TABLE OF CONTENTS

1) Archival Research
2) Case Studies
3) Ethnographic Methods
4) Focus Group Research
5) Oral Histories
6) Quantitative Methods
7) Survey Research
8) Research Ethics
9) Miscellaneous
1) ARCHIVAL RESEARCH

Prefatory remarks

For non-historians, archival research may seem like a standardized and transparent method of inquiry that is carried out mainly in libraries and special collections rooms. Even for some historically-oriented social scientists today, questions of “historiology” appear to be divorced from what they think historians do at and with “the archives.” But there are as many different kinds of archives as there are different agents and agencies—letter writers, households, firms, parties, unions, universities, states—that produce and save their own records. And, as with other critical sources and strategies for “reconstructing the past” and “detecting the future in the present,” we need to be reflective about the range of (mostly) unpublished and (but not always) eye-witness inventories that we use.


2) CASE STUDIES


3) ETHNOGRAPHIC METHODS

Prefatory remarks

“The process of doing ethnographic research was a kind of insiders’ information until about 1970, when Peggy Golde edited and published Women in the Field. Until then, the prevailing wisdom was that fieldwork was something to be learned by doing, that was individual and idiosyncratic, and therefore not teachable. There were accounts of fieldwork to be sure, but their role was primarily to enhance the mystique of the heroic anthropologist, braving unfamiliar customs, suspicious natives, and horrible hygiene in order to add to the Science of Men. Once you had done it, you could sit and drink beer and swap stories by the hour, but fieldwork was like combat in that you had no idea what it was like until you had done it.

Since 1970, everything has changed, and the process of fieldwork has been scrutinized repetitively (and sometimes repetitiously) from many angles. The stimuli for this seem to be two: the realization that we can learn from each other, and in fact have the obligation to share information; and the troubling thought that fieldwork, as an unsystematized process, embodies biases that we hardly realize are there. There have thus sprung up two rather different but related literatures: one on how to do it (techniques), and one on what it’s really doing (critiques).

You can read just about any ethnographic monograph from the “classic” era between the World Wars (and some of the more modern ones) and find an account of what the anthropologist did in the field. Particularly enlightening not only about the methods employed by the old masters, but also about their attitudes toward their work, are the introductory sections of Bronislaw Malinowski (1922), F. E. Evans-Pritchard (1940), Napoleon Chagnon Yanomamo (1968), or the chapters on the field from Margaret Mead’s autobiography, Blackberry Winter.

More accounts of What It Was Like, written just at the beginning of the era of methodological and critical scrutiny of the fieldwork process, can be found in Peggy Golde (1970).

Regarding technique, there are more manuals here than one can keep track of, almost all published in the 1970’s and 1980’s. These include Robert Burgess (1982); Werner Schoepfle (1987); P. F. Ellen (1984); Pertti Pelto and Greta Pelto (1979); and James Spradley (1979) and (1980).

The general critique of anthropology as a politically and socially embedded endeavor, rather than an objective science, began in earnest with two edited books published in 1974: Talal Asad’s Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter and Michelle Rosaldo and Louise Lamphere’s Woman, Culture, and Society. One questioned the colonial roots of the discipline; the other, the implicit and unexamined gender bias.
This critique grew and flourished into the 1970s and 1980s, and shows signs of abating in the 1990s with most of the issues out on the table. One branch of the critique is directed specifically at the process of ethnography, demoted and enriched from positivistic science to literary endeavor that may or may not be scientific. The most influential collection in this vein has been James Clifford and George Marcus (1986). Also noteworthy (and shorter and easier) is Clifford Geertz’s *Works and Lives*.

Recently, there have been attempts to combine critical with methodological thinking, to extract anthropologists from the epistemological bind created by the early critiques. I have found both Tony Larry Whitehead and Mary Ellen Conway’s *Self, Sex, and Gender* and *Gender in Cross-Cultural Fieldwork* (1986), and Roger Sanjek’s *Fieldnotes* (1990) to contain many valuable pieces.

A useful exercise is to read the introduction to Evans-Pritchard’s *The Nuer*. Then read critiques of Evans-Pritchard’s approach to Geertz’s *Works and Lives*, James Clifford’s “On Ethnographic Authority” in his *The Predicament of Culture*, and Renato Rosaldo’s “From the Door of his Tent,” in Clifford and Marcus’ *Writing Culture* (1986). Would you feel like doing ethnography after this? If so, how?


John Bodley, *Victims of Progress*, Mayfield Press.


James Clifford, “On Ethnographic Authority,” in *The Predicament of Culture*.


Clifford Geertz, *Works and Lives*.


Margaret Mead, *Blackberry Winter.*


Tony Larry Whitehead and Mary Ellen Conway *Gender in Cross-Cultural Fieldwork* (1986).

Tony Larry Whitehead and Mary Ellen Conway *Self, Sex, and Gender.*


4) FOCUS GROUP RESEARCH


5) ORAL HISTORIES

**Oral Traditions: Theory and Method**


*History in Africa*, annual.


**Oral Traditions: Case Studies**


**Oral and Life History: Theory and Method**


Hofmeyer, Isabel, “*We Spend Our Years as a Tale that is Told*”, Heinemann, 1993.


**Oral and Life History: Case Studies**


Reviewing Books about Africa,” *History in Africa*, 17 (1990), 373-78.


Robertson, Claire, *Sharing the Same Bowl*, Indiana, 1984.


6) QUANTITATIVE METHODS

Overview:

Survey data, coded texts, and administrative data are the most likely examples of evidence that are typically analyzed using quantitative methods. These data are often numerous and/or reflect a probability sample of a population, allowing researchers to employ quantitative methods to draw broad descriptions, in their simplest form, or test causal arguments, in their most complex form. In both cases, the purpose of a quantitative approach is to offer generalized descriptions of patterns with some statistical estimate of the likelihood of observing that pattern. Quantitative methods can be employed at numerous points in the research process and in combination with data analyzed qualitatively, a mixed-methods approach. Researchers in Economics, Sociology, Psychology, and Geography are more likely to employ quantitative methods, but quantitative approaches are not limited to these disciplines. For example, quantitative methods might be used to provide a background description of a place about which qualitative methods are employed to gain deeper understanding. Or, quantitative methods might be employed to get a sense of the extent of a phenomenon and the degree to which the phenomenon varies across important categories, such as class, race or gender. This information is then used to inform a qualitative study design.

Typical concerns for quantitative methods are measurement (e.g., attention to reliability and validity or the appropriateness of composite indices for capturing conceptual complexity), independence of observations (e.g. spatial or temporal autocorrelation), distributions (e.g. normal, linear, or non-linear) and model specification (causality, omitted variables, outliers, and estimators/estimation techniques). Quantitative evidence can take the form of a cross-section—representing one moment in time with observations of multiple people, households, communities, or countries at that moment. Or, quantitative evidence and methodologies can take into account multiple observations over time. Or, quantitative evidence can be relational observations as in a multi-level data set (for example, evidence from individuals with additional information about their households with additional information about their communities) or a network data set (e.g. information about the extent and quality of ties between people – kinship relations or friendship networks).

Prefatory remarks

There are a number of potential bridge points between economics and other disciplines on development issues. Bridge points with anthropology include theories of the household, resource allocation and institutional formation, migration, networks, and economic integration of labor markets across international boundaries.

Two fields of economics—economic history and development economics—have so much overlap with certain areas of history as a discipline that thematic bridges are abundant. From U.S. history, three examples come to mind: women and work in the industrial revolution, economic and historical roots of slavery, and women and work since World
Bridge points between economics and political science include theories of the state, political economy of policy, government action and credibility, provision of public or social goods, coalitional formation and strategic interactions, and collective action problems.

An array of topics focusing on individual behavior - attitudes toward risk, deviant behavior, charity, child development, etc., are potential bridges with economics as well.

With respect to sociology, potential bridges include institutional formation, collective actions problems, group behavior, especially the microfoundations, industrial organization, labor unions and the contractual arrangements of labor relations and theories of the household.

Those who are not familiar with much of development economics may read a few introductory books on development such as Basu, Gills et al, or Todaro. To get more information on any particular topic, a basic reference book is the Chenery and Srinivasan edited *Handbook of Development Economics*.

Once you have formulated your quantitative theoretical model that has interesting policy implications, or you have postulated some behavioral relationships, you would like to estimate these relationships and test if your theory or its predictions are supported empirically.

It is important to statistically estimate the behavioral relationships that you have assumed in your theoretical model, otherwise you are building up bubbles on the air with your theory. Appropriate econometric techniques need to be applied to estimate your model, and to choose between models. Of course, the techniques that you can apply depend on the type of data you have. If wrong econometric techniques are applied to your valuable data that you collected with enormous efforts, you will draw wrong inference and policy conclusions. A starting point for those of you who do not have a formal course in econometrics/ statistics before is the book by Ramanathan [1992]. This book takes you through most of the econometric techniques and issues without requiring you to have much prior knowledge in the area, and the book comes with a software which is helpful for you to practice most of the empirical exercises yourself. A somewhat more advanced reference book covering most of the econometric issues is Judge, et al.

If you have historical quantitative information on certain variables, or you have aggregate macro data for a country over a long period of time, and you would like to see whether these variables are related in certain ways (you postulate the relationship), then you will be using time series analysis. For this purpose, after you master the materials in Ramanathan, read Harvey, and then Granger and Newbold.

When you have data on certain variables for a lot of households, or time and suppose you postulate a certain behavioral relationship to hold for a representative household and want to estimate your postulated relationship, you use survey data analysis. There are different
techniques available depending on the type of variables you have, the type of relationships you postulated, and the way you have collected your data. The books you may consult in this area are Maddala, Heckman and Singer, and Amamlya (in this order of difficulty).

When you have repeated observations on a few households or firms over a certain period of time, you use pooled time series cross section analysis. The basic book on this is Hsiao.

It is not enough that you specify only one model and estimate it using most appropriate statistical techniques. In fact, in most situations there are a lot of competing models that you will come up with. Then the natural question is how to decide which estimated model to choose for your final analysis of the behavioral and policy issues that you started with. These issues fall in the area known as specification testing, a basic reference in this area is Godfrey, and a more advanced text is White.


7) SURVEY RESEARCH

Overview


Planning (and Proposing) Survey Data Collection


Research Design


Qualitative Inquiry in and beyond the Design Process


Overview of Concepts in Sampling


Developing Good Questions: Fundamental Concepts


Developing Good Questions, Cont.: Measuring Behaviors, Facts, Knowledge, and Attitudes


From Questions to an Instrument: Components of a Questionnaire and Guidelines for Ordering and Formatting


Pretesting: Rationale and Overview of Pre-Field and Field Techniques


**Data Pre-Coding, Coding, Cleaning and Management**


University of Michigan Survey Research Center. ND. *Introduction to the Coding Procedures Used in the Survey Research Center.*

**Modes of Administration: Overview of Classic and Innovative Approaches and Criteria for Selection**


page 24, reading list


Interviewer Recruitment and Training


Fieldwork, In Principle and Practice: Strategies for Monitoring Quality


8) RESEARCH ETHICS

Defining the Standard Realm of Ethical Issues


Also available at http://ohrp.osophs.dhhs.gov/humansubjects/guidance/45cfr46.htm


Freed-Taylor, M. “Ethical Considerations in European Cross-National Research.” Available at http://www.unesco.org/most/ethissj.htm


Ziman, John. “Why must scientists become more ethically sensitive than they used to be?” Science; Washington; Dec 4, 1998


Expanding the Standard Realm: Starting and Doing Field Research


James E. Giles. Ethics and epistemology in the twenty-first century. *Cross Currents*; New Rochelle; Fall 2001;


Do the Ends Justify the Means? The Ethics of Deception in Social Science Research. from Online Ethics Center (June 2000) Available at http://www.onlineethics.org/reseth/appex/vol11/justify.html


*Widening the Standard Realm of Ethical Issues when Considering Research in International and Cross-Cultural Settings: Research Collaborations and Dissemination.*


Jones, Todd. “Interpretive Social Science and the ‘Native’s Point of View’: A Closer Look.” *Philosophy of Social Sciences* 28 (1):32-68


9) SOME EXAMPLES OF SECONDARY DATA SOURCES

Through the web it is now possible to access numerous types of data either immediately by downloading information, or relatively quickly through purchase, or slightly longer through permission from principal investigators. In any case, it is likely that it will not take much effort to find important background or critical information and statistics about your topic, country, or site of study. The following are just a few starting points and should not be viewed as inclusive of all possible data available for your analysis. Along with your own search on the web, your university’s social sciences librarian should be able to provide you with numerous data sources.

A final source for finding data is the literature. Carefully read empirically-based, published research articles to see from where the data came and consider the possibility that the data might be able to answer the questions you are posing or provide evidence not yet analyzed by anyone. In all cases of data collection, the great effort that goes into collecting data usually yields a gold mine of under utilized evidence that is just waiting for a graduate student to dig up and make use of in creative ways!


**International Labor Office**

http://laborsta.ilo.org/cgi-bin/brokerv8.exe?_debug=2&_service=appsrv1v8&_program=pgm.applpgm.start.scl

**United Nations**


**World Bank**


Livelihood Surveys (conducted throughout the world):

**Some Recent Surveys Available Online**

Demographic and Health Surveys: http://www.measuredhs.com/

World Fertility Surveys: http://opr.princeton.edu/archive/wfs/

Family Life Surveys from Indonesia, Malaysia, Bangladesh, and Guatemala:
http://www.rand.org/labor/FLS/
Mexican Migration Project: http://www.pop.upenn.edu/mexmig/

Nang Rong Surveys:: http://www.cpc.unc.edu/projects/nangrong/

South African Household and Livelihood Survey::

African Ideational Diffusion Project: http://lexis.pop.upenn.edu/networks/
10) ESSENTIALS


*Fieldwork in Developing Countries*, edited by J. Hoddinot and S. Devereux (Harvester Wheatsheaf, UK and Lynne Reinner, USA), 1992.


Tony Larry Whitehead and Mary Ellen Conaway, eds. *Self, Sex and Gender in Cross-Cultural Fieldwork*, University of Illinois Press (1986).
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