

NEW VOICES IN SOCIAL SCIENCE*

SHEILA CLIFFE**

INTRODUCTION.

While conducting research for the social science PhD I have been working on, I have been reading widely on the theory behind qualitative research and its methodology. Traditionally social science has been viewed as soft, an inferior sibling to hard science, and therefore quantitative methodology has been privileged over qualitative and numerical data over other kinds of data. Social science has tried to be as scientific as possible. The author puts forward the view that sciences concerning the experiences of people; sociology, ethnography, anthropology and cultural studies are, in reality, as much of an art as a science, and that we need to take notice of the voices of humanity as expressed via social science research which privileges the personal experiences of people, voiced through researchers using not only traditional scientific tools, but employing the crafts of literature, philosophy and their sociological imaginations to understand and to interpret the multiple experiences of humanity in our world today.

TRADITIONAL CONVENTIONS ABOUT RESEARCH.

The assumption that quantitative research is more scientific than qualitative research has a long tradition. Anthropology, for example, grew out of colonialism, and assumed the measuring instruments of the scientific community. It makes certain assumptions about reality and about society, that there is a truth out there, that can be measured and validated. New writings in the social sciences, those in the symbolic interactionist camps, followers of Mead, Blumer, Goffman etc, and the post-modernists have been trying to overturn these traditional, gendered and racist viewpoints, but this kind of positivist research is still very much alive, and in terms of funded research, puts other kinds of research in danger.

* 社会科学分野における新しい視点

** Sheila Cliffe 十文字学園女子大学短期大学部 文学科英語英文専攻 (English Language and Literature)

keywords : sociology, qualitative research, anthropology, voice, reflexivity

In the paper *The Elephant in the Living Room*, Denzin, (2009),⁽¹⁾ Denzin makes a critique of the inconsistencies and threats to the interpretive community, by the “global audit” culture. He makes his case from a pedagogic stance. He says that scientific articles now compete, and are judged by standards of experimental methodologies, randomized control trials, quantitative metrics, citation analysis, shared data bases, journal impact factors, rigid notions of accountability, data transparency, warrantability, rigorous peer-review evaluation scales and fixed formats for scientific articles. He goes on to say that federally funded research, for which there are many bodies, (and many also in the UK, Europe and New Zealand and Australia,) have all sets of standards which are based around similar discourses about the collection of evidence, and are historically and politically situated epistemological and ethical discourses. Denzin states of the National Research Council, (2009)⁽²⁾

For this group quality research is: scientific, empirical, linked to theory, uses methods for direct investigation, and produces coherent chains of causal reasoning based on experimental or quasi-experimental finding, offering generalizations that can be replicated, and used to test, and refine theory. If research has these features it has high quality and it is scientific (National Research Council 2005: 20).

Whilst this is a traditional view of research, it is increasingly considered the standard by which research is funded, and therefore it is a political stance. It is concerned only with the collection and measurement of quantitative data, and qualitative research of any kind cannot be measured by the same standards. Evidence becomes a political issue. Who has the power to control the definition of evidence? Maxwell, (2000a, 2004b),⁽³⁾ in Denzin (2009) argues that this view privileges a regular view of causation, a variable-based rather than process based attitude to research, denies the possibility of using single case studies, neglects context, meaning and processes as essentials of causality and analysis and erroneously assumes that both qualitative and quantitative methods share the same logic, and gives higher priority to quantitative and experimental methods. Causality is only one narrative of interpretation, and Denzin argues that autoethnography, performative and art-based research, poetry and other forms of action-based research representations are also powerful means of analysis and interpretation. He further points out that there is no attention given by the funding bodies as to how evidence is turned into data and how it is then used to produce generalizations and used for causal reasoning. Denzin (2009) says;⁽⁴⁾

It is clear, though, that data becomes a commodity that does several things. That is, third, evidence as data carries the weight of the scientific process. This process works through a self-fulfilling, self-validating process. You know you have quality data that are scientific when you have tested and refined your theory. How you have addressed problems in the

real world remains a mystery.

He also brings up issues concerned with data sharing, finance and the political manipulation of peer review. These complications do not seem to be addressed by the guide-lines of the funding bodies.

The above assumes a post-positivist regime, which is choosing to ignore the wealth of research about humans and society, that is being produced today. Qualitative evidence may be about lived experiences, emotions, events, processes. It could be presented in text or performance. It is also about revealing truths, it is also often about giving voice to those who have none, questioning authoritarian and racist or sexist regimes and practices in our societies, and asking hard questions which are difficult to answer. What was once called 'research', is now termed 'blue sky research'. It is researching to find out something, though the ultimate application may not be apparent at the time. This is true to the spirit of inquiry, and grows out of the human imagination, but according to Denzin the funding for this kind of research is likely to be hard to find.

Whilst the debate goes on, as it has done for many years, there have been great changes in the world of qualitative research. Increasingly cross-disciplinary, and focusing on groups, individuals and issues that are new to academic discourses and study, there are pioneers who are rewriting not only the suitable subjects of research but are re-examining the processes and epistemologies behind methods, and who are challenging traditional academic ways of writing and presenting research.

THE AUTOETHNORAPHY OF MARGARET VICKERS.

Margaret Vickers, University of Western Sydney, who has written extensively on injustice, illness, and marginalization and bullying, particularly in the workplace, is a risk-taker. She has challenged taboos. Firstly, in that she has used herself as the subject matter of ethnographic research, and secondly in her determination to both uncover, and to write publicly about bullying and injustice at her place of work. Vickers's autoethnographic writing is uncomfortable to read. Perhaps this is because she demands of herself a level of honesty that we are unfamiliar with in academic text. This also means that her writing has a power and that it leaves an imprint on the memory of the reader. Vickers (2002) says:⁽⁵⁾ "Authentic writing is risky. However, we should not be enemies of new knowledge because danger lurks." Even as she writes she expresses fears that not only her colleagues but strangers and enemies may read what she is writing. She seeks to break down the conceptual polarities of subject and object, mind and body, and other dualities, including sick and well. This is because

Vickers, who was researching on the experiences of those with hidden diseases, is herself a sufferer of MS. Her research on others, some of whom have since died, magnified her personal fears about her own illness. At the time of writing, her partner also had a brain seizure, resulting in abnormal personality traits, and behavior, and could have died at any moment. Vickers includes passages from her journal. These document the experimental treatments she undergoes, her physical state, her feelings about injecting herself, about her self-image, her depression, and her fears about her and her partner's deteriorating health. She also includes another kind of writing. She includes letters that were sent to various people in the uncovering of her case that she was bullied or harassed at work. Interspersed between these autobiographical writings, are theory and her reasons justifying what she is doing. Vickers contends that in narrative interviews, researchers must consider the ethical implications of telling the participants' stories. It can violate privacy, and cause, social, mental or even legal harm. However, these issues are also very real for ethnographers who turn the lense on themselves and reveal their own stories. In traditional texts, the writer is kept out of the stories as much as possible.⁽⁶⁾

Texts produced in the traditional manner sustain the illusion of disinterest and neutrality. It is worse for our readers. Keeping the personal voice our frequently means that our work is underread, dry, inaccessible – and boring. We do a good job of protecting our secrets, although many of us are increasingly troubled by the loss of excitement and liveliness that follows. (2002)

Vickers shares the view of Orwell that writing is about exposing facts, but she acknowledges that this can be taking a great risk. Particularly if one is writing about politically sensitive situations this could be so, but the autoethnographer is open to allegations of narcissism and self-indulgence. Though it is considered positive for informants to tell stories, even cathartic, or as contributing to knowledge, the telling of the researcher's own story, is not yet accepted in these terms.⁽⁷⁾

Even when intimate details and painful emotions are explored, narrative interviews are usually regarded as cathartic and affirming for the participant (Jesselsson, 1996, p.62)..... My question is, why is it acceptable (even positively regarded) for people to share their life experiences with a researcher when, concurrently, it is perceived to be problematic that a researcher – who is presumably best qualified to do the recording and interpretation – examines his or her own life? (2002)

Vickers reminds us that when we tell the stories of others, there is always the danger of misinterpretation, or not expressing respondents as they would like to be seen. If we conduct

work on ourselves, it is clear whose agenda and interpretation we work from. She also reminds us that researchers have a responsibility to give of themselves, just as they ask others to do so. This kind of research can offer unique insights into processes or phenomena that others cannot witness. It also gives the opportunity to examine unique areas. Vickers believes that far from indulgence, researchers have an obligation to speak out and to share, 'to lift the veil on the unspeakable and the undiscussed'. (2002)

THE NEW ETHNOGRAPHY OF H. L. GOODALL. JR.

Goodall's book, "Writing the new ethnography", is both autobiographical and a textbook. (It already denies conventional classification.) The book is to help students of ethnography learning to write. He describes how, in 1984, a group of researchers got together at the School of American Research in Santa Fe, to discuss ethnographic writing. The results were published in *Current Ethnography* April 1985, and in Clifford and Marcus's "*Writing Ethnography; The Politics and Poetics of Ethnography*" 1986. These researchers recognized that the assumption that ethnographic writing was a "direct, unmediated reflection" of fieldwork undertaken, was no longer tenable. This recognition freed the rhetoric and the way of framing ethnographic texts. Literary genres such as journalism or creative nonfiction could qualify. Indeed it opened the way for other kinds of texts: fiction, drama, poetry, dance, letters etc. could all vie for position as academic text. For realists this meant a "perceived loss of authority" and they asked if these people should not be on creative writing courses. However, for those of the new ethnography camp, according to Goodall, (2000)⁽⁸⁾

For the new ethnographers, this "crisis" among traditionalists was interpreted as a resource for potential liberation. After years of struggling with feelings of quiet incompleteness that suggested the gap we ought to be addressing was within that which we held most sacred - our theories and methods - we new ethnographers began experimenting more openly with new ways of framing questions, conducting inquiry, and writing. We began turning our gaze away from those whom we were studying to the processes we used to study and write, and within that turning, we came full circle, back to ourselves (*Tedlock, 1991*), Goodall. (2002)

Goodall's journey brought him to realize that his job was to write stories of the cultures that he was involved with. He also needed to write himself into the story, in a similar way to Vickers. There were two stories to be told, his personal, self-reflexive narrative, and that of the culture. The challenge of new ethnography, was to write the intersection of the two stories. A traditional ethnography is bent towards representation, with little acknowledgement of the positionality of the writer, who is meant to be impartial. He is an

omniscient narrator, with a hypothesis to be proved. He codes and classifies data. In a new ethnography, the journey of the researcher is important too, and as the researcher examines his or her own journey, this also reveals the culture encountered. Goodall proposes that we need to be aware that no prose can completely capture the truth of human action. We cannot declare our work to be a “factual representation”. Therefore the writer should acknowledge that it is “what happened to her”, and the story that she has constructed of it. Even the act of observing and interpreting is an act of academically sanctioned colonialism. To whom does the story really belong anyway? Goodall believes that authors are accountable for what they write, and they are therefore bound to tell the truth, their truth, as accurately as possible. However, traditional writing has claimed to be self-less, objective, third person. It makes no references to real experience, but in reality it has been white, male, middle-class and heterosexual. New ethnography declares its voice, and believes that identifying with the writer is a good thing for the reader, that this interaction makes a better text and a more complete learning experience. Human beings are natural storytellers and users of symbols. This does not detract from the quality of the research. A good story should be good to read, and a final quote from Goodall. (2000)⁽⁹⁾

I don't think messing with your head is a problem. I think messing with your head is what *all* scholarship should be and do. It should be *dangerous*. It should *expand your mind*. It should open locks, provide pathways offer a language capable of inspiring personal, social, and institutional liberation. I think it should help people think and behave differently, if they choose to. *Writing that doesn't mess with your head isn't very good writing.*

THE ETHNOGRAPHIC IMAGINATION OF PAUL WILLIS.

Paul Willis, educated at Cambridge and then at Birmingham at the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, and now teaching at Wolverhampton, entitled his 2006 book, “The Ethnographic Imagination”. At first glance, ethnography, the recording and description of truthful events that happen to people, and imagination, flights of fancy, appear diametrically opposed to each other. However, to Willis, imagination is essential to the art of ethnography. He describes ethnography as the needle, through the eye of which the threads of imagination must pass. Willis also sees the way that people construct meanings in their lives as an art form. He asks the question, “What happens if we understand the raw materials of everyday lived cultures as if they were living art forms?” Willis, (2006) He goes on to describe how close reading techniques had bored him when studying literature, but that when applied to living culture, with a social connection, they were inspiring, and saved him from the “flattening reductions of social science.” (2006) The themes of imaginative

ethnography and life as an art permeate his work. Curiosity, a constant asking of “why” questions, must stimulate the researcher to go and find out. Willis sees the ethnographer as putting together a social puzzle. He uses art to describe how people constantly make and remake their material lives, and also how they make sense of their existence. Willis, (2006)⁽¹⁰⁾

This is a cultural production, as making sense of themselves as actors in their own cultural worlds. Cultural practices of meaning-making are intrinsically self-motivated as aspects of identity-making and self-construction: in making our cultural worlds we make ourselves.

So people continue to work on their identities through their creative, cultural practices. They make significance for themselves. Meaning-making is achieved through work on forms, and is a type of cultural production. It could be through a hobby, club, work, magazines or an online blog. This culture making is how people interact with structures. There is also a symbolic level, whereby the whole or social formation continues to reproduce itself. Much meaning-making centers around commodities, such as cars being symbols of status as well as a means of transport, and new products and new meanings for these products, (other than their function) are continually being invented. These meanings are often concerned with fashion, glamour and lifestyle and the fetishization of objects includes our bodies too. Symbolic or meaning-making work adds value to commodities. This could be in contexts, such as the careful selection of separate garments to form an outfit, or a CD collection. It could be in the sharing of music, or films, between young people. Selection and collection and combinations of things add symbolic value. Selection leads to appropriation, when objects are taken for personal meaning-making. This often results in “my music” or “my style”, which is the production of something new from all the component parts. Willis says, (2006)⁽¹¹⁾

High art objects say: ‘appreciate, not use me’. Against this, the grounded aesthetics of informal cultural practices put sensuous human activity at the heart of things in the multiple performances of consumption rather than fixed performances to score.

Willis argues that as consumers, the masses are now more or less working under capitalism’s logic. However, to people, especially young people, in the post modern world there appear only fragments of culture and not a unified culture. Travel, commodities and electronic media are seen as more important than neighborhood or work or family. As homogeneity is lost to fragmentation, and there are more and more choices to be made, the ethnographer must be concerned with how things relate to each other. Willis (2006)⁽¹²⁾

The ethnographic imagination should concern itself with the relations within and

between at least three 'elements': creative meaning-making in sensuous practices; the forms, i.e. what the symbolic resources used for meaning-making are and how they are used; the social, i.e. the formed and forming relation to the main structural relations, necessities and conflicts of society.

Willis like Goodall, argues for reflexivity on the part of the investigator, seeing 'history, subjectivity and theoretical positioning as a vital resource for the understanding of, and respect for, those under study.' (2006)

He emphasizes that the researcher must keep asking questions, must work 'on the hoof' and constantly form and reform grounded ethnographic imaginings. There must be 'nagging issues' which drive curiosity, and one must be willing to work from hunches and a stance of openness. The ethnographer must use theoretically informed methodology for her work. Willis and Trondman; (2002)⁽¹³⁾

Most basically, we are interested in recording and presenting the "nitty-gritty" of everyday life, of how "the meat is cut close to the bone" in ordinary cultural practices, and presenting them in ways that produce maximum "illumination" for readers. If you like, we are interested in producing "aha" effects where evocative expression through data hits the experience, body and emotions of the reader. These are moments where new understandings and possibilities are opened up in the space between experience and discourse, at the same time deconstructing and reshaping the taken for granted in a particular response to the shape of the social order, a response that transcends dichotomies such as public/private, social/individual. Aha effects fuse old experiences with new ones, thus opening up readers' minds toward new horizons.

It is through the creative use of grounding imaginings, which relate data and experience to theoretical perspectives which maximize enlightenment of what is found, that the ethnographer can produce the 'aha' effect in the reader.

NORMAN DENZIN'S WRITING AND PERFORMING ACROSS BOUNDARIES.

Norman Denzin is professor of communications at the Institute of Communications Research, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign. He is editor of *Cultural Studies* ⇔ *Critical Methodologies*, and co-editor of *Qualitative Inquiry* both published by Sage. He is a tireless critic of the positivist schools of traditionalists and is a pioneer of new ways of representing the research that sociologists do. He calls for reflexivity in work and also for researchers to speak out and involve themselves in political issues. In his scathing attack on the Bush administration, and its turning black into white, to justify the Iraq war, Denzin speaks out:

(2004)⁽¹⁴⁾

Cultural studies scholars have a moral obligation to confront the current situation, to speak to the death of lives, culture and truth, to undo the official pedagogies that circulate in the media see Denzin and Lincoln, (2003). What is happening in the world today lies outside “the realm of human understanding,” Roy (2001b). It is up to the poets, the writers, the artists, and scholars in cultural studies to make sense of what is happening, We need testimonials, autoethnographies, performance texts, plays, and dramas about real people with real lives, the horror of it all.

Notice that Denzin does not say that we need more statistics or more surveys, or even more academic texts. It is only in the realm of qualitative work that what is happening can be revealed. In this he includes the artists and various kinds of performative texts. In *Drawn to Yellowstone*, 2008, Denzin presents his research on the production of Thomas Moran’s painting of the Grand Canyon in Yellowstone Park, and how it was a part of the commodification of the area. His purpose was to expose “those contradictions and ruptures that brought science, art, capitalism, railroads and tourism together” (2008). In order to do this he uses a four-act performance, including the characters of Moran, Cooke, (a millionaire who was sponsoring the building of the North Pacific Railroad), railroad workers, a publisher, a critic, a historian, and narrator, amongst others. On the stage at various times appear dioramas of the timelines of the production of the commissioned painting, the members of the expedition to Yellowstone, and the final passing of the park bill, appear. In this dramatic performance Denzin brings history to life. He has the painting critiqued on the stage, revealing how Moran had created a representation of the park, which could be sold to the public. Though he had been true to geological forms, it was the image of the great Canyon in his mind that he had painted. It glorified nature, and was inspired by Turner, but also glorified man’s power over it. The native American in the painting significantly looks away from the Canyon. Moran’s vision was sold to the public and his painting to congress. Many luxury hotels were opened by Cooke’s park improvement company. Moran’s image was sold through tourist guides and brochures, and a market of middle-class tourists was built up. The government bought the last areas of land in Yellowstone, and the native population was emptied out. The railroads were built by natives, freed slaves, Chinese, Irish, and war veterans. Denzin reveals the connections between art, science, business, politics and capital enterprises at the expense of the racialized other, who is only involved as labor to create the park.

Denzin challenges the idea that writing can present ‘the truth’. Writing is always a representation and there is no one ‘the truth’ to be presented. The boundaries between fact

and fiction are growing increasingly fuzzy. New journalists in the 1990s created reflexive texts, for readers to actively interpret, to read between the lines. They were hesitant and complex, calling attention to themselves and to language. Denzin believes that ethnography should do the same. (1996)⁽¹⁵⁾

I oppose all hierarchical categories, including those that distinguish literary and nonliterary, fictional and nonfictional textual forms. These categories, which are socially and politically constructed, work against the creation of an expansive, complex public discourse wherein multiple narrative forms circulate and inform one another. If all is narrative, then it can be argued that narrative techniques are neither fictional nor factual, they are merely formal “methods used in making sense of all kinds of situation” (Eason, 1982, p143). Truth is socially established by the norms that operate for each form, or genre.

Using the same logic neither does Denzin believe that an interview can reveal the inner world of a person. (2001)⁽¹⁶⁾

The interview is a way of writing the world, a way of bringing the world into play. The interview is not a mirror of the so-called external world, nor is it a window into the inner life of the person. The interview is a simulcrum, a perfectly miniature and coherent world in its own right. Seen in this way, the interview functions as a narrative device which allows persons who are so inclined to tell stories about themselves.

He sees the interview as a fabrication, but as a reconstruction of the world, told to its own version of narrative logic. Speech for Denzin is action. Our whole lives are mediated by cinema, television and the media. We are actors in each other's lives. We experience the world in a series of representations. We are also an interview society, exacting confessions from people not only for police investigation, but for television entertainment. Private worlds become public. The act of the interview is a performance. The interview can then be turned into dramatic text and performed for an audience, who can find authenticity and presence in the performance. Life is turned into narrative, and narratives become commodities. Denzin contrasts dialogic interview with documentary interview. The latter hides its own means of production, creating an illusion of reality. The dialogic interview should reveal its production, its politics, should use multiple voices, should interrogate realities, invoke the teller as well as the story, and should make the audience responsible for interpretation.

To present research through performance has some advantages over conventional presentation of research. This kind of presentation shows, not only tells. It seeks to evoke

what it speaks about. It is performed in a world that is already mediated by our cinematic experiences. Denzin speaks of his work thus.⁽¹⁷⁾

I seek an interpretive social science that is simultaneously auto-ethnographic, vulnerable, performative and critical. This is a social science that refuses abstractions and high theory. It is a way of being in the world, a way of writing, hearing and listening. Viewing culture as a complex performative process, it seeks to understand how people enact and construct meaning in their daily lives. This is a return to narrative as a political act; a social science that has learned how to critically use the reflexive, dialogical interview.

THE IMAGINATIVE SOCIOLOGY OF ZYGMUNT BAUMAN.

Zygmunt Bauman is one of the most important voices of sociology today. Professor Emeritus of the University of Leeds, he resides there in his adopted city, but his work is clearly influenced by his experiences as a Polish Jew and his training in Polish sociology. According to Sztompka (1984), summarized thus by Jacobsen and Marshman, (2008);

Polish sociology has three characteristics. First, it rejects conventional neopositivist notions of value-neutrality and advances a humanistic and socially engaged perspective. Second, it focuses on the 'big issues' of macro structure and cultural change (however always with a keen eye on the consequences on human experience). Finally, and perhaps most importantly for our immediate purposes, Polish sociology has a long-standing tradition for integrative and interdisciplinary work whereby sociology is fertilized by outside perspectives, including literature.

Bauman's contribution to sociology certainly fits with this picture. It is not only in his attention to vitally important themes, such as globalization, the holocaust and its meanings, post-modernity and human suffering, and the humanity and insight which he brings to these potent topics. It is his use of literature as a source, and his imaginative and illuminating use of metaphor to illustrate these topics that enable Bauman's work to aid readers' comprehension on the meaning of the subject matter far more effectively than could any chart, graph or numerical data. Jacobsen and Marshman, (2008) highlight three particular metaphors that Bauman employs to great effect. The first is his metaphor about postmodern society. He used the term "Liquid Society" and indeed uses the word in several book titles; "Liquid Love", "Liquid Fears", "Liquid Life", and "Liquid Modernity". To quote Jacobsen and Marshman on this metaphor, (2008)⁽¹⁸⁾

Bauman's metaphor of liquidity is employed to describe a world that has 'melted',

changed beyond all recognition when compared to its former 'solid' state. Liquid modern society is one that does not hold any particular shape for long. Life in a 'liquid' environment is such that one cannot rely on anything to remain fixed: nothing lasts, nothing stays the same. Individuals cannot use past events and experiences to navigate their futures, as Bauman asserts: 'Liquid life is a precarious life, lived under conditions of constant uncertainty' Bauman (2005a: 2). Thus, a profound transition has taken place. We have moved from the stability, permanence, and heaviness of the 'solid' modern era, to the unstable, fleeting era of 'liquid' modernity, where maximum impact, instance obsolescence and constant mobility are all important – and from which we cannot escape.

Japanese society, no less than those of Europe, is experiencing the effects of this liquid modernity. Increasingly family bonds, and bonds to natal place are eroded, and lifetime employment seems to be a thing of the past. University degrees no longer ensure a role in the workplace and permanent relationships are replaced by online networks of friends who can be easily dropped at the click of a mouse.

Another aspect of the liquid society that we experience is the phenomenon of movement. This happens both physically and through networks. What is solid is fixed, but the liquid substance is constantly able to move. An image that comes to mind is the jet-setting businessman or model, who cross frontiers almost daily in the course of their business. However, there is another kind of traveler: the migrant, stranger, refugee, tramp. Using the second metaphor which Jacobsen and Marshman highlight, Bauman divides travelers into two types, which he calls the tourist and the vagabond. The tourists' spare cash and access to leisure, to experience new places, and new experiences enable them to stave off boredom, and is a symbol of their success. The family holiday is almost a God-given right to the European or American family. Of the vagabond Bauman states, (1998a)⁽¹⁹⁾

Many would go elsewhere, or refuse to embark on a life of wandering altogether – were they asked, but they have not been asked in the first place.

The vagabond is the waste product of our society, who apparently contributes nothing. They are gypsies who are not welcome, tramps who sleep in our stations, those who lose their home with their job, those who are pushed across borders by famine, or by civil war, those who set sail in precarious crafts in vain attempts to start a better life. They serve to remind the tourist how fortunate she is, and also to instill a little fear of the kind of traveler she could become, were she born in another situation or if things go wrong. The third metaphor that is highlighted, is Bauman's metaphor about utopia. This is intertwined with the first two metaphors. He traces the history of our society in the following terms. First there was the

stage of the gamekeeper. This was a premodern stage where nature was wild, and the humans lived in it, but did not attempt to control it. This gave way to the gardener stage. Jacobsen and Marshman (2008),⁽²⁰⁾

Solid modernity, however, was all about 'cultivation', planning and design. Obviously, in a real garden there is no moral significance when talking of the cultivation of 'desirable plants or the 'eradication' of 'weeds'. When, however, it is society that is being 'engineered', a more sinister air pervades such discussions.

Solid modernity experimented with 'gardening' in horrific ways, often in the name of making a better world, or a utopia; totalitarian regimes, wars against those who were seen as 'weedy', eliminating people through concentration camps and nuclear and chemical weapons. Surveillance and spying became increasingly necessary to police states and to weed out undesirables. Though the age of state gardening is over, in most places, the weeds have not disappeared. According to Bauman, we have now entered a new phase, that of the hunter. The hunter is really a tourist or consumer, and the weeds are those who are flawed as consumers. The grand utopia of the future has now vanished, but it has been replaced with a personal one, which can be purchased by a tourist. It might be in the form of a package holiday to Greece or Hawaii or in the form of a facelift. Satisfaction, personal utopia, is now available for sale, and can be purchased. In the "New Internationalist" (1997) Bauman says⁽²¹⁾

But what she (Rosa Luxembour) did not predict was that Modernism (or industrialism) would create expanding enclaves of 'post-modern' existence in which people are consumers first – and workers only a very distant second. The work ethic has been replaced by a consumer ethic; the savings-book culture of delayed gratification has been replaced by the credit-card culture that 'takes the waiting out of wanting'. The inhabitants of these enclaves are kept in place not by coercion but by seduction, by the creation of new desires rather than by normative regulation.

Bauman goes on to explain that the poor are no longer necessary to the rich, not even as a pool of cheap labor, as in the increasingly mechanized and computerized environment, they are no longer needed. Whilst the rich are busy and short of time, the poor are killing time as they are killed by it. Bauman's challenge is that there must be a break in the link between employment and living resources in order for all the citizens of the world to enjoy a basic minimum wage.

Bauman believes that the poetic imagination is vital to all sociological study. He sees in literary devices, creative tools that can be used for great effect: analogies, allegories and

parables, comparisons with fiction and poetry. These are available to bridge the divide between social science and literature. Whilst metaphor cannot replace scientific methodology or evidence, it can greatly aid our understanding of what the evidence points to. Bauman's revelations about today's society are an intense cry for us to look for ethical solutions to the problems we have created.

CONCLUSIONS.

Our post-modern world, where our experience of culture is fragmented, and often mediated through film, or other media, demands that the field of qualitative research change. Issues of positionality and of voice are addressed throughout this paper. Willis argues that reflexivity and the investigators history, subjectivity and theoretical position are a vital resource for understanding and respecting the subjects. Goodman, a well-known researcher of Japan's education system, found his position of the issue of *kikokushijo*, (Japanese students returning after being educated in schools abroad), completely changed during the course of his research. He found that though he thought he was a detached researcher, he had started out with a very negative attitude towards the government, due to bad experiences in Japan and his opinions about the education system in general. In spite of this position he was forced by his data to rethink his stance. He found himself being changed by the material he was finding. Because of this he argues the importance of researchers stating clearly their positionality.⁽²²⁾

Even the detached view I thought I was taking was, in fact, very largely determined by my personal – intellectual and emotional – position *vis-vis* Japan. If this paper can make only a single contribution to anthropology, it is, therefore, to suggest that the recent trend for anthropologists to analyze how they fit into their own accounts when 'writing culture' see Clifford and Marcus (1986) Fardon, (1989) is neither unscientific nor self-indulgent, but both ethically and morally responsible. Goodman, (1994).

Issues of language and of representation also have to be addressed, along with positionality. In a sense, researchers are being asked to come clean, or to get honest, about who they are and what they are doing. It is easy to hide behind academic language or to focus on the other, from a privileged position, rather than asking difficult questions of ourselves. All use of language involves interpretative decisions. Research is, more often than not, using words to describe non-linguistic practices. This is in itself a representation. How can the interview be used most effectively as a method of obtaining data, and of seeing truths? How are issues of power and representation addressed? What is the best method of presenting the research to the public?

The art and imagination of the researcher are also seen to be crucial to the process of qualitative research. In order to be able to offer new contributions to knowledge, researchers must be able to put together the pieces of the puzzle. Researchers must be able to search for links and meanings, for patterns behind cultural practices. The practice is like that of a detective, an archeologist or a lawyer. Researchers must strive for Willis's moment of truth, the 'a-ha' effect.

IMPLICATIONS AND APPLICATIONS.

Funding.

It is clear that the kind of ethnographic work that is presented here, offers a very important strand of research, very different to, though complimentary rather than opposed to, that of the positivist, data based kind of research. This kind of research is necessary for us to be able to understand the experiences of people, and to examine how systems or institutional practices affect their lives. It is vital for us in order to understand our cultures and cultural practices and to determine how we interact with these practices. However, this kind of research is in great danger of being sidelined by funding bodies, which determine allocations of money according to the standards of quantitative research. Researchers in social science may have to fight to fund such people-centered research. This may involve justifying such work on theoretical or epistemological grounds.

Learning a new language.

For many who have grown up in traditional ways of academic writing, there is a need to learn a new language. Goodall informs us that the truth is not compromised by writing it in an interesting way. Our research must have high standards of writing as well as solid, academic research. We owe it to our readers. We need to learn to be storytellers, to attend to narratives, to be able to manipulate the literary skills which can bring our writing to life. We may need to learn to be open to other ways of representation, which can present the research in more enlightening ways, such as poetry or performance.

Risk-taking.

The researcher also needs to be a risk-taker. It is hard to publish non-conventional forms of research. It is hard to be honest enough to write autoethnography. It is hard to be vulnerable. It is hard to accept ambiguity or the unresolved. It is hard to expose injustice or to stand on the side of victims. Such voices need to be heard.

- (1) Denzin, N. K. 'The Elephant in the Living Room: of extending the conversation about the politics of evidence'. *Qualitative Research* 2009; 9: 139-144.

- (2) Denzin, N. K. 'The Elephant in the Living Room: of extending the conversation about the politics of evidence'. *Qualitative Research* 2009; 9; 143-144.
- (3) Maxwell, J.A. (2004a) 'Using Qualitative Methods for Causal Explanation.' *Field Methods* 16: 3.
Maxwell, J.A. (2004b) 'Causal Explanation, qualitative Research, and Scientific Inquiry in Education'. *Educational Researcher*. 23: 2: 3-11.
- (4) Denzin, N.K. 'The Elephant in the Living Room: of extending the conversation about the politics of evidence'. *Qualitative Research* 2009; 9; 146.
- (5) Vickers. M.H. (2002) 'Researchers as Storytellers: Writing on the Edge – And Without a Safety Net'. *Qualitative Inquiry* 2002: 8: 608.
- (6) Vickers. M.H. (2002) 'Researchers as Storytellers: Writing on the Edge – And Without a Safety Net'. *Qualitative Inquiry* 2002: 8: 613.
- (7) Vickers. M.H. (2002) 'Researchers as Storytellers: Writing on the Edge – And Without a Safety Net'. *Qualitative Inquiry* 2002: 8: 617.
- (8) Goodall, H.L. Jr. (2000) *Writing the New Ethnography*. Alta Mira Press. 78.
- (9) Goodall, H.L. Jr. (2000) *Writing the New Ethnography*. Alta Mira Press. 193-194.
- (10) Willis, P. (2006) *The Ethnographic Imagination*. Polity Press. XIV.
- (11) Willis, P. (2006) *The Ethnographic Imagination*. Polity Press. 79.
- (12) Willis, P. (2006) *The Ethnographic Imagination*. Polity Press 109.
- (13) Willis, P. Trondman, M. 'Manifesto for Ethnography' *Cultural Studies ⇔ Critical Methodologies* 2002; 2; 239.
- (14) Denzin, N. (2004) "The War on Culture, the War on Truth". *Cultural Studies ⇔ Critical Methodologies*. 2004; 4: 140.
- (15) Denzin, N. (1996) 'The Facts and Fictions of Qualitative inquiry'. *Qualitative Inquiry*. 1996; 2: 237.
- (16) Denzin, N. (2001) "The Reflexive interview and a Performative Social Science." *Qualitative Research* 2001: 1: 25.
- (17) Denzin, N. (2001) 'The reflexive interview and a performative social science.' *Qualitative Research*. 2001: 1: 43.
- (18) Jacobsen, M.H. and Marshman, S. 'Bauman's Metaphors: The Poetic Imagination in Sociology'. *Current Sociology* 2008; 56; 805.
- (19) Bauman, Z. (1998a) *Globalization: The Human Consequences*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- (20) Jacobsen, M.H. and Marshman, S. 'Bauman's Metaphors: The Poetic Imagination in Sociology'. *Current Sociology* 2008; 56; 811.
- (21) Bauman, Z. (1997) 'The haunted house'. *New Internationalist*. April 1997; 24.
- (22) Ben Ari, E. Moeran, B, Valentine, J. (1994) Eds. Goodman R. (1994) 'Deconstructing an anthropological text: a 'moving' account of returnee schoolchildren in contemporary Japan.' in *Unwrapping Japan*. Honolulu, University of Hawaii Press. 181

Bibliography.

- Bauman, Z. (2000) *Liquid Modernity*. Cambridge, New Malden: Polity Press.
- Bauman, Z. (2002) *Society Under Siege*. Cambridge, New Malden: Polity Press.
- Bauman, Z. (2004) *Identity*. Cambridge, New Malden: Polity Press.
- Bauman, Z. (2006) *Liquid Fear*. Cambridge, Malden: Polity Press.
- Bauman, Z. (2006) *Liquid Love*. Cambridge, New Malden: Polity Press.
- Bauman, Z. (2008) *Globalization, The Human Consequences*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bauman, Z. (2008) *The Art of Life*. Cambridge, New Malden: Polity Press.
- Ben-Ari, E. Moeran, B and Valentine, J. Eds. (1994) *Unwrapping Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y.S. Eds. (1994) *The Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage.
- Denzin, N. (2001) *The reflexive interview and a performative social science*, *Qualitative Research* 1. 23-46.
- Denzin, N. (2004) *The War on Culture, the War on Truth*. *Cultural Studies⇔Critical Methodologies*. Vol.4.2. 137-142.
- Denzin, N. (2008) *Drawn to Yellowstone*. *Qualitative Research* 8 451-472.
- Denzin, N. (2009) *The elephant in the living room: or extending the conversation about the politics of evidence*. *Qualitative Research* 9 139-159.
- Ellis, C. Bochner, A. Denzin, N. Lincoln, Y. Morse, J. and Richardson, L. (2008) *Talking and Thinking About Qualitative Research*. *Qualitative Inquiry*. Vol.14. 2. 258-284.
- Goodall, H.L. Jr. (2000) *Writing the New Ethnology*. Maryland, Oxford: AltaMira Press.
- Jacobsen, M.H. and Marshman, S. (2008) *Bauman's Metaphors: The Poetic Imagination in Sociology*. *Current Sociology* Vol 56, 5. 798-818.
- Pelias, R. (2008) *H. L. Goodall's A Need to Know and the Stories We Tell ourselves*. *Qualitative Enquiry*. 14. 1309-1313.
- Vickers, M.H. (2002) *Researchers as Storytellers: Writing on the Edge - And Without a Safety Net*. Vol. 8.5. 608-621.
- Willis, P. (2006) *The Ethnographic Imagination*. Cambridge, Malden: Polity Press.
- Willis, P. Trondman, M. (2002) *Manifesto for Ethnography*. *Cultural Studies⇔Critical Methodologies*. 2. 394-402.