. I do describe some texts, but I have no desire to valorize a new canon. Again, *process* rather than product is the purpose of this chapter.

Evocative experimental forms display interpretive frameworks that demand analysis of themselves as cultural products and as methods for rendering the sociological. Evocative representations are a striking way of seeing through and beyond sociological naturalisms. They are powerful tools in the "writing as analysis" tool chest. Casting sociology into evocative forms reveals the underlying labor of sociological production and its rhetoric, as well as its potential as a human endeavor, because evocative writing touches us where we live, in our bodies. Through it we can experience the self-reflexive and transformational process of self-creation. Trying out evocative forms, we relate differently to our material; we know it differently. We find ourselves attending to feelings, ambiguities, temporal sequences, blurred experiences, and so on; we struggle to find a textual place for ourselves and our doubts and uncertainties.

One form of evocative writing is the *narrative of the self*. This is a highly personalized, revealing text in which an author tells stories about his or

her own lived experience. Using dramatic recall, strong metaphors, images, characters, unusual phrasings, puns, subtexts, and allusions, the writer constructs a sequence of events, a "plot," holding back on interpretation, asking the reader to "relive" the events emotionally with the writer. Narratives of the self do not read like traditional ethnography because they use the writing techniques of fiction. They are specific stories of particular events. Accuracy is not the issue; rather, narratives of the self seek to meet literary criteria of coherence, verisimilitude, and interest. Because narratives of the self are staged as imaginative renderings, they allow the field-worker to exaggerate, swagger, entertain, make a point without tedious documentation, relive the experience, and say what might be unsayable in other circumstances. Writing these frankly subjective narratives, ethnographers are somewhat relieved of the problems of speaking for the "Other," because they are the Other in their texts.

In *ethnographic fictional representations*, another evocative form, writers define their work as fiction, as products of the imagination. The writers are seeking a format in which to tell a "good story"; that story might be about the self, but more likely it is about the group or culture studied. In addition to the techniques used by self-narrators, ethnographic fiction writers draw upon other devices, such as flashback, flashforward, alternative points of view, deep characterization, tone shifts, synecdoche, dialogue, interior monologue, and, sometimes, even the omniscient narrator. The ethnographic setting encases the story, the cultural norms are seen through the characters, but the work is understood as fiction. Although writing up qualitative research as fiction frees the author from the constraints of science, competing with "real" fiction writers is chancy. And if the author wants the work to have an impact for social change, fiction may be a rhetorically poor way to stage the research. But it may just be a good way for the writer to see the material from different points of view.

A third evocative form is *poetic representation*. A poem, as Robert Frost articulates it, is "the shortest emotional distance between two points"—the speaker and the reader. Writing sociological interviews as poetry displays the role of the *prose trope* in constituting knowledge. When we read or hear poetry, we are continually nudged into recognizing that the text has been constructed. But all texts are constructed—prose ones, too; therefore, poetry helps problematize reliability, validity, and "truth."

When people talk, whether as conversants, storytellers, informants, or interviewees, their speech is closer to poetry than it is to sociological prose (Tedlock, 1983). Writing up interviews as poems honors the speaker's

pauses, repetitions, alliteration. Poetry may actually be quoting snippets in place of breath points, alliteration and rhyme engage the listener. "Poetry is above all a use of the power of our ultimate imagination as if forces we can lay out in sensuous form" (DeSha). This configuration lets us hear. Poetry is thus a *practical*.

Ethnographic drama is a way of shaping an experience into a fictional, and poetic technique. It comes from multiple "as-lived" experiences, unspoken, but present, in ethnographic drama, or in performance. When the material to be written is emotionally laden, drama is standard writing.

Constructing drama in "research" texts. Which comes first? What are the consequences? When Originating in the lived experience, moving into an ethnographic publication, the printed "valid" version, particularly the "original" or the performed. We accept this validity claim. It is a claim of invention and potential. It is written texts, rhetorical invention. It doesn't just "talk about

A last evocative form is *poetry*. It is used freely in his or her production. Often breaking the boundaries of the scholarly conventions, the scholar might think of as a postmodernist.

In traditionally staged ethnography, the presentation of triangulation as

g dramatic recall, strong metaphors, images, puns, subtexts, and allusions, the writer s, a "plot," holding back on interpretation, the events emotionally with the writer. d like traditional ethnography because they tion. They are specific stories of particular ; rather, narratives of the self seek to meet erisimilitude, and interest. Because narra- ; imaginative renderings, they allow the vagger, entertain, make a point without the experience, and say what might be es. Writing these frankly subjective narra- hat relieved of the problems of speaking e the Other in their texts.

representations, another evocative form, writ- s products of the imagination. The writers o tell a "good story"; that story might be is about the group or culture studied. In l by self-narrators, ethnographic fiction- such as flashback, flashforward, alterna- terization, tone shifts, synecdoche, dia- ometimes, even the omniscient narrator. s the story, the cultural norms are seen work is understood as fiction. Although s fiction frees the author from the con- h "real" fiction writers is chancy. And if an impact for social change, fiction may e the research. But it may just be a good rial from different points of view.

representation. A poem, as Robert Frost onal distance between two points"—the ological interviews as poetry displays tituting knowledge. When we read or dged into recognizing that the text has onstructed—prose ones, too; therefore, y, validity, and "truth." onversants, storytellers, informants, or o poetry than it is to sociological prose views as poems honors the speaker's

pauses, repetitions, alliterations, narrative strategies, rhythms, and so on. Poetry may actually better represent the speaker than the practice of quoting snippets in prose. Further, poetry's rhythms, silences, spaces, breath points, alliterations, meter, cadence, assonance, rhyme, and off-rhyme engage the listener's body, even when the mind resists and denies it. "Poetry is above all a concentration of the power of language which is the power of our ultimate relationship to everything in the universe. It is as if forces we can lay claim to in no other way become present to us in sensuous form" (DeShazer, 1986, p. 138). Settling words together in new configurations lets us hear, see, and feel the world in new dimensions. Poetry is thus a *practical* and *powerful* method for analyzing social worlds.

Ethnographic drama is a fourth evocative genre. Drama is a way of shaping an experience without losing the experience; it can blend realist, fictional, and poetic techniques; it can reconstruct the "sense" of an event from multiple "as-lived" perspectives; and it can give voice to what is unspoken, but present, such as "cancer," as portrayed in Paget's (1990) ethnographic drama, or abortion, as in Ellis and Bochner's (1992) drama. When the material to be displayed is intractable, unruly, multisited, and emotionally laden, drama is more likely to recapture the experience than is standard writing.

Constructing drama raises the postmodern debate about "oral" and "written" texts. Which comes first? Which one should be (is) privileged, and with what consequences? Why the bifurcation between "oral" and "written"? Originating in the lived experience, encoded as field notes, transformed into an ethnographic play, performed, tape-recorded, and then reedited for publication, the printed script might well be fancied the definitive or "valid" version, particularly by those who privilege the published over the "original" or the performance over the lived experience. What happens if we accept this validity claim? Dramatic construction provides multiple sites of invention and potential contestation for validity, the blurring of oral and written texts, rhetorical moves, ethical dilemmas, and authority/authorship. It doesn't just "talk about" these issues, it *is* these issues.

A last evocative form to consider is *mixed genres*. The scholar draws freely in his or her productions from literary, artistic, and scientific genres, often breaking the boundaries of each of those as well. In these productions, the scholar might have different "takes" on the same topic, what I think of as a postmodernist deconstruction of triangulation.

In traditionally staged research we valorize "triangulation" (for discussion of triangulation as method, see Denzin, 1978; for an example, see

Statham, Richardson, & Cook, 1991). In that process, a researcher deploys "different methods"—such as interviews, exploration of census data, and document checking—to "validate" findings. These methods, however, carry the *same domain* assumptions, including the assumption that there is a "fixed point" or "object" that can be triangulated. But in postmodernist mixed-genre texts, we do not triangulate; we *crystallize*. We recognize that there are far more than "three sides" from which to approach the world.

I propose that the central image for "validity" for postmodernist texts is not the triangle—a rigid, fixed, two-dimensional object. Rather, the central image is the crystal, which combines symmetry and substance with an infinite variety of shapes, substances, transmutations, multidimensionalities, and angles of approach. Crystals grow, change, alter, but are not amorphous.

Crystals are prisms that reflect externalities and refract within themselves, creating different colors, patterns, arrays, casting off in different directions. What we see depends upon our angle of repose. Not triangulation, crystallization. In postmodernist mixed-genre texts, we have moved from plane geometry to light theory, where light can be both waves and particles.

Crystallization, without losing structure, deconstructs the traditional idea of "validity" (we feel how there is no single truth, we see how texts validate themselves); and crystallization provides us with a deepened, complex, thoroughly partial, understanding of the topic. Paradoxically, we know more and doubt what we know.

We see this crystallization process in several recent books. Margery Wolf, in *A Thrice-Told Tale* (1992), takes the same event and tells it as fictional story, field notes, and a social scientific paper. John Stewart, in *Drinkers, Drummers and Decent Folk* (1989), writes poetry, fiction, ethnographic accounts, and field notes about Village Trinidad. Valerie Walkerdine's *Schoolgirl Fictions* (1990) develops/displays the theme that "masculinity and femininity are fictions which take on the status of fact" (p. xiii) by incorporating into the book journal entries, poems, essays, photographs of herself, drawings, cartoons, and annotated transcripts. Ruth Linden's *Making Stories, Making Selves: Feminist Reflections on the Holocaust* (1992) intertwines autobiography, academic writing, and survivors' stories in a Helen Hooven Santmyer Prize in Women's Studies book, which was her dissertation. Patti Lather's *Getting Smart: Feminist Research and Pedagogy with/in the Postmodern* (1991), a winner of the American Educational Studies Critics Choice book award, displays high theory and transcript, pedagogue and students. John Dorst's *The Written Suburb*

(1989) presents an assemblage of

In some moments, breaking topics, breaking of how topics the issues of Susan Krieger (1991) is a Susan Krieger's attachment says, it "look Trinh T. Mir conventions poetry, self-re help readers *Field* (1988) narratives. S collage strat and militant: Ellis and Mir *Experience* (*Interaction*, i

Whither ar

The conte tive research review, critic our texts in constraints : authority, tr political/ide easily valida freedom to better produ articles that the work is think about.

One thin publication

). In that process, a researcher deploys views, exploration of census data, and findings. These methods, however, including the assumption that there be triangulated. But in postmodernist late; we *crystallize*. We recognize that from which to approach the world. or "validity" for postmodernist texts or two-dimensional object. Rather, the combines symmetry and substance with ces, transmutations, multidimensionals grow, change, alter, but are not

nalities and refract within themselves, ys, casting off in different directions. ngle of repose. Not triangulation, ed-genre texts, we have moved from light can be both waves and particles. icture, deconstructs the traditional is no single truth, we see how texts tion provides us with a deepened, nding of the topic. Paradoxically, we

several recent books. Margery Wolf, e same event and tells it as fictional ic paper. John Stewart, in *Drinkers*, writes poetry, fiction, ethnographic age Trinidad. Valerie Walkerdine's displays the theme that "masculinity e on the status of fact" (p. xiii) by tries, poems, essays, photographs of otated transcripts. Ruth Linden's *Feminist Reflections on the Holocaust* lemic writing, and survivors' stories Women's Studies book, which was *Being Smart: Feminist Research and* 1), a winner of the American Eduaward, displays high theory and John Dorst's *The Written Suburb*

(1989) presents a geographic site as site, image, idea, discourse, and an assemblage of texts.

In some mixed-genre productions, the writer/artist roams freely around topics, breaking our sense of the externality of topics, developing our sense of how topic and self are twin constructs. With the artful self in display, the issues of constructedness and authorial responsibility are profiled. Susan Krieger's *Social Science and the Self: Personal Essays on an Art Form* (1991) is a superb example. The book is "design oriented," reflecting Krieger's attachment to Pueblo potters and Georgia O'Keefe, and, as she says, it "looks more like a pot or a painting than a hypothesis" (p. 120). Trinh T. Minh-ha's *Woman, Native, Other* (1989) breaks down writing conventions within each of the essays that constitute the book, mixing poetry, self-reflection, feminist criticism, photographs, and quotations that help readers experience postcoloniality. John Van Maanen's *Tales of the Field* (1988) analyzes examples of realist, confessional, and impressionist narratives. Stephen Pfohl's *Death at the Parasite Cafe* (1992) employs collage strategies and synchronic juxtapositions, blurring critical theory and militant art forms. Anthologies also reflect these mixed genres. Carolyn Ellis and Michael Flaherty's *Investigating Subjectivity: Research on Lived Experience* (1992) is one example, and the series, *Studies in Symbolic Interaction*, is another.

Whither and Whence?

The contemporary postmodernist context in which we work as qualitative researchers is a propitious one. It provides an opportunity for us to review, critique, and re-vision writing. Although we are freer to present our texts in a variety of forms to diverse audiences, we have different constraints arising from self-consciousness about claims to authorship, authority, truth, validity, and reliability. Self-reflexivity unmasks complex political/ideological agendas hidden in our writing. Truth claims are less easily validated now; desires to speak "for" others are suspect. The greater freedom to experiment with textual form, however, does not guarantee a better product. The opportunities for writing worthy texts—books and articles that are "good reads"—are multiple, exciting, and demanding. But the work is harder. The guarantees are fewer. There is a lot more for us to think about.

One thing for us to think about is whether writing experimentally for publication is a luxury open only to those who have academic sinecure.

Can/should only the already tenured write in experimental modes? Are the tenured doing a disservice to students by introducing them to alternative forms of writing? Will teaching them hereticisms "deskill" them? Alienate them from their discipline? These are heady ethical, pedagogical, and practical questions. I struggle with them in my teaching, writing, and collegial discussions. I have no definitive answers, but I do have some thoughts on the issues.

First, there are many different avenues open for the sociological writer (see Denzin, 1994; Richardson, 1990). There is no single way—much less "right" way—of staging a text. The same material can be written for different audiences—positivists, interactionists, postmodernists, feminists, humanities professors, cultural studies scholars, policy makers, and so on. That is why it is called *material*. Like wet clay, it is there for us to shape. What are our purposes? What are our goals? Who do we want to reach? What do we want to accomplish? If you are a graduate student, your likely purpose is the approval of your Ph.D. dissertation by your committee; if you are an untenured academic, your concern is probably the acceptance of an article by a mainline journal. Writing for those purposes is one way of knowing the material and one way of communicating with one kind of reader. Writing in standard ways does not prevent us from writing in other ways. We cannot write every way, for every purpose, at the same time. Most important, once we understand how to stage a dissertation or journal article rhetorically, we are more likely to get it accepted, get tenured, or the like. Even liberatory and radical messages can be published in conservative journals, if the writer follows the rules (Agger, 1990). Consequently, deconstructing traditional writing practices is a way of making writers more conscious of writing conventions, and, therefore, more competently able to meet them and to get their messages into mainstream social science.

Second, writing is a process of discovery. My purpose is not to turn us into poets, novelists, or dramatists—few of us will write well enough to succeed in those competitive fields. Most of us, like Poe, will be at best only almost poets. Rather, my intention is to encourage individuals to accept and nurture their own voices. The researcher's self-knowledge and knowledge of the topic develops through experimentation with point of view, tone, texture, sequencing, metaphor, and so on. The whole enterprise is demystified. Even the analysis paralysis that afflicts some readers of postmodernism is attenuated when writers view their work as process rather than as definitive representation.

Third, writing p
relate more deeply
stands the material i
deepens the text. T
more consciously c
others.

Finally, contemp
research has been
High-grade journals
tion, Journal of Co
already publish ex
Interaction, showc
versity of Chicago,
sity of Pennsylvania
larly publish exper
authors. Traditior
consciously (see Tl
legitimate it throu
sciences, conventic
conferences are de
Ethnography" cont
speakers from diffe
programs—at the U
University of South
teaching about rep
practices are signs c

In the 1950s, the
Today, the sociolog
ciplinary "science s
perspective. Today,
subfield in social
thrived because the
falsely limited kno
of social scientists.
in our bodies. They
experienced world

Today, the postri
sciences that scienc

write in experimental modes? Are the
by introducing them to alternative
hereticisms “deskill” them? Alienate
re heady ethical, pedagogical, and
hem in my teaching, writing, and
itive answers, but I do have some

ues open for the sociological writer
There is no single way—much less
same material can be written for
tionists, postmodernists, feminists,
scholars, policy makers, and so on.
vet clay, it is there for us to shape.
goals? Who do we want to reach?
are a graduate student, your likely
dissertation by your committee; if
concern is probably the acceptance
ing for those purposes is one way
f communicating with one kind of
ot prevent us from writing in other
ry purpose, at the same time. Most
age a dissertation or journal article
accepted, get tenured, or the like.
can be published in conservative
es (Agger, 1990). Consequently,
es is a way of making writers more
herefore, more competently able
nto mainstream social science.
ery. My purpose is not to turn us
of us will write well enough to
of us, like Poe, will be at best only
encourage individuals to accept
her’s self-knowledge and knowl-
perimentation with point of view,
l so on. The whole enterprise is
s that afflicts some readers of
ers view their work as process

Third, writing practices can improve traditional texts because writers relate more deeply and complexly to their materials. The writer understands the material in different ways. The deepened understanding of a Self deepens the text. The text will be less boring because the writer will be more consciously engaged in its production, more present to self and others.

Finally, contemporary experimental writing is a harbinger; qualitative research has been and will continue to be changed by and through it. High-grade journals—such as *The Sociological Quarterly*, *Symbolic Interaction*, *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, and *Qualitative Sociology*—already publish experimental pieces. The annual, *Studies in Symbolic Interaction*, showcases evocative writing. Presses such as Routledge, University of Chicago, University of Michigan, University of Indiana, University of Pennsylvania, Rutgers University Press, and Sage Publications regularly publish experimental work by both well-known and lesser-known authors. Traditional ethnographers write more reflexively and self-consciously (see Thorne, 1993). Even those opposed to postmodernism legitimate it through dialogue (Whyte, 1992). Throughout the social sciences, convention papers include transgressive presentations. Entire conferences are devoted to experimentation, such as the “Redesigning Ethnography” conference at the University of Colorado, which featured speakers from different disciplines. At least two well-respected interpretive programs—at the University of Illinois (under Norman Denzin) and at the University of South Florida (under Arthur Bochner and Carolyn Ellis)—are teaching about representational issues. All of these changes in academic practices are signs of *paradigm changes*.

In the 1950s, the sociology of science was a new, reflexively critical area. Today, the sociology of science undergirds theory, methods, and interdisciplinary “science studies.” In the 1960s, “gender” emerged as a theoretical perspective. Today, gender studies is one of the largest (if not the largest) subfield in social sciences. In part, science studies and gender studies thrived because they identified normative assumptions of social science that falsely limited knowledge. They spoke “truly” to the everyday experiences of social scientists. The new areas hit us where we lived—in our work and in our bodies. They offered alternative perspectives for understanding the experienced world.

Today, the postmodernist critique is having the same impact on social sciences that science studies and gender have had, and for similar reasons.

Postmodernism identifies unspecified assumptions that hinder us in our search for understanding “truly,” and it offers alternative practices that work. We feel its “truth”—its moral, intellectual, aesthetic, emotional, intuitive, embodied, playful pull. Each researcher is likely to respond to that pull differently, which should lead to writing that is more diverse, more author centered, less boring, and humbler. This is a time of transition, a propitious moment. Where this experimentation will eventually take us, I do not know, but I do know that we cannot go back to where we were.

◆ Writing Practices

Writing, the creative effort, should come first—at least for some part of every day of your life. It is a wonderful blessing if you will use it. You will become happier, more enlightened, alive, impassioned, light hearted and generous to everybody else. Even your health will improve. Colds will disappear and all the other ailments of discouragement and boredom. (Ueland, 1938/1987)

In what follows, I suggest some ways of using writing as a method of knowing. I have chosen exercises that have been productive for me and my students because they demystify writing, nurture the researcher’s voice, and serve the process of discovery. I wish I could guarantee them to bring good health as well! The practices are organized around topics discussed in the text.

Metaphor

Using old, wornout metaphors, although easy and comfortable, after a while invites stodginess and stiffness. The stiffer you get, the less flexible you are. You invite being ignored. In less metaphoric terms, if your writing is clichéd, you will not stretch your own imagination (ouch! hear the cliché! hear the cliché of me pointing out the cliché!) and you will bore people.

1. In standard social scientific writing, the metaphor for theory is that it is a “building” (structure, foundation, construction, deconstruction, framework, form, and so on). Consider a different metaphor for theory, such as “theory as a tapestry” or “theory as an illness.” Write a paragraph about theory using your metaphor. (See above for examples of “theory as

building.”) Do you “when you use an un

2. Consider alter the heliocentric one resense “knowledge’

3. What metapho your papers and high through metaphors t reinscribing? Do yo change how you “se your mixed metaph science’s glossing ov

4. Take a look a *Live By* (1980). It i metaphors in everyo thinking, and acting ing/writing? What al

Writing Formats

1. Choose a jou conventions of the : four-page analysis of presumed audience? author claim “authc are “you” in this pa research here?

2. Choose a jou research, and write the article built upo claimed? Where is t the subjects and wh

3. Choose a paj published that you t your discipline? Wei paper? What parts d upon those norms difficult areas thro

assumptions that hinder us in our offers alternative practices that intellectual, aesthetic, emotional, researcher is likely to respond to writing that is more diverse, more er. This is a time of transition, a entation will eventually take us, I ot go back to where we were.

first—at least for some part of essing if you will use it. You will , impassioned, light hearted and health will improve. Colds will discouragement and boredom.

of using writing as a method of e been productive for me and my , nurture the researcher's voice, I could guarantee them to bring ganized around topics discussed

ugh easy and comfortable, after a e stiffer you get, the less flexible metaphoric terms, if your writing agination (ouch! hear the cliché! ché!) and you will bore people.

, the metaphor for theory is that a, construction, deconstruction, a different metaphor for theory, as an illness." Write a paragraph above for examples of "theory as

building.") Do you "see" differently and "feel" differently about theorizing when you use an unusual metaphor?

2. Consider alternative sensory metaphors for "knowledge" other than the heliocentric one mentioned above. What happens when you rethink/resense "knowledge" as situated in "voice"? In touch?

3. What metaphors do you use in your writing? Take a look at one of your papers and highlight your metaphors and images. What are you saying through metaphors that you did not realize you were saying? What are you reinscribing? Do you want to? Can you find different metaphors that change how you "see" ("feel"?) the material? Your relationship to it? Are your mixed metaphors pointing to confusion in yourself or to social science's glossing over of ideas?

4. Take a look at George Lakoff and Mark Johnson's *Metaphors We Live By* (1980). It is a wonderful book, a compendium of examples of metaphors in everyday life and how they affect our ways of perceiving, thinking, and acting. What everyday metaphors are shaping your knowing/writing? What alternative ones can you find?

Writing Formats

1. Choose a journal article that you think exemplifies the writing conventions of the mainstream of your discipline. Then write a two- to four-page analysis of that article. How is the argument staged? Who is the presumed audience? How does the paper inscribe ideology? How does the author claim "authority" over the material? Where is the author? Where are "you" in this paper? Who are the subjects and who are the objects of research here?

2. Choose a journal article that exemplifies excellence in qualitative research, and write a two- to four-page analysis of that article. How has the article built upon normative social science writing? How is authority claimed? Where is the author? Where are "you" in the article? Who are the subjects and who are the objects of research here?

3. Choose a paper you have written for a class or that you have published that you think is pretty good. How did you follow the norms of your discipline? Were you conscious of doing so? How did you stage your paper? What parts did your professor/reviewer laud? How did you depend upon those norms to carry your argument? Did you elide over some difficult areas through vagueness, jargon, calls to authorities, or other

rhetorical devices? What voices did you exclude in your writing? Who is the audience? Where are the subjects in the paper? Where are you? How do you feel about the paper now? About your process of constructing it?

Experimental Writing

An excellent way to open yourself up to experimental writing is to learn from creative writers. They have much to teach us about writing, and about ourselves. Even if you chose to write a fairly traditional text, the creative writing experience will enrich that text.

1. Join or start a writing group. This could be a writing support group, a creative writing group, a poetry group, a dissertation group, or another kind. (For dissertation and article writing, see Becker, 1986; Fox, 1985; Richardson, 1990; Wolcott, 1990.)

2. Work through a creative writing guidebook. Natalie Goldberg (1986, 1990), Rust Hills (1987), Brenda Ueland (1938/1987), and Deena Metzger (1993) all provide excellent guides.

3. Enroll in a creative writing workshop. This experience is valuable for both beginning and experienced researchers. Here is testimony from Barrie Thorne (personal communication, September 2, 1992), an experienced, compelling, and traditionally inclined ethnography writer: "Taking a weekly creative writing class from Deena Metzger has been an important part of this quest. She encourages connecting with the unconscious, reaching for unusual verbs and evocative concrete detail, and exploring the emotional side of writing."

4. Use "writing up" field notes as an opportunity to expand your writing vocabulary, habits of thought, and attentiveness to your senses, and as a bulwark against the censorious voice of science. Where better to develop your sense of self, your voice, than in the process of doing your research? Apply creative writing skills to your field notes. I turn again to Barrie Thorne's description and testimony, not only because it is instructive, but because she writes within mainstream ethnographic tradition:

Field notes . . . have a private and intimate character; one can innovate, make false starts, flare up with emotions without feeling an anonymous audience at one's shoulder. . . . As I write field notes, I push for full description, avoiding sociological jargon, staying close to what I saw, while

letting my imagination
larger chains of
hunches in capit

5. Some of us
writing, and we r
may mean rethinl
and the ethnograp
to different conte
four categories, v

- ◆ *Observation*
make them.
see, hear, fee
- ◆ *Methodology*
collect "data"
write a lot o
of my work
- ◆ *Theoretical*
connections
because the
tations and
being hook
- ◆ *Personal no*
people I an
my pleasur
paper beca
affecting v
way for m
inquiry int

6. Keep a
This not only f
writing a narra

7. If you v
begin is by tra
graphic rules y
fidelity in the c
are invoking (
"plot" moving
matic presenta

...u exclude in your writing? Who is
...n the paper? Where are you? How
...ut your process of constructing it?

...p to experimental writing is to learn
...to teach us about writing, and about
...a fairly traditional text, the creative
...it.

...his could be a writing support group,
...up, a dissertation group, or another
...writing, see Becker, 1986; Fox, 1985;

...riting guidebook. Natalie Goldberg
...da Ueland (1938/1987), and Deena
...guides.

...orkshop. This experience is valuable
...researchers. Here is testimony from
...ion, September 2, 1992), an experi-
...nclined ethnography writer: "Taking
...Deena Metzger has been an important
...connecting with the unconscious,
...ive concrete detail, and exploring the

...as an opportunity to expand your
...and attentiveness to your senses, and
...s voice of science. Where better to
...ce, than in the process of doing your
...lls to your field notes. I turn again to
...imony, not only because it is instruc-
...mainstream ethnographic tradition:

...intimate character; one can innovate,
...otions without feeling an anonymous
...s I write field notes, I push for full
...rgon, staying close to what I saw, while

...letting my imagination roam around the event, searching for patterns and
...larger chains of significance (as they occur to me, I write these analytic
...hunches in capital letters in parentheses).

5. Some of us are more "choked" than Barrie Thorne in our field note
...writing, and we may need other devices to free our writing. For some it
...may mean rethinking what we have been taught about objectivity, science,
...and the ethnographic project. What works for me is to give different labels
...to different content. Building upon Glaser and Strauss's (1967) work, I use
...four categories, which you may find of value:

- ◆ *Observation notes* (ON): These are as concrete and detailed as I am able to
...make them. I want to think of them as fairly accurate renditions of what I
...see, hear, feel, taste, and so on.
- ◆ *Methodological notes* (MN): These are messages to myself regarding how to
...collect "data,"—who to talk to, what to wear, when to phone, and so on. I
...write a lot of these because I like methods, and I like to keep a process diary
...of my work.
- ◆ *Theoretical notes* (TN): These are hunches, hypotheses, poststructuralist
...connections, critiques of what I am doing/thinking/seeing. I like writing these
...because they open up my text—my field note text—to alternative interpre-
...tations and a critical epistemological stance. It is a way of keeping me from
...being hooked on my "take" on reality.
- ◆ *Personal notes* (PN): These are feelings statements about the research, the
...people I am talking to, myself doing the process, my doubts, my anxieties,
...my pleasures. I do no censoring here at all. I want all my feelings out on
...paper because I like them and because I know they are there anyway,
...affecting what/how I lay claim to knowing. Writing personal notes is a
...way for me to know myself better, a way of using writing as a method of
...inquiry into the self.

6. Keep a journal. In it, write about your feelings about your work.
...This not only frees up your writing, it becomes the "historical record" for
...writing a narrative of the self.

7. If you wish to experiment with evocative writing, a good place to
...begin is by transforming your field notes into drama. See what ethno-
...graphic rules you are using (such as fidelity to the speech of the participants,
...fidelity in the order of the speakers and events) and what literary ones you
...are invoking (such as limits on how long a speaker speaks, keeping the
..."plot" moving along, developing character through actions). Writing dra-
...matic presentations accentuates ethical considerations. If you doubt that,

contrast writing up an ethnographic event as a "typical" event with writing it as a play, with you and your hosts cast in roles that will be performed before others. Who has ownership of spoken words? How is authorship attributed? What if people don't like how they are characterized? Are courtesy norms being violated? Experiment here with both oral and written versions of your drama.

8. Experiment with transforming an in-depth interview into a poetic representation. Try using only the words, rhythms, figures of speech, breath points, pauses, syntax, and diction of the speaker. Where do you figure in the poem? What do you know about the interviewee and about yourself that you did not know before you wrote the poem? What poetic devices have you sacrificed in the name of science?

9. Experiment with writing narratives of the self. Keep in mind Barbara Tuchman's warning: "The writer's object is—or should be—to hold the reader's attention. . . . I want the reader to turn the page and keep on turning to the end. This is accomplished only when the narrative moves steadily ahead, not when it comes to a weary standstill, overlaced with every item uncovered in the research" (in *New York Times*, February 2, 1989).

10. Consider a fieldwork setting. Consider the various subject positions you have or have had within it. For example, in a store you might be a salesclerk, customer, manager, feminist, capitalist, parent, child, and so on. Write about the setting (or an event in the setting) from several different subject positions. What do you "know" from the different positions? Next, let the different points of view dialogue with each other. What do you discover through these dialogues?

11. Consider a paper you have written (or your field notes). What has been left out? Who is not present in this text? Who has been repressed? Who has been marginalized? Rewrite the text from that point of view.

12. Write a story about the "self" from your point of view (such as something that happened in your family or in your seminar). Then, interview another participant (such as a family or seminar member) and have that person tell you his or her story of the event. See yourself as part of the other individual's story in the same way he or she is part of your story. How do you rewrite your story from the other person's point of view? (This is an exercise used by Carolyn Ellis.)

13. Collaborative writing is a way to see beyond one's own naturalisms of style and attitude. This is an exercise that I have used in my teaching,

but it wou
a story of
story, cult
sional tale
The grou
each subg
its membe
narrative
collabora
their feeli
their lives
14. A
her own
oral one
then com
oral and

I hope
experime

Willing
unders
becaus
anothe
and ge

Happy w

◆ **Refer**

- Agger, B. (1989).
NY:
Agger, B. (1989).
capit
Atkinson, (1989).
Lon
Balzac, H. (1989).
(C. J.)

ent as a "typical" event with writing cast in roles that will be performed in spoken words? How is authorship and how they are characterized? Are ment here with both oral and written

an in-depth interview into a poetic ds, rhythms, figures of speech, breath the speaker. Where do you figure in the interviewee and about yourself ote the poem? What poetic devices ence?

natives of the self. Keep in mind riter's object is—or should be—to the reader to turn the page and keep ished only when the narrative moves o a weary standstill, overlaced with " (in *New York Times*, February 2,

onsider the various subject positions example, in a store you might be a t, capitalist, parent, child, and so on. n the setting) from several different " from the different positions? Next, gue with each other. What do you

ritten (or your field notes). What has this text? Who has been repressed? the text from that point of view.

from your point of view (such as family or in your seminar). Then, s a family or seminar member) and cry of the event. See yourself as part same way he or she is part of your y from the other person's point of :olyn Ellis.)

to see beyond one's own naturalisms ise that I have used in my teaching,

but it would be appropriate for a writing group as well. Each member writes a story of his or her life. It could be a feminist story, success story, queer story, cultural story, professional socialization story, realist tale, confessional tale, or whatever. All persons' stories are photocopied for the group. The group is then broken into subgroups (I prefer groups of three), and each subgroup collaborates on writing a new story, the collective story of its members. The collaboration can take any form: drama, poetry, fiction, narrative of the selves, realism, whatever the subgroup chooses. The collaboration is shared with the entire group. All members then write about their feelings about the collaboration and what happened to their stories, their lives, in the process.

14. A variant on exercise 13 is for each member to tape-record his or her own story and for other members to create a written text out of the oral one (a technique used by Art Bochner). The "originator" of the story then comments upon the others' telling. This is a good way to break down oral and written codes.

I hope these exercises are helpful. I hope you find new ways to experiment. I hope we all do.

Willing is doing something you know already—there is no new imaginative understanding in it. And presently your soul gets frightfully sterile and dry because you are so quick, snappy, and efficient about doing one thing after another that you have no time for your own ideas to come in and develop and gently shine. (Ueland, 1938/1987, p. 29)

Happy writing and rewriting!

◆ References

- Agger, B. (1989). *Reading science: A literary, political and sociological analysis*. Dix Hills, NY: General Hall.
- Agger, B. (1990). *The decline of discourse: Reading, writing and resistance in postmodern capitalism*. Bristol, PA: Falmer.
- Atkinson, P. A. (1990). *The ethnographic imagination: Textual constructions of reality*. London: Routledge.
- Balzac, H. de. (1965). Preface to *The human comedy*, from *At the sign of the cat and racket* (C. Bell, Trans., 1897; original work published 1842). In R. Ellman & C. Feidelson,

THE ART OF INTERPRETATION, EVALUATION, AND PRESENTATION

- Jr. (Eds.), *The modern tradition: Backgrounds of modern literature* (pp. 246-254). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Barley, N. (1986). *Ceremony: An anthropologist's misadventures in the African bush*. New York: Henry Holt.
- Barley, N. (1988). *Not a pleasant sport*. New York: Henry Holt.
- Becker, H. S. (1986). *Writing for social scientists: How to finish your thesis, book, or article*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Brady, I. (Ed.). (1991). *Anthropological poetics*. Savage, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Brodkey, L. (1987). *Academic writing as social practice*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Brown, R. H. (1977). *A poetic for sociology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Butler, S., & Rosenblum, B. (1991). *Cancer in two voices*. San Francisco: Spinsters.
- Carey, J. W. (1989). *Communication as culture: Essays on media and society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clifford, J. (1986). Introduction: Partial truths. In J. Clifford & G. E. Marcus (Eds.), *Writing culture: The poetics and politics of ethnography* (pp. 1-26). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Clifford, J., & Marcus, G. E. (Eds.). (1986). *Writing culture: The poetics and politics of ethnography*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Clough, P. T. (1992). *The end(s) of ethnography: From realism to social criticism*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Crawford, M. A. (1951). Introduction. In H. de Balzac, *Old Goriot*. New York: Penguin.
- Denzin, N. K. (1978). *The research act*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Denzin, N. K. (1986). A postmodern social theory. *Sociological Theory*, 4, 194-204.
- Denzin, N. K. (1991). *Images of postmodern society*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Denzin, N. K. (1994). Evaluating qualitative research in the poststructural moment: The lessons James Joyce teaches us. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 7, 295-308.
- Derrida, J. (1982). *The margins of philosophy* (A. Bass, Trans.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- DeShazer, M. K. (1986). *Inspiring women: Reimagining the muse*. New York: Pergamon.
- Diamond, S. (1981). *Totems*. Barrytown, NY: Open Book.
- Dorst, J. D. (1989). *The written suburb: An American site, an ethnographic dilemma*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Eagleton, T. (1983). *Literary theory: An introduction*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Edmondson, R. (1984). *Rhetoric in sociology*. London: Macmillan.
- Ellis, C. (forthcoming). *Final negotiations*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Ellis, C. (1993). Telling a story of sudden death. *Sociological Quarterly*, 34, 711-730.
- Ellis, C., & Bochner, A. P. (1992). Telling and performing personal stories: The constraints of choice in abortion. In C. Ellis & M. G. Flaherty (Eds.), *Investigating subjectivity: Research on lived experience* (pp. 79-101). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Erikson, K. T. (1976). *Everything in its path: Destruction of the community in the Buffalo Creek flood*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Fine, M. (1992). *Disruptive voices: The possibility of feminist research*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

- Fiske, D. W., & Sch...
subjectivities.
- Fox, M. F. (Ed.). (1...
Boulder, CO:
- Frohock, F. (1992)
- Geertz, C. (1983). I...
Basic Books.
- Geertz, C. (1988).
University Pr
- Glaser, B. G., & I...
qualitative re
- Gleick, J. (1984,
Magazine, p]
- Goldberg, N. (198
- Goldberg, N. (199
- Harper, D. (1987
University c
- Hills, R. (1987).
Mifflin.
- hooks, b. (1990).
- Hutcheon, L. (19...
Routledge.
- Jameson, F. (198
- Kaufman, S. (19...
of Wiscon:
- Kline, M. (1980
- Kondo, D. (199
- Krieger, S. (199...
Temple U
- Krieger, S. (199...
NJ: Rutge
- Lakoff, G., & J...
Press.
- Lather, P. (1999
New Yor
- Lehman, D. (1...
York: Po
- Levine, D. N.
Chicago
- Liebow, E. (19
- Linden, R. R.
Columb
- Lyotard, J.-F.
G. Mas
- Marcus, G. E
mental

ATION, AND PRESENTATION

s of modern literature (pp. 246-254). New
 s misadventures in the African bush. New
 k: Henry Holt.
 How to finish your thesis, book, or article.
 Savage, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
 practice. Philadelphia: Temple University
 nbridge: Cambridge University Press.
 wo voices. San Francisco: Spinsters.
 : Essays on media and society. Cambridge:
 n J. Clifford & G. E. Marcus (Eds.), *Writing
 graphy* (pp. 1-26). Berkeley: University of
 Writing culture: The poetics and politics of
 ornia Press.
 : From realism to social criticism. Newbury
 e Balzac, *Old Goriot*. New York: Penguin.
 ork: McGraw-Hill.
 eory. *Sociological Theory*, 4, 194-204.
 ociety. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
 research in the poststructural moment: The
 ive Studies in Education, 7, 295-308.
 y (A. Bass, Trans.). Chicago: University of
 imagining the muse. New York: Pergamon.
 Open Book.
 n American site, an ethnographic dilemma.
 a Press.
 uction. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota
 . London: Macmillan.
 iladelphia: Temple University Press.
 ath. *Sociological Quarterly*, 34, 711-730.
 d performing personal stories: The constraints
 . G. Flaherty (Eds.), *Investigating subjectivity:*
 01). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
 : Destruction of the community in the Buffalo
 aster.
 ibility of feminist research. Ann Arbor: Univer-

Writing: A Method of Inquiry

Fiske, D. W., & Schweder, R. A. (Eds.). (1986). *Metatheory in social science: Pluralisms and
 subjectivities*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
 Fox, M. F. (Ed.). (1985). *Scholarly writing and publishing: Issues, problems, and solutions*.
 Boulder, CO: Westview.
 Frohock, F. (1992). *Healing powers*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
 Geertz, C. (1983). *Local knowledge: Further essays in interpretive anthropology*. New York:
 Basic Books.
 Geertz, C. (1988). *Works and lives: The anthropologist as author*. Stanford, CA: Stanford
 University Press.
 Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for
 qualitative research*. Chicago: Aldine.
 Gleick, J. (1984, June 10). Solving the mathematical riddle of chaos. *New York Times
 Magazine*, pp. 30-32.
 Goldberg, N. (1986). *Writing down the bones: Freeing the writer within*. Boston: Shambala.
 Goldberg, N. (1990). *Wild mind: Living the writer's life*. New York: Bantam.
 Harper, D. (1987). *Working knowledge: Skill and community in a small shop*. Chicago:
 University of Chicago Press.
 Hills, R. (1987). *Writing in general and the short story in particular*. Boston: Houghton
 Mifflin.
 hooks, b. (1990). *Yearning: Race, gender, and cultural politics*. Boston: South End.
 Hutcheon, L. (1988). *A poetics of postmodernism: History, theory and fiction*. New York:
 Routledge.
 Jameson, F. (1981). *The political unconscious*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
 Kaufman, S. (1986). *The ageless self: Sources of meaning in later life*. Madison: University
 of Wisconsin Press.
 Kline, M. (1980). *Mathematics: The loss of certainty*. New York: Oxford University Press.
 Kondo, D. (1990). *Crafting selves*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
 Krieger, S. (1983). *The mirror dance: Identity in a women's community*. Philadelphia:
 Temple University Press.
 Krieger, S. (1991). *Social science and the self: Personal essays on an art form*. New Brunswick,
 NJ: Rutgers University Press.
 Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago
 Press.
 Lather, P. (1991). *Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy within the postmodern*.
 New York: Routledge.
 Lehman, D. (1991). *Signs of the times: Deconstruction and the fall of Paul de Man*. New
 York: Poseidon.
 Levine, D. N. (1985). *The flight from ambiguity: Essays in social and cultural theory*.
 Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
 Liebow, E. (1967). *Tally's corner: A study of Negro street corner men*. Boston: Little, Brown.
 Linden, R. R. (1992). *Making stories, making selves: Feminist reflections on the Holocaust*.
 Columbus: Ohio State University.
 Lyotard, J.-F. (1979). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge* (G. Bennington &
 G. Masumi, Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
 Marcus, G. E., & Fischer, M. J. M. (1986). *Anthropology as cultural critique: An experi-
 mental moment in the human sciences*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- McCall, M., & Becker, H. S. (1990). Performance science. *Social Problems*, 32, 117-132.
- Metzger, D. (1993). *Writing for your life: A guide and companion to the inner worlds*. New York: Harper-Collins.
- Mischler, E. G. (1991). *Research interviewing: Context and narrative*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Morris, M. (1988). *The pirate's fiancée: Feminism, reading, and postmodernism*. New York: Verso.
- Nelson, J. S., Megill, A., & McCloskey, D. N. (Eds.). (1987). *The rhetoric of the human sciences: Language and argument in scholarship and human affairs*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Nicholson, L. J. (Ed.). (1990). *Feminism/postmodernism*. New York: Routledge.
- Paget, M. (1990). Performing the text. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 19, 136-155.
- Patai, D. (1988). Constructing a self: A Brazilian life story. *Feminist Studies*, 14, 142-163.
- Pfohl, S. J. (1992). *Death at the Parasite Cafe: Social science (fictions) and the postmodern*. New York: St. Martin's.
- Prattis, I. (Ed.). (1985). *Reflections: The anthropological muse*. Washington, DC: American Anthropological Association.
- Richardson, L. (1985). *The new other woman: Contemporary single women in affairs with married men*. New York: Free Press.
- Richardson, L. (1990). *Writing strategies: Reaching diverse audiences*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Richardson, L. (1991). Postmodern social theory: Representational practices. *Sociological Theory*, 9, 173-180.
- Richardson, L. (1992a). The consequences of poetic representation: Writing the other, rewriting the self. In C. Ellis & M. G. Flaherty (Eds.), *Investigating subjectivity: Research on lived experience* (pp. 125-140). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Richardson, L. (1992b). Resisting resistance narratives: A representation for communication. *Studies in Symbolic Interaction*, 13, 77-83.
- Richardson, L. (1993). The case of the skipped line: Poetics, dramatics and transgressive validity. *Sociological Quarterly*, 34, 695-710.
- Richardson, L., & Lockridge, E. (1991). The sea monster: An "ethnographic drama." *Symbolic Interaction*, 14, 335-340.
- Ronai, C. R. (1992). The reflexive self through narrative: A night in the life of an erotic dancer/researcher. In C. Ellis & M. G. Flaherty (Eds.), *Investigating subjectivity: Research on lived experience* (pp. 102-124). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Rorty, R. (1979). *Philosophy and the mirror of man*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Rose, D. (1989). *Patterns of American culture: Ethnography and estrangement*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Rose, E. (1992). *The werald*. Boulder, CO: Waiting Room.
- Rubin, L. B. (1976). *Worlds of pain: Life in the working-class family*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schneider, J. (1991). Troubles with textual authority in sociology. *Symbolic Interaction*, 14, 295-320.
- Seidman, S., & Wagner, D. (Eds.). (1991). *Postmodernism and social theory*. New York: Basil Blackwell.

Shapiro, M. (1
Critique,
Simons, H. W.
Stack, C. B. (1
Harper &
Statham, A., R
negotiate
Steedman, K. (1
NJ: Rutg
Stewart, J. (19
Trinidad.
Stoller, P. (191
Universit
Tedlock, D. (1
city of Pe
Thorne, B. (19
Trinh T. M.-
Bloomin
Turner, V., &
Urbana:
Ueland, B. (19
Paul, M.
Ulmer, G. (19
Van Maanen,
Chicago
Walkerdine, V
Weedon, C. (1
Whyte, W. F.
Univers
Whyte, W. F.
raphy, 2
Williams, P. J
MA: H
Wolf, M. (19
bility. S
Wolcott, H. J
Zola, E. (196
modern
Univers
Zola, I. K. (19
Univer:

ance science. *Social Problems*, 32, 117-132.

side and companion to the inner worlds. New

g: *Context and narrative*. Cambridge, MA:

ism, reading, and postmodernism. New York:

J. (Eds.). (1987). *The rhetoric of the human*

larship and human affairs. Madison: Univer-

modernism. New York: Routledge.

of *Contemporary Ethnography*, 19, 136-155.

an life story. *Feminist Studies*, 14, 142-163.

Social science (fictions) and the postmodern.

gological muse. Washington, DC: American

Contemporary single women in affairs with

hing diverse audiences. Newbury Park, CA:

ry: Representational practices. *Sociological*

poetic representation: Writing the other,

Flaherty (Eds.), *Investigating subjectivity*:

0). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

narratives: A representation for communica-

77-83.

d line: Poetics, dramatics and transgressive

710.

: sea monster: An "ethnographic drama."

a narrative: A night in the life of an erotic

Flaherty (Eds.), *Investigating subjectivity*:

1). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

man. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University

hnography and estrangement. Philadelphia:

ting Room.

orking-class family. New York: Basic Books.

ority in sociology. *Symbolic Interaction*, 14,

tmodernism and social theory. New York:

- Shapiro, M. (1985-1986). Metaphor in the philosophy of the social sciences. *Cultural Critique*, 2, 191-214.
- Simons, H. W. (1990). *Rhetoric in the human sciences*. London: Sage.
- Stack, C. B. (1974). *All our kin: Strategies for survival in a black community*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Statham, A., Richardson, L., & Cook, J. A. (1991). *Gender and university teaching: A negotiated difference*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Steedman, K. (1986). *Landscape for a good woman: A story of two lives*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Stewart, J. (1989). *Drinkers, drummers and decent folk: Ethnographic narratives of Village Trinidad*. Albany: State University of New York.
- Stoller, P. (1989). *Taste of ethnographic things: The senses in anthropology*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Tedlock, D. (1983). *The spoken word and the work of interpretation*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Thorne, B. (1993). *Gender play*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Trinh T. M.-H. (1989). *Woman, native, other: Writing postcoloniality and feminism*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Turner, V., & Bruner, E. M. (Eds.). (1986). *The anthropology of experience*. Champagne-Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Ueland, B. (1987). *If you want to write: A book about art, independence and spirit*. Saint Paul, MN: Graywolf. (Original work published 1938)
- Ulmer, G. (1989). *Teletheory: Grammatology in the age of video*. New York: Routledge.
- Van Maanen, J. (1988). *Tales of the field: On writing ethnography*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Walkerdine, V. (1990). *Schoolgirl fictions*. London: Verso.
- Weedon, C. (1987). *Feminist practice and poststructuralist theory*. New York: Basil Blackwell.
- Whyte, W. F. (1943). *Street corner society: The social structure of an Italian slum*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Whyte, W. F. (1992). In defense of *Street corner society*. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 21, 52-68.
- Williams, P. J. (1991). *The alchemy of race and rights: Diary of a law professor*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wolf, M. (1992). *A thrice-told tale: Feminism, postmodernism, and ethnographic responsibility*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Wolcott, H. F. (1990). *Writing up qualitative research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Zola, E. (1965). The novel as social science. In R. Ellman & C. Feidelson, Jr. (Eds.), *The modern tradition: Backgrounds of modern literature* (pp. 270-289). New York: Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1880)
- Zola, I. K. (1983). *Missing pieces: A chronicle of living with a disability*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.