the ethnographer's

WAY

a handbook for multidimensional research design

Kristin Peterson & Valerie Olson

THE ETHNOGRAPHER'S WAY

BUY

ethnographer's

DUKE

a handbook *for* multidimensional research design

Kristin Peterson & Valerie Olson

DUKE

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS Durham and London 2024

PRESS

© 2024 DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

All rights reserved

Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper ∞

Project Editor: Bird Williams

Designed by A. Mattson Gallagher

Typeset in Cronos Pro and Literata TT by

Westchester Publishing Services

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Peterson, Kristin, [date] author. | Olson, Valerie, [date]

author.

Title: The ethnographer's way: a handbook for multidimensional

research design / Kristin Peterson, Valerie Olson.

Description: Durham: Duke University Press, 2024. | Includes

bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2023026792 (print)

LCCN 2023026793 (ebook)

ISBN 9781478030157 (paperback)

ISBN 9781478025900 (hardcover)

ISBN 9781478059141 (ebook)

Subjects: LCSH: Anthropology—Research—Methodology.

Ethnology—Research—Methodology. | Research—Methodology. |

BISAC: SOCIAL SCIENCE / Anthropology / Cultural & Social |

SOCIAL SCIENCE / Sociology / General

Classification: LCCN GN42.P484 2024 (print)

LCCN GN42 (ebook)

DDC 301.072/1—dc23/eng/20231025

LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2023026792

LC ebook record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2023026793

DUKE

CONTENTS

xi

XVII	Preiude
	Why and How to Use This Handbook
xxvii	Acknowledgments
1	INTRODUCTION
	Multidimensional Concept Work
6	Designing with Connectivity, Intuition, Curiosity,
	and Congruence
8	Beginning with the Research Imaginary
12	Getting out of Vertical Scaling and into Multidimensional
	Space
19	Identifying a Multidimensional Object (MO)
24	Relating Multidimensional Zones of Inquiry
25	Project Listening: Attending to What's There and
	What's Possible
26	Overview of the Multidimensional Design Elements
	and Processes

Tables, Examples, Figures, and Formulas



36	Personal Needs Assessment for Collective Concept Workspaces
37	Make Collective Agreements
3,	3
43	MODULE 1
	Imagine the Research
46	Write Your Research Imaginary in Four Days
62	Create Your Key Concepts Table
64	Research Project Grid 1
66	Collective Concept Workspace 1
_	
69	MODULE 2 Focus on Literatures
	rocus on Literatures
76	Use Your Project Concepts to Find Three Key Literatures
83	Assess How Your Project Engages with Conversations
	within Key Literatures
86	Include Literature-Based "Other Concepts"
89	Create and Listen to the Literatures Diagram
91	Make a Preliminary Reading List with Timelines
92	Research Project Grid 2
93	Collective Concept Workspace 2
95	Module 3
	Map Concepts
97	Prepare to Work Graphically and Archive Your Creations
101	Make a Concept Map with Connections
103	Assess Your Map's Ethnographic Specificity
108	Listen to and Explain Your Map
109	Research Project Grid 3
109	Collective Concept Workspace 3

111	MODULE 4		
	Create Multidimensional Concept Combos		
116	Place Key Concepts within Literatures		
123	Create Your Concept Combos		
127	Do Concept Combo Literature Searches and Assessments		
134	Identify the Most Promising Concept Combos		
136	Revise Your Key Concepts Table and Concept Map		
137	Research Project Grid 4		
138	Collective Concept Workspace 4		
139	MODULE 5		
-37	Describe Your Research		
141	Project Listening: Admiring Successful Ethnographic		
4.40	Descriptions Warm Lin to Communicating Your Project		
143	Warm Up to Communicating Your Project		
147	Understanding Research Description (RD) Structure		
152	Draft a Baseline RD and Identify Key Descriptors		
157	Interrelate Key Descriptors		
162	Finalize your RD		
164	Research Project Grid 5		
165	Collective Concept Workspace 5		
167	MODULE 6		
	Perceive Your Multidimensional Object		
170	Revise Your Key Concepts Table, Concept Map, and RD		
170	Pause to Feed Creativity		
173	The RD-MO Relationship and Multidimensional		
	Tensegrity		
180	Perceive and Create Your MO		
188	Feel into Your MO		
188	Research Project Grid 6		
189	Collective Concept Workspace 6		



191 INTERLUDE 2 The Inquiry Zones

195	MODULE 7
	The Scoping Zone
199	Prepare to Define Your Scope
203	Attune to Curiosity and Not-Knowing
205	Draft a Scoping Question
212	Identify Disciplinary and Social Significance
218	Confirm the Scoping Question and Significance Relationship
220	Research Project Grid 7
221	Collective Concept Workspace 7
223	MODULE 8 The Connecting Zone
	_
225	Identify Your Process Clusters
232	Define Data Sets
238	Pose Data-Gathering Questions
244	Research Project Grid 8
245	Collective Concept Workspace 8
247	MODULE 9
	The Interacting Zone
250	Establish Your Data Collecting Interactivities
255	Define Questions for Your Observational
	Interactivities
258	Compose Questions for Your Conversational
	Interactivities
262	Account for the Archive
264	Conceptualize Nonstandard and Other Methods



267	Ensure That the Connecting and Interacting Zones
	Are Congruent
269	Research Project Grid 9
270	Collective Concept Workspace 9
273	Mobilia Vary Passanda Project Cuid
	Mobilize Your Research Project Grid
274	Make a Whole-Project Congruence Check
276	Develop an Ethics Review Board Application Plan
278	The Opening Paragraph of the Project Description
286	The Literature Review Section
294	The Methods Section
298	Maintain Multidimensional Concept Work during
	Field Research
301	POSTLUDE Posting Reflecting Property to Regin Angel
	Resting, Reflecting, Preparing to Begin Anew
	Appendixes
202	Scheduling the Modules for Academic Quarters
303	and Semesters
305	Wilkinson's Partially Filled Research Project Grid
303	2. Wilkinson's Farciary Finea Research Project Grid
309	Glossary
315	Notes
315	Notes
315 321	Bibliography
321	Bibliography
321	Bibliography

TABLES, EXAMPLES, FIGURES, AND FORMULAS

Tables

l.1	Vertical Scaling	14
1.2	Multidimensional Frameworks	17
l.3	Handbook Overview	27
1.1	Key Concepts Explained	51
1.2	Key Concepts	63
1.3	Research Project Grid	64
2.1	Literature Category Identification	79
2.2	Key Literatures	82
2.3	Key Concepts	89
3.1	Empirical vs. Theoretical Concepts	104
4.1	Concept-Combo Literature Search	127
4.2	Concept-Combo Literature Citations	129
4.3	Final Concept Combos	136
5.1	Reverse-Engineering Kladky's and Badami's Research Descriptions	150
5.2	Key Descriptors	158
5.3	Key Descriptor Combos and Multidimensionality	161
Inter.1	Project Zone Dimensions	193
7.1	Scoping Table	202
7.2	Scope + Significance	218
8.1	Process Clusters	226
8.2	Process Clusters and Data Sets	237
8. ₃	Data-Gathering Questions	243

9.1	The Three Hows	248
9.2	Data Sets-Data-Gathering Questions-Methods Relationship	254
9.3	Rahman's Interacting Questions: Observations	257
9.4	Interacting Questions: Interviews	259
9.5	Data Sets-Data-Gathering Questions-Archives Relationship	264
9.6	Other Methods	266
9.7	Checking for Congruence Gaps between Connecting and Interacting Zones	267
9.8	Final Project Grid	269
10.1	Grid Elements for a Project Description's Opening Paragraph	284
10.2	Possible Structure for a Project Description's Opening Paragraph	285
10.3	Grid Elements for the Literature Section	290
10.4	Possible Structure for a Literature Section's Opening Paragraph	291
10.5	Possible Structure for a Methods Section's Opening Paragraph	296
Examples		
1.1	Rahman's Research Imaginary	47
1.2	Identifying the 4Ps	53
1.3	Identifying Broad Contexts	54
1.4	Addressing Assumptions about People	57
1.5	Addressing Assumptions about People, Parts, and Processes	57
1.6	Rahman's Key Concepts	62
2.1	Locating Concepts within Literature Categories: "Finance"	73
2.2	Rahman's Key Concepts	77
2.3	Rahman's Literature Category Identification	78
UNI	VERSITY	

TABLES, EXAMPLES, FIGURES, AND FORMULAS

Xİİ

2.4	Ranman's Rey Concepts (Opdated)	81
4.1	Rahman's Key Concepts	113
4.2	McKinson's Key Concepts	118
4.3	Palmer's Key Concepts	120
4.4	McKinson's Concept Combos	125
4.5	Palmer's Concept Combos	125
4.6	Rahman's Decision about Literature Substitution and/or Addition	131
4.7	McKinson's Concept-Combo Literature Work	132
4.8	McKinson's Final Concept Combos	134
4.9	Palmer's Final Concept Combos	135
5.1	Olson's and Peterson's Twenty-Five-Word Project Descriptions	145
5.2	Haven's and Wilkinson's Key Descriptors, Concept Combos, and RDs	147
5.3	Haven's RD Structure	149
5.4	Wilkinson's RD Structure	149
5.5	Haven's Key Descriptors	156
5.6	Wilkinson's Key Descriptors	156
5.7	Haven's Key Descriptor Combos and Multidimensionality	159
5.8	Wilkinson's Key Descriptor Combos and Multidimensionality	160
5.9	Haven's Dimensioning within a Category	161
6.1	The RD-MO Relationship and Multidimensional Tensegrity	174
6.2	How the мо Maintains Multidimensional Tensegrity: Haven	177
6.3	How the мо Maintains Multidimensional Tensegrity: Badami	179
6.4	Rahman's MO Perception	182
7.1	Haven's Scoping Table	199
7.2	Scoping Questions = MO + Scoping Terms	206



7.3	Well-Scoped vs. Underscoped Questions: McKinson	207
7.4	Well-Scoped vs. Underscoped Questions: Haven	208
7.5	Well-Scoped vs. Underscoped Questions: Palmer	209
7.6	Haven's Scoping Table	212
7.7	Haven's Scope and Significance	214
7.8	Haven's Scoping Question-Significance Relationship	220
8.1	Wilkinson's Process Clusters	226
8.2	Kladky's Process Clusters	227
8.3	Wilkinson's Process Clusters and Data Sets	232
8.4	Kladky's Process Clusters and Data Sets	234
8.5	Wilkinson's Data-Gathering Questions	238
8.6	Kladky's Data-Gathering Questions	240
9.1	Wilkinson's Data Sets–Data-Gathering Questions–Interactivities Relationship	251
9.2	Rahman's Interacting Questions: Observations	256
9.3	Kladky's Interacting Questions: Interviews	260
9.4	McKinson's Data Sets-Data-Gathering Questions-Archives Relationship	263
10.1	Reverse-Engineering the Opening Paragraph of Mallin's Project Description	279
10.2	Reverse-Engineering the Opening Paragraph of Rahman's Project Description	282
10.3	Mallin's Literature Section Excerpt	287
10.4	Opening Paragraph of Rahman's Methods Section	295
10.5	Rahman's Participant Observation Plan for One Process Cluster	296

Figures

2.1	Literatures Venn Diagram	74
3.1	McKinson's Concept Map	98
3.2	Palmer's Concept Map	99
4.1	McKinson's Concept Placements	119
U	NIVERSITY	



4.2	Palmer's Concept Placements	121	
4.3	Project Literatures Venn Diagram	122	
4.4	Venn Diagram with a Fourth Literature	133	
4.5	Literatures Venn Diagram with Concept Combos	137	
6.1	Rahman's MO Evolution	181	
Formulas			
RD Structure = Research Problem + The Problem's Key Empirical, Contextual, and Theoretical Descriptors + Research Aims		148	
MO = Ethnog	мо = Ethnographic Concept(s) + Theoretical Concept(s)		
Scoping Question = MO + Scoping Terms		205	

DUKE

Why and How to Use This Handbook

How can researchers turn inspired hunches into full-fledged projects? Since 2014, we've been teaching ethnographic research design from its nascent stages, namely imagining, conceptualizing, and clarifying project intentions. Typically, this early phase of conceptualization is a solitary and free-form process. It sets the stage for the project's innovative potential. But it is also the phase in which grave flaws can be made, such as an insufficient literature review and failure to create congruence between research questions and fieldwork plans. Research design often takes a backseat to the more prominently formalized processes of methods selection, proposal writing, fieldwork, data collection, and publication.

In contrast to books that deal with those more visible processes, this handbook pays attention to research design's incipient conceptualization processes and uses them to complete research question development and data-collection planning. Because we focus on conceptualization, this is not a methods handbook, but it expects designers to have been exposed to ethnographic methods and analysis training. After you've completed all the handbook's modules, you will have a framework for writing grants and other proposals, collecting data, approaching qualitative analysis, and offering important theory-making avenues in your written, audio, or visual products. But our intent goes further. We want to showcase research design's possibilities as a communally shared and iterative process from its nascent beginnings. This handbook, then, offers more than a way to design research—it invites ways to change research life.

We refer to our process as research design while keeping in mind that design is the focus of critiques as well as liberatory activism. Scholars in several disciplines show how the term legitimates the visions, practices, and hierarchical structures of elite engineering and architecture enclaves. Their critiques often focus on the rise of design thinking, a planning and self-fashioning practice based on tech-market logics. At the same time, ethnographers cite



rising movements to reclaim and reshape design as a powerful, collective social transformation activity.³ Our experience has shown that students at all levels are empowered by the sense of purposeful making and signifying that design invites. We are inviting the reconceptualization of both research and design, based on practices of community care and open-ended ways of finding things out and writing about them.

The way that we offer here is one among many ways to imagine and design frameworks of ethnographic inquiry. What is "new" about it is how we tested, assembled, and refined bits and pieces of different tools and design approaches into a step-by-step, iterable process. Like the design process we advocate, the handbook itself emerged iteratively through years of responding to student and colleague feedback on what worked and what didn't. Moreover, we attended to the experiences of recently returned fieldworkers and graduated students who were turning their projects into books, becoming instructors, and finding themselves mentoring others in research design. We also used its techniques to guide well-established researchers to design and coordinate collective projects made up of multiple teams and research objectives. Therefore, this book is the product of ongoing relationships with beginning and advanced designers and research collectives. We were motivated by our shared concerns with navigating the highs and lows of institutionalized research processes and managing careers in a variety of settings, academic and beyond.

Foundational to this handbook is a design mode that we call multidimensional: an iterative approach to assembling diverse research concepts and intentions within a congruent framework of inquiry. Unlike site, scale, or perspective, the term dimension does not solely refer to situated differences—such as a place, size, or view—within a kind or category. Dimensions are broadly and differentially aspectual: they can be material or perceptual, spatial or temporal, quantifiable or immeasurable, tangible or intangible, concrete or speculative. We use multidimensional to signal the fully lively form that a project can take when researchers work on all its aspects and angles in a creative way. For example, one researcher we worked with, Tariq Rahman, created an ethnographic project centered on the seemingly concrete concept of land-asproperty, which takes measurable form within the categorical dimensions of economics and legality. But researchers can also attend to people's emerging experiences of land as a shifting and less concretized dimension of speculative technical and spiritual space-making. The result of putting these seemingly disparate dimensions of land together is a multidimensional project that focuses on important nonconcrete and more-than-territorial aspects of land-

PRESS

xviii

as-property. This is one example of putting multiple conceptual dimensions together in a way that creates intellectually compelling and socially responsive multidimensionality.

The approach we take, then, is unlike most traditionally prescribed research design procedures because it emphasizes checking out conceptual connections that can be obscured by institutionalized design ideologies. By this, we mean prescribed ideas about which kinds of people, places, processes, things, situations, contexts, and theoretical ideas designers should put together. To help designers do this, the handbook favors a slow try-and-refine design process. It encourages designers to work with design elements in new, nonlinear, more iterative ways. These elements include seemingly disparate concepts, theoretical perspectives, social processes, forms of data, and literatures, as well as personal experiences, imaginative intuitions, and political commitments. From a normative perspective, the project elements we coach learners to connect may sometimes seem unrelatable and incongruous, and the ways we help them make those connections may appear unconventional. But we have found that fostering this creative and often audacious try-andsee process helps designers develop innovative projects with broad intellectual significance and social impact.

Experienced researchers will recognize the spirit of multidimensional design. It is found in the intuitive analytic moves that ethnographers make in final written works in which they claim to "bring different literatures together," "connect different processes," or "juxtapose sites" in novel ways. While most anthropologists aim to design such richly multidimensional projects, the cryptic adage "you know an innovative project when you see it" has meant that the process of getting there is not well specified or explicitly taught. Connecting project elements against or across normative categorical barriers often happens later in the postfield analysis stage. But we believe that you can make these kinds of connections throughout all phases of the research process, including the very beginning phases. In this way, our handbook is both new and not new. It simply encourages what happens felicitously in outstanding ethnographic design, and it is dedicated to making that outcome accessible.

STUDENT COMMENTS

I just can't articulate here how helpful this course was to my project, and beyond that, my progress as a scholar. I came in with a swath of disorganized data and really no concept of how to work through it.

- At the end of this course, I feel that I both have turned it into something solid and have the skills to continue doing so over the course of my dissertation work and my career.
- This process takes what seems to be a mysterious, esoteric, or commonsense part of qualitative research—project conceptualization—and demystifies some of its most important components without oversimplifying the complexity of what goes into developing a research project. The assignments in this course have helped me completely rethink my thesis research and set an agenda for the next several years. I have gained skills in this course that I will use for the rest of my career.

Through this way of designing, we support the critical reworking of anthropology as an institutional discipline and social practice. To do so, we advocate for creatively open, intuitive, and collectively centered ethnographic design that allows for noninstitutionalized kinds of attending, knowing, and sensing.

We take inspiration here from other writings on "ways" of doing, following the lead of other handbook writers who argue that transformative work requires deep attention to embodied preparation, rest, and collective spiritual attunement. Julia Cameron's The Artist's Way: The Spiritual Path to Higher Creativity provided a strong guide. Cameron's handbook provides twelve weeks of exercises to uncover and break through blocks to creative work of all kinds. It's inspiring because it insists that creativity and imagination are inherent and that they require as much deliberate care and cultivation as scientific knowledge production. We also are inspired by Felicia Rose Chavez's The Anti-racist Writing Workshop: How to Decolonize the Creative Classroom. In it, Chavez shows how to work against "traditions of dominance" in the classroom. In her workshops, she specifically acknowledges the affective dimensions of those traditions, and she restructures learning and writing hierarchies to undermine normative and damaging patterns.

This handbook's multidimensional approach and emphasis on collective process are also inspired by decades of changes in ethnographic practice. Anthropology's shifting terrains began when scholars in the late twentieth century insisted that fieldwork and writing processes were as political as theory and analysis. In particular, the 1980s writing culture debates were responses to concerns about anthropology, representation, and imperialism.⁶



They surfaced the problem of ethnography's biased compositional and literary structure. Feminist, racial, and postcolonial analytical responses to these issues showed how the experience of ethnographic writing and reading is always situated in the gendered, racial, and class-based subjectivities of researchers and readers.⁷ This prompted anthropologists to reflect on the production of research and theory responsive to emerging questions about the political nature of anthropology as a discipline and ethnography as a practice.⁸ Furthermore, ethnographers began to draw attention to what "spaces" and "scales" meant in terms of examining the complexity of relational interconnection at large.⁹ More recently, ethnographers concerned with methodology insist, in different and not always aligned ways, that fieldwork praxis and training must be attuned to emerging forms of research politics, ethics, philosophy, and creativity.¹⁰

The content of these debates and provocations is quite varied. Yet most (not all) assume one peculiar thing: that anthropological methods and theories are where disciplinary transformations begin. We amend this assumption. We assert that *research conceptualization and design* opens a foundationally powerful and vibrantly imaginative space for shifting disciplinary conceptualizations and practices. In fact, qualitative methods books have emphasized this point via calls for intersectional and anticolonial approaches to research design.¹¹

When we teach and facilitate workshops on developing ethnographic research projects, we find that participants have relatively few difficulties with learning fieldwork methods, including addressing the ethics and politics of research interactions. Far more challenging for learners—and even for our experienced colleagues—is grappling with the slip-sliding problems of earlyphase project planning within ever-changing research milieus. Problems that plague all of us include trying to engage newly urgent-seeming topics that are difficult to define, situating a project within overwhelming volumes of literature, managing fuzzy and untethered research concepts, ending up with elusive research questions that don't connect well to data-collection plans; and fielding uncertainties about engaging in relationships with people and places. Given these problems, it is difficult to stabilize a core cluster of researchable concepts and questions. As we read more or gather new data, clusters seem continually to disconnect or break down. Certainly, dealing with in-progress design changes and disintegration can be overwhelming; along the way we can feel anxiety about whether we are designing an intellectually significant and socially impactful project.

ERSITY

Therefore, this handbook consistently addresses the need for a project to be innovative and significant, as well as to be meaningfully connected to scholarly and broader communities. As such, careful attention to research design processes also has implications for research justice, in part by opening ways to come into community in the early imaginative and concept-work processes. While we provide only one among many possible ways to design ethnographic research in collective modes, we hope it might serve as a guide for cultivating and sharing other unique ways of making a project. In helping designers mindfully attend, with others, to the relational, political, and intentional dynamics of the project, the handbook can be useful in helping to establish ethical, reciprocal, and nonextractive commitments of their projects. However, we leave the specifics of collective work to the wisdom of designers, their advisers and colleagues, and the communities they are engaging as they deal with the many dimensions of fieldwork planning. Our process, therefore, offers ways to make visionary design decisions part of an ethically responsive and socially connected practice. This makes project development a mutually supportive rather than lone process, which helps produce projects that have conceptual and political integrity.

However, this goal is often difficult in the structural conditions of our working lives. Research design usually (but not always) takes place in academic environments that encourage conformity, competition, and individualism. In the United States, where we work and teach, these demands come from settler colonial institutionalizations that prescribe narrow and fixated approaches to research and what counts as "conceptual" or "empirical." As a result, there can be little room for openness, curiosity, play, speculation, flexibility, and thinking and relating otherwise. The *otherwise* in anthropological and other work is about being present to and materializing alternative social ways of interacting and being. ¹² We hold that such endeavors are vital to becoming proficient in research design *as a peer-based collective craft*. We provide suggestions about how to work collectively with peers; we intend that these be modified to meet the researchers' own collective inquiry practices.

This book is for people at all levels of design experience: undergraduate students who are developing an ethnographic project for their methods courses or who are initiating an honors thesis or longer-term independent study; graduate students who are conceptualizing their projects; experienced researchers who want to refresh their approach to project construction; and those planning to teach research design.

PRESS

xxii

While the handbook is designed for anthropologists conducting ethnographic work, it is also for those engaging in ethnographic and autoethnographic work across inter/disciplines such as sociology, geography, history, comparative literature, political science, creative writing, gender and sexuality studies, and ethnic studies, to name a few. For those conducting ethnography in ways other than it has been normatively defined, or even those who are *not* conducting ethnography, we invite you to hack our use of "ethnography" and substitute it with your inter/discipline's own key concepts and methods. Thus, the conceptualization and design process found in *The Ethnographer's Way* is applicable across multiple disciplines.

If you plan to teach this book or to use it to guide a group endeavor, we suggest doing all the modules yourself first. Not doing so would be like teaching a musical instrument without having learned to play it. That is, engaging this material requires an *embodied* sense of knowing the process. Even if you are a seasoned ethnographer, we think you will find, as others have, that this process will reorient and probably reenchant your project development experience. It tends to be a joy to teach because it empowers new and established researchers to unearth what is important to them while assembling a project with clearly evident intellectual and social significance. It can also help them get in touch with skills and knowing that they didn't realize they had, which can be healing for many who do this work.

As instructors, we understand that the multidimensional design process needs to unfold carefully or it could be overwhelming. A very common reaction to project overwhelm and unwieldiness is to cut elements and add new ones without having a way to attend to the whole project. In this handbook, we address how to make a project that can be altered as needed, in ways that maintain a flexibly integrated theoretical core. In addition, we offer ways to imaginatively expand and pragmatically contract the overall project scope—that is, its empirical and theoretical range—in effective ways that don't reproduce normative hierarchical ethnographic scopes like "local to global" or "home to nation." Ultimately, this kind of attentive work results in a conceptual assemblage that sustains congruence between the research objectives and data collection and is also exploratory and innovative. We get there by using techniques that engage minds, bodies, and collective energies.

This handbook can be used and modified (hacked) in or out of the classroom. As a standard institution-based teaching process, it can be used in a class that spans a quarter (ten weeks) or a semester (about fifteen weeks). In those teaching frameworks, it can be used to structure an entire

course on design or used as part of a broader course on design and methods training. As a classroom guide, it is ideal for graduate-level training but can be adapted to give undergraduates experience in developing research topics, planning and executing research, and writing an ethnographic paper.

The handbook is devised to be used in workplace or workshop settings, where individuals or teams are preparing to conduct ethnographic research. This can include collaboration with interlocutors engaging in participatory and justice-based research design. We encourage those who are planning to use this handbook in the classroom or in a workgroup to consider modifications appropriate for their settings. For example, you might spend more time on modules or add exercises on actual methods to use and practice (for longer academic terms). Another option might be to break up the design work by allowing participants to field-test methods in tandem with the design exercises. Lastly, this handbook can also be used to support or clarify proposal designs and grant-writing processes.

After reading and planning for modifications, instructors and research collectives who plan to engage in group feedback should create an exercise submission plan for each module. That is, individual designers should complete all exercises in each module, but instructors or research collectives may want to specify which exercises they wish individuals to submit for coursework or group review.

There are two guiding process principles that we offer to both research designers and research design instructors: *valuing iteration* and *practicing in community*.

Valuing the Iterative Process over and above Instantly Materialized Results

In our teaching, we find that students attempt to power through and get things done quickly because that's what they're trained to do for all their classes. An enthusiastic attitude is a good disposition and can generate energetic activity. But yielding to anxiety-based pressures to get things done and dusted can be problematic when performativity and competition are the driving cultural forces of the work. This can deaden curiosity and the capacity to carefully reorganize one's work in innovative and liberatory ways.

Our efforts to pace this handbook to stay process-oriented and provide breathing room, even within the structure of academic terms, are centered



vviv

on student-researcher well-being. But we also want to provide a rewarding and illuminating experience for researchers and instructors as they open new possibilities for research design interactions. We want both students and instructors to recognize that an unrelenting "powering through" and "finishit-up" attitude can be harmful to experienced and novice researchers alike. We've seen, and personally felt, such embodiments lead to self-doubt, chronic avoidance, and other threats to well-being.

We also recognize, however, that efforts to shift out of "results now!" paradigms can be rattling for learners, instructors, and others, so we address this problem in our modules. It's difficult to trust a process whose outcomes will materialize in good time and often at different paces. We think this needs to be openly managed in the classroom and workplace. Being clear about the emotional highs and lows that accompany this work helps to regulate emotional reactivity (in order to remove obstacles to intellectual insights), encourages self-trust (which diffuses self-doubt), and normalizes a cooperative sympathetic joy for all intellectual pursuits (which can diminish the competition and aggression that we are all socialized into from a young age).

To counter worries about the lack of instant certainty, we remind novice researchers in our courses that they may not get to their final multidimensional design in ten weeks. Instead, we emphasize that the focus and aim of the course are on listening to the project and gaining conceptual project design skills. These skills are designed to become intuitive, which is the aim of any craft. And so when students finish our course, they will have learned a lot about their projects but not everything. They leave knowing that they have the know-how to help the rest of the project conceptually unfold long into the future.

Lastly, we encourage instructors and mentors to be mindful of their own professional urgencies and expectations. Without meaning to, instructors and mentors often want to help learners toward finality in ways that don't always cultivate enough space for intuition, listening, staying open, and remaining curious. We advise that breakdown and slowdown in the design process not be pathologized by instructors. ¹³ Research designers need to be told this and guided through conceptual challenges—challenges that are usually just typical encounters with designing a long-term research project. Such moments are often encouraging signs that the project is in process, and it may need a focused revision or more radical forms of letting go. That is, breakdowns and slowdowns can signal attachments that prevent one from going back to earlier steps or from experimenting with alternative design elements.

Instructors can adapt our exercises to provide wise guidance as learners move through design ups and downs. They can, for example, allow learners to move through their uniquely powerful responses to the uncertainties of research design, including making space for expressions of self-conscious hesitancy and personal or communal trauma. In practical terms, instructors and mentors might suggest that learners take a process break, redo earlier exercises, or do some free-writing exercises to get unstuck and centered again. When instructors prioritize processes of allowing and guiding together, we find that learners arrive at a project that "feels right" and that is also intellectually and socially significant.

Practicing Community Necessity

We feel it's important for learners to be effectively supported by working within a community of peers every step of the way. Community isn't an option: it is a necessity. For this process, we address how to establish and practice community necessity in more depth in Interlude I. At the end of each module—in the "Collective Concept Workspace" sections—we provide prompts that (1) emphasize the iterative aspect of design work, for the purpose of (2) cultivating a strong intuition for organizing multidimensional projects that (3) slows down the process so that openings to project insights can be possible.

Such insights flourish in a consistent, supportive environment provided by the communities you create. We recognize that finding community can be easy for some and difficult for others. In academic settings, students can feel marginalized in their programs. But in the same way that we may choose our "families" and friends, community here means finding ways to choose our allies and in/formal mentors.¹⁴

The necessity of intentional collective design work leads to an enacted politics of support that gets us out of the kind of individualism that we are enticed by and awarded for in institutionalized professions. We advocate breaking the interior and exterior bonds of that institutionalization. We all need different places and paths for creating knowledge. The scope of contemporary political problems calls for a radical rethinking of our professional patterns. Working within our own community-created processes provides one avenue for doing research otherwise. If there is momentum for the kind of practice we offer, then we hope that structures that foster exclusion and competition will give way to more liberating ways of being in our research and academic worlds together.

PRESS

xxvi

When we first started working in the Anthropology Department at University of California Irvine (UCI) in the late 2000s, the graduate training program's second-year required methods sequence consisted of two quantitatively focused, ten-week-long methods courses. These courses were developed by the department's founding anthropologists to advance mathematical models of social behavior, measurements of cultural knowledge, and quantitative multidimensional scaling. (The latter was developed by A. Kimball Romney and not to be conflated with our multidimensioning approaches.) We are grateful to Michael Burton and Bill Maurer, who dedicated themselves to transforming these courses into fascinating and impactful science and technology studies approaches to anthropological methods.

By 2013, Mike retired, Bill became dean of the School of Social Sciences, and George Marcus became chair of the department. George approached us and asked if we wanted to "play around" with these courses. We enthusiastically accepted and, along with other colleagues, embarked on transforming the second-year sequence from two quantitative methods courses to three qualitative project training classes: methods, research design, and grant writing. At first we spread our conceptual approach across the anthropological methods and research design courses. Now we teach the entirety of this handbook in the ten-week Research Design course.

It took many years and lots of experimentation before we produced *The Ethnographer's Way*. We would very much like to thank George Marcus for trusting us with core graduate training. He continues to be a generous colleague and friend, as well as a generative interlocutor for our research design endeavors. As graduate students at Rice University, we worked closely with George as well as Jim Faubion, Nia Georges, Chris Kelty, Hannah Landecker, Ben Lee, Amy Ninetto, and Julie Taylor. We deeply thank them for their support in a creative environment that shaped our conceptual thinking as anthropologists, research designers, and teachers. After we finished at Rice, Kim

PRESS

Fortun, also a Rice alum, generously shared her graduate ethnography syllabus with Kris in 2006, which, importantly, showcased Kim's innovative practices in the classroom that have evolved into her own conceptual training.

We are deeply grateful to the UCI Anthropology faculty who may have often wondered what we were up to—especially as we came up with strange new project design terms to use with students. But they nevertheless had faith and encouraged our experimental endeavors. We especially acknowledge our colleagues who are also instructors of the second-year sequence who, over the years, have supported our and each other's teaching endeavors. Much gratitude to Victoria Bernal, Tom Boellstorff, Kim Fortun, Sherine Hamdy, and Eleana Kim. We thank all of our colleagues for their kindness, support, and inspiring teaching and scholarship: Samar Al-Bulushi, Mike Burton, Leo Chavez, Ricky Crano, Tom Douglas, Chris Drover, Jim Egan, Julia Elyachar, Mike Fortun, Angela Garcia, David Theo Goldberg, Anneeth Kaur Hundle, Angela Jenks, Karen Leonard, Chris Lowman, Lilith Mahmud, Bill Maurer, Keith Murphy, Sylvia Nam, Sheila O'Rourke, Justin Richland, Taylor Riley, Damien Sojoyner, Ian Straughn, António Tomás, Roxanne Varzi, Sal Zárate, and Mei Zhan.

Other colleagues have read, taught, or otherwise engaged this work and provided invaluable feedback, great dialogue, and much kindness over the years. Many thanks to Samar al-Bulushi, Kamari Clarke, Jatin Dua, Joe Dumit, Sahana Ghosh, Anneeth Kuar Hundle, Kaushik Sunder Rajan, Negar Razavi, Emilia Sanabria, Gabrielle Schwab, Damien Sojoyner, and Madiha Tahir. We are grateful to Ellen Kladky for expert copyediting!

We also thank Teresa Montoya, Natacha Nsabimana, and the Anthropology Department at the University of Chicago, who hosted Valerie for a talk in 2021. Students especially asked questions that helped transform the names of our core concepts, which, at the time, represented more hierarchical and linear thinking—what we were trying to get away from. Tim Choy at UC Davis hosted Kris (along with Kaushik Sunder Rajan) for a talk as well as extensive day-long conversations with Marisol de la Cadena, Joe Dumit, Alan Klima, Fatimah Mojadeddi, James Smith, Smriti Srinivas, as well as many UC Davis graduate students. These dialogues eventually led to new experimental class exercises that now appear in the book.

Some of the deepest thanks goes to Emilia Sanabria who organized a 2.5-day multidimensional design workshop at a retreat center outside of Paris. She did so without knowing the full extent of what we were doing. We deeply thank the participants at that workshop: Claire Beaudevin, Charlotte



Brives, Fanny Chabol, Denis Chartier, Joe Dumit, Chris Elcock, Sophie Houdart, Sylvia Mesturini, Mariana Rios, Emilia Sanabria, and Piera Talin. They helped us with profound conceptual insights regarding the corporeal and somatic aspects of research design. It was a high-energy, ground-shifting time for all of us. To this day, we are truly grateful for such a rare experience that most of us never had at an academic event. After that workshop, we've had the privilege of ongoing, insightful, and brilliant engagements and observations with Joe Dumit and Emilia Sanabria. Valerie also thanks her colleagues Daniel Knight, Valentina Marcheselli, Perig Pitrou, and Istvan Praet who allowed her to integrate some of this material into invited talks and conversations in Europe and the United Kingdom. Kris additionally thanks Hannah Appel, Sean Brotherton, Larisa Castillo, Moréniké Foláyan, Angela Garcia, Avery Gordon, Laura Johnson, Julie Livingston, Metsi Makhetha, Sabrina McCorkmick, HLT Quan, Nonie Reyes, Elizabeth Robinson, and Judy Talaugon for their friendship and intellectual kindness. We have so much gratitude for our colleagues's friendship and support.

Most of all, we thank all the students who took, and will take, our courses on design and analysis and to whom we dedicate the development of this process. They are always open to experimental classroom practices as well as giving us room to name the moments that we didn't know what we were doing. They provide a great deal of patience and enthusiasm. Every week we learn from their research and, more importantly, learn how to better conceptualize and teach this work.

This book would not be possible without these students. Sincere and enthusiastic thanks goes to Gray Abarca, Ahmed Adam, James Adams, Tawfiq Alhamedi, Chima Anyadike-Danes, Kyrstin Mallon Andrews, Lucy Carrillo Arciniega, Monique Azzara, Nandita Badami, Shannon Bae, Nicola Bagic, Nataly Bautista, Melissa Begey, Michael Briante, Emily Brooks, Colin Cahill, Alice Chen, Alexandra Chmieleswki, Joshua Clark, Nathan Coben, Evan Conaway, Benjamin Cox, Katie Cox, Charlie Curtis, Marc Da Costa, Liz DeLuca, Upuli DeSilva, Cheryl Deutsch, Nan Ding, Nathan Dobson, Garrison Doreck, Emily Earl, Raymond Fang, Nasim Fekrat, Margaux Fisher, Akil Fletcher, Colin Ford, Diana Gamez, Melissa Gang, Lucy Garbett, Vida Garcia, Anissa Gastalum, Oviya Govindan, Padma Govindan, Courtney Graves, Mariel Gruszko, Kelly Hacker, Gina Hakim, Georgia Hartman, Tim Hartshorn, Forest Haven, Muneira Hoballah, Tannya Islas, Emily Jorgenson, Scott Jung, Anna Kamanzi, Neil Kaplan Kelly, Robert Kett, Christine Kim, Hae Sue Kim, Inah Kim, Mette Kim-Larsen, Ellen Kladky, Alex Knoepfelmacher, Greg Kohler, Yimin Lai, Matthew

Lane, Orlando Lara, Juwon Lee, Janelle Levy, Neak Loucks, Guilberly Louissaint, S. Zaynab Mahmood, Sean Mallin, Emily Matteson, Andrew McGrath, Kimberley D. McKinson, Colin McLaughlin-Alcock, Chandra Middleton, Tarek Mohammed, Alberto Morales, Rojelio Muñoz, Megan Neal, Angela Okune, Adan Martinez Ordaz, Jason Palmer, Justin Perez, René Perez, Simone Popperl, Matthew Porter, Farah Qureshi, Kaitlyn Rabach, Tariq Rahman, Lili Ramirez, Muhammad Raqib, Beth Reddy, Rebecca Richart, Darwin Rodriguez, Liz Rubio, Katherine Sacco, Camille Samuels, Daina Sanchez, Leah Sanchez, Linda Sanchez, Rosie Sanchez, Tim Schuetz, Nick Seaver, Taylor Silverman, Jessica Slattery, Isabelle Soifer, Prerna Srigyan, Danielle Tassara, Mindy Tauberg, Michael Tecson, Heather Thomas, Natali Valdez, Yvette Vasquez, Tenzing Wangdak, Sandy Wenger, Josef Wieland, Annie Wilkinson, Alex Wolff, Melissa Wrapp, Fei Yuan, Nima Yolmo, Leah Zani, and Jennifer Zelnick.

With much gratitude, we thank students who cotaught our undergraduate version of this course. These experiences helped refine what we were teaching in the graduate seminar. With each iteration, we all agreed that teaching project design and guiding undergraduates to analyze data, and produce papers and films out of the process, were some of the best mentoring experiences of our lives. Deepest thanks to Colin McLaughlin-Alcock, Mariel Gruzsko, Tim Hartshorn, and S. Zaynab Mahmood. Valerie also thanks her postdocs Ségolène Guinard and Michael Vine.

We have so much gratitude for former students (most now working in various professions) who were in our courses and who agreed to let us use their in-progress work as exercise examples: Nandita Badami, Forest Haven, Ellen Kladky, Sean Mallin, Kimberley D. McKinson, Colin McLaughlin-Alcock, Jason Palmer, Tariq Rahman, and Annie Wilkinson. We are very inspired by their compelling research and savvy multidimensional thinking and teaching.

We are so happy that Ken Wissoker at Duke University Press was supportive and enthusiastic about this project. Deepest appreciation for you, Ken! We also thank all the people and teams at Duke who made this handbook come into being, including A. Mattson Gallagher, Kate Mullen, David Rainey, Christopher Robinson, Laura Sell, and most especially Bird Williams, our project editor.

We are both joyfully indebted to our families and life mentors who supported our work on this handbook through the pandemic and our illnesses. Valerie wishes to thank her partner Guy; her daughter Morrigan; her mother, Gail; her sister Hillary, her brother Kurt, and her godmother, Phyllis. Her friend and colleague Roberta Raffaeta provided steadfast companion-





ship for thinking across dimensions over five years. Kris thanks her mother, Suzie; and siblings Susie, Todd, John, and Drew, and their partners and kids; she writes in memory of Robert Simon. We are indebted to our teachers and guides: Kris Abrams, Shannon Dailey, Marianne D'amore, Clara Favale, Nancy Guiliani, Bruce Johnston, Melissa LaFlamme, Jessica Mathon, Dave Smith. Additionally, we thank our oncologist, Robert Bristow, and the health teams at UC Irvine Medical Center who provided care and support while writing this book. We hold many people in our hearts who inspire us. We are grateful that they have shown us that practicing the spirit of generosity, nourishing kindness, and collective liberation is meant for all who wish to live and love deeply in our worlds.

DUKE



INTRODUCTION

Multidimensional Concept Work

In this handbook, we show you how to design an innovative and socially responsive research project. Throughout the process, we invite you to keep a beginner's mind. This asks you to stay open to states of *not*-knowing and to welcome the process of learning with others. This invitation makes the handbook more than a toolkit. It can become a way to integrate research's personal and collective possibilities.

We have been helping people experience the joys and challenges of research design for years, cultivating activities that result in well-integrated and successful projects. We take you through these activities step-by-step. After you complete the handbook, you will have all the elements of a coherently assembled project: a sound integration of relevant literatures; a compelling description of your topic and aims; a coherent theoretical and empirical object of study; and elegant research questions that shape the project's scope, data sets, and field interactions. You will need to be familiar with ethnographic methods and ethics in order to complete the module on field interactions, but this handbook will help you produce all the other elements. Along the way you will put these elements into a cogent project grid, which provides the basis, later, for writing a strongly congruent research proposal. All these elements are standard for a successful research design process. But our process is also nonstandard in that it also includes ways to help you attune these



activities with your existing experiences, intuitive intentions, creative activities, and collectives.

Our aim, overall, is to make research design a transformative process—meaning one that does more than produce a proposal or thesis. We hold that ethnographic research design, with its processes of imagining and engaging, offers opportunities to connect knowledge production processes with transformative practices in intellectual work and perhaps even social change. In this way, we advocate pushing the institutional boundaries of anthropological inquiry so that researchers can better align academic projects with broader values and goals. In short, we hope to make research design a process with scholarly as well as visionary dimensions.

This integrative approach treats projects as intellectually and personally multidimensional. Let's walk through a definition of our design approach, and then we'll detail what makes a research project *multidimensional* and how *multidimensioning* works as a design technique.

Multidimensional research design is an iterative approach to assembling diverse research concepts and intentions within a congruent framework of inquiry.

We use the word concept for all the terms that constitute your project. The concepts you will assemble in this handbook are diverse: empirically specific as well as general and theoretical. They may be rendered in the language you are using to develop the project but also could include terms relevant to those with whom you'll be working. Concepts include varieties of beings, objects, places, processes, and contexts you will directly encounter as well as theoretical ideas and other creative elements you want to bring into your design. In other words, concepts specific to a project's particular beings, things, activities, and places like "land," "Haa Atxaayi Haa Kusteeyix Sitee," "digital deeds," "food," "mohallas," "saving money," "fake drugs," "Peru," and "Alaska," as well as broader contextual or processural experiential concepts like "love," "racial enclosure," "neoliberalism," "financialization," "security systems," "rizq," "liberation," and "democracy." You will find these concepts in this handbook's examples. You will derive your project's key concepts from mapping out your own knowledge and intuitions and from doing literature reviews (in Modules 1 and 2).



We emphasize that the key concepts you decide to engage in your project are interdependent and contingent. Each concept must be understood to be in relation to the others. Understanding concepts as modular terms in this way helps you change or replace them if needed. Keeping modular helps you maintain curiosity and respect for what emerges when you assemble different concepts in different ways—what we will refer to as *concept combos* (Module 4). For example, putting "farmers" and "Argentina" and "soy" together in a project dislodges a set meaning for any of these stand-alone terms. To farm soy, rather than something else, in Rosario, Argentina, is a unique process, and it is not the same as farming soy in Maharashtra, India. When you regard terms as flexible concepts that change in relation, you can keep their contingent concreteness and abstractness in view. This helps you decide how to select and relate concepts in intuitive and newly compelling ways.

The *iterative* aspect of the multidimensional design occurs as you work forward and backward at the same time via practices of finding, assembling, reflecting, revising, and iterating concepts. This helps you create conceptual connections that are meaningful but not formulaic or hierarchical. We help you to cohere these conceptual connections to create a *congruent* ethnographic project that also integrates other concerns you have—social and political—that extend beyond the practice of ethnography. In the final phase of the handbook's process, you will produce a congruent *framework of inquiry* with broad theoretical and specific data-collection questions that are inspiring and answerable. Given that your project design clearly demonstrates a relationship between the gaps you found in the existing literatures and your data-collection plan, your answers to those research questions promise to be intellectually and socially significant.

We provided one example of a multidimensional project with these features in the prelude; here is another example we expand on in this handbook. Forest Haven, a researcher we worked with, designed a project that created a new conceptual framework for examining the politics of Indigenous food sovereignty in Alaska. She could have simply focused on Native food as an ingestible *material dimension* of life. But based on her personal and field experiences, she intuited that she could also examine how different groups of people experience food as a nonmetabolic and *sensorially embodied and technical dimension* found within unique (Alaskan) Natively and colonially defined spaces.

The result of putting those seemingly disparate dimensions of food together is a *multidimensional* project that dynamically combines two

conceptual dimensions: the environmental and the sensorial aspects of Alaskan food sovereignty politics. The project does so within a broadly spatial and temporal colonial context. Haven's literature review of this conceptual combination, a vital part of the multidimensioning process, confirmed that this was a productive and underexamined ethnographic concept combination throughout literatures on food politics in general.

Let's now take this moment to discern the difference between multidimensionality and unidimensionality. Haven might have designed a conventionally legible single-dimension project by focusing just on "Alaskan Indigenous food consumption and procurement in a changing environment" rather than focusing equally on the "sensing" dimension. Such a project would have examined what is locationally and culturally unique about Alaskan food: an edible and gatherable substance in the context of contemporary environmental degradation and food insecurity. However, at the conceptual level this creates only one-way dimensioning, meaning that people (Alaskan Indigenous people) and food-as-matter-in-environment are only indexing each other in the design framework. This could limit the researcher to designing a standard "food case study" form of ethnographic theorizing. Such a project wouldn't have reason to reach further—to plan for fieldwork on how food impacts the social and political dimensions of life as something in relation to spatial belonging and perceiving in other ways than eating and gathering. Nor would it be able to account for, or theorize, the practices and effects of Alaskan settler colonialism as a way to control environmental embodiment. Such a case study project certainly might contribute to a geographically situated "food and peoples" gap in the literature. But it wouldn't "pull" the project "outward" into the deeper conceptual combinatory multidimensionality that emerges by combining eating and gathering with Indigenous and state processes of sensing.

In contrast, Haven's multidimensional approach reimagines her project's theoretical and political possibilities—and what food is as an aspect of lived, spatialized experience. Based on her conviction that food sovereignty is intimately related to processes that make food uniquely sensed in Alaska, by both Native bodies and colonial surveillance technologies, she intuitively juxtaposed concepts of seemingly different kinds to open up and/or reframe her project questions. In particular, she was able to interrelate a chronically underexamined dimension of "Alaskan Indigenous food"—the broader embodied and technical dimensions of "sensing" with the broader contextual dimensions of "colonialism" and "sovereignty." In one of her project narra-



tives, she explains, "I am juxtaposing sensing and sovereignty in order to understand the meaning of food governance and dispossession on Native terms; I am studying how sensory politics are not 'local' or 'personal' bodily politics, but relate to larger spatial schemas of collective embodied sovereignty and conflict."

When the ethnographic and theoretical dimensions of food, sensing, and sovereignty are put together, new theory-making and social activist possibilities arise; these can include new or alternative ways to understand how modes of colonial governance, dispossession, and sovereignty emerge through very different processes of sensing: that of Native communities and that of the state.

Multidimensionality, therefore, isn't about random conceptual aspects jammed together; rather, it's a small, well-curated set of conceptual combinations that pulls the research into new possibilities. What makes such a project innovative is that it has a unique conceptual shape, helping us engage social processes differently.

Here is a definition of the design technique of multidimensioning. Come back to it when you need a design inspiration refresher.

Multidimensioning is the process of defining a project's conceptual combinations and using them to create congruently integrated project elements, from research topic to research questions.

Multidimensional research design addresses the need for ambitious research in urgent and complex political times. The entangled dynamics of racism, climate change, pandemics, indefinite war, precarious life, and volatile economies, to name a few, coexist with rising forms of resistance and otherwise ways to be and inhabit.² Otherwise ways of conceptualizing and doing creative work can get us out of modernity's linear, hierarchical, and racial prescriptions. Such ways out are not individualistic; they require mutuality. As Emilia Sanabria writes, "The taking care, the dwelling in, and staying with the trouble throughout is what makes the otherwise possible; it includes a simultaneous dynamic of struggle and collective imagination that is not just against but powerfully oriented towards something otherwise." Today's ethnography, then, has the potential to engage the multiple dimensions of distinctive and interconnected lifeworlds.

In what follows, we cover the "connective tissue" components of our particular approach: multidimensional concept work, imagining, project listening, and working in community. We encourage you to continue to adapt it for yourself and with others.

Designing with Connectivity, Intuition, Curiosity, and Congruence

To embark on this way, you will engage with others in flexible but disciplined *concept work*. In anthropology and other vocations, concept work generally refers to connecting ideas and things in order to form useful working constructs that lead to generative questions and fieldwork. In research design, concept-work "think tools" help you construct a project.

We understand concept work to be a fully embodied activity, and for this reason we address the importance of care, pausing, and reflection on a personal and collective level. This handbook's concept work aims to nurture your intuition and imagination, generate and test research feasibility, stay true to your curiosity and intentions, and manifest project congruence and potential.

Multidimensional concept work encourages an intuitively attuned approach to connecting project elements in ways that feel, in your body and in your social experiences, true to life. By intuition, we mean those inspired flashes of whispery inklings that don't necessarily arrive from normative reasoning processes. Listening to these intuitive inklings enhances your capacity to reflect on what you think you know, what you don't know, and what might be productively counter to standard notions of how things relate (for example, relating the process of sensing food with eating food, or of having a soul with seeking citizenship). We give you techniques to explore such experience-based intuitions that "this might connect to that," whether you are new to research design or not. Intuition is essential for honing any craft such as art, architecture, carpentry, cooking, making music, and so on. It helps a creative worker to dream something new into being and to explore and revise this living creation until it manifests their intentions in the best possible way.

We cultivate your intuition, with its inchoate states of interconnected feeling-knowing, while recognizing that in Western institutions intuition is only provisionally associated with intellectual work yet is entirely essential to it. We also know that the politics of intuition are deeply fraught on many



levels. Conventional academic infrastructures can divert us from playing with our open-ended intuitions, especially when they reinforce hegemonic forms of institutional and imperialist performativity of "reason." Intuitive thought is also constrained by "grind culture" that perpetuates capitalism's breakneck speed and chronic neglect of bodies and minds, denying us, among other vital needs, the care, stillness, and rest that nurture visionary work. Yet intuition is an embodied mode of open-minded perceiving that's always present, always dynamic, and can be carefully developed. We believe that cultivating processes of slowing down, listening, and intuiting can increase the potential of anthropological projects to usher us lightly into other possibilities of living and relating.

Ethnographers often put intuitive creativity on hold until after data collection. But we don't want you to wait that long! We find that such intuitive leaps can be productive at the earliest phases of research design, especially when you think them through with others. So, we developed exercises and feedback processes that incorporate both intuitive and classic empirical modes.

In addition to supporting intuition, we also want to counter disjunctive institutionalized processes that kill *curiosity*. The vitality of an ethnographic project anchors in its accounts of what research already shows, but it also faces what is truly unknown. And, even more importantly, it faces what the researcher does not know. Unfortunately, the neoliberal academy is moving further from open-ended curious inquiry and deeper into instrumentalized research that can be "applied" in order to refine, reform, or rebrand existing structures. We have noticed that, in this milieu, students often anxiously construct projects that safely reproduce established work. They feel disempowered to explore what they, and their mentors, don't know about social worlds. They feel instead that they must fit their project into inquiry slots that are already deeply grooved, so they can demonstrate how their project aligns with given conclusions about everything from social cohesion and belonging to racism and capitalism. They hesitate to break out and do something different. For example, they might intuit that there are ways to ask new, perhaps unusual, questions—such as to put questions of economy together with cosmological or spiritual questions, or to ask about the colonial state in relation to questions about how people smell and taste and sense things—but they don't feel permitted to do so. The coming modules show how successfully intuitive and curiosity-based projects came into being.

In cultivating your intuition and curiosity, we aim to reempower your right to not-know and to join with people taking risks to imagine something

new and open to difference. With all of this in view, we offer practices to cultivate the researcher's curious and intuitive body, heart, and mind in order to align not-knowing with imaginative possibility. Curious, intuitive, and imaginative practices can connect the project with liberative currents. And beyond producing projects, those practices can also support nurturing kindness toward our own and others' research processes. This leads the way to deep insights and care for our intellectual communities.

In sum, effective concept work enriched by imagination and curiosity results in a project that stays flexibly congruent at every stage of the research process. Although its concepts are diverse and connected in ways that may not seem coherent in a normative Western sense, the project hangs together as a whole from initial design to final writeup. This requires aligning the disparate aspects of research design—people, sites, things, theories, literatures, methods, processes—within a flexible but harmonious framework.

To maintain this congruence, researchers need to clarify and *re-*clarify project elements and their connections throughout project design, research, and writing. That is, a project requires *iterative* redesign across its life course. This handbook has ten modules of proven concept-work exercises that address these and other design challenges; in Module 10, we explain how to adapt these tools to produce analyses and other final products. The sequence unfolds as it does to save you lots of trial and error, but also allows you to double back and redo exercises when necessary. The first process that we teach you will help you address how to connect obvious but also intuitive inklings about what belongs in the study.

Beginning with the Research Imaginary

We usually begin a research project with the intent to ask and answer questions in ways that generate powerful social critiques. Critique is, of course, a necessary political and revelatory act. It is at the heart of any social science training. Effective, engaged critical analysis is refined over intellectual lifetimes. But critiquing is often seen as more rigorous or impactful than imagining. In contrast, in this handbook, *imagining* is a foundational design practice meant for empowering curiosity and engaging otherwise visions. In *The Ethnographer's Way* we enact our conviction that creating a critically attuned, socially responsive framework of inquiry requires imaginative stretching and experimentation. Critical thought does not have to be separated from imagining



new ways to conceptualize projects and to be in worlds together. Understanding why this is important in the research design process requires a deeper look at the historical dissociation of thinking and imagining.

The history of social science is rife with convictions that critical reasoning is a higher perceptual form than intuition or imagining. This conventional institutional attitude (per Aristotle's De Anima) holds that imagining is a sensation-based process of thinking in nonlogos forms, like images, that must be disciplined through linear processes like narration and formalized logic. The implication is that imagining simply indulges in messing around with ideas about existing social forms in undisciplined and frivolous ways, as opposed to reasoning about them in a categorically driven, linear, and logically orderly fashion. According to this perspective, what someone imagines, therefore, is perceived but in an ultimately disorderly and irreal way. Imagination, in this perspective, can be used to stir new ideas, but only if those ideas can be symbolically ordered.4 These perspectives bifurcate conceptualization into two streams: those that are orderly and rational, and others that are free-form or nonlinear. That is, imagination is deemed a place of fantasy, rather than an avenue of insight or perception. In contrast, we invite you to see how imagination can recognize the real nonlinear and unordered connectivities of living experience that critical reasoning, with its preordained categories, hierarchies, and scales, can overlook.

When we use *imaginary* as a noun to refer to making a written account of what you imagine—as we do in this handbook from Module 1 onward—we are deliberately breaking down irreal boundaries. We want to free researchers to constellate what they imagine to be probable and possible in ways that aren't linear, in service of narration, or in service to standard forms of generalizing or realizing.

By taking the imaginary as a fully-fledged form to design with, we follow theorists such as Sylvia Wynter and Báyò Akómoláfé, among others. These theorists hold that given Western conceits about the need to segregate sensing, feeling, intuiting, and imagining from disciplined or scientific thinking reproduce body/mind splits within individuals and across race and reinforce liberal mythologies about the ascendance of conventionally rational Man.⁵ This mandate to segregate and order perception can extend into anthropology's research design practices and epistemological frameworks, which operate almost by default, even as anthropologists consciously try to refute them.⁶ As Édouard Glissant shows, Western modes of splitting and reductionism force our very humanity into foreclosed modes of being and

knowing, such that we do not even possess the everyday language to inquire and imagine what life could be like outside of these reductions.⁷

Therefore, by encouraging your capacity to intuit and imagine, we hope to walk with you out of reductionist liberal and positivist frameworks and into new epistemological and practical possibilities for your projects and what you can do with them in worlds.

Fortunately, anthropology has traditions and emerging practices that honor curiosity, intuition, and imagination. Imagining, in such practices, is an active process that requires cultivation and faith in otherwise creativity and thought. Our design method is, for example, inspired by Zora Neale Hurston's insistence on pairing imaginative storytelling with ethnographic reportage, which connects imagining and analyzing.8 It is thus in alignment with scholars who explicitly link imagination with social analytic processes. Some of our exercises reflect C. Wright Mills's admonishment to turn comfortably obvious research ideas and questions on their heads and upside down in order to open up the unknown.9 Other exercises reflect our solidarity with colleagues working to remake research methods and foster collective methods development.¹⁰ Scholars pursuing such exploratory collective processes in academic and para-academic settings—such as Keith Murphy and George Marcus's ethnocharette, Andrea Ballestero and Brit Ross Winthereik's studio process, the Center for Imaginative Ethnography's play outside of the usual ethnographic boundaries, and the multimodal teamwork of Coleman Nye and Sherine Hamdy—advocate for collectively engaged iterations of reimagining, redesigning, and reanalyzing.¹¹ Many of these new processes are informed by the political conviction that otherwise ways of knowing and being stand outside and can act to dismantle liberal suppositions about what counts as an acceptable form of scientific or analytic creativity. Imagining, therefore, is not something that only proceeds research. It can also guide and shape it, resulting in tangible written and graphical works that are imaginaries in their own right, not simply the products of earlier imagination.

The imaginative concept work you will do in this handbook starts with Module 1, "Imagine the Research." From this module forward, we enact our support of other scholars who aim to conjoin research with counterinstitutional liberatory practices. We are especially inspired by studies found in the Black radical tradition pertaining to marronage and fugitivity, feminist approaches to experientially integrated and embodied modes of anthropological research development, studies of Indigenous political cultures as models for social relations as well as political organization, and multispecies



work that engages post- and nonhuman subjectivities and more-than-terran worlds.¹² Following the leads that arise in these bodies of work we ask: What if the purpose of curious and intuitive anthropological imagining is to let go of liberal segregations and reductions and create spaciousness for otherwise ways of inquiry and being to present themselves?

Module 1 allows you to play freely with intuitions and ideas, helping you begin outside of patterned conceptual categories and topics so that your project doesn't come into view eclipsed by academic shadows of the past. We'll get to literature reviewing in Module 2, but first we want you to reclaim the imaginary as a space for experimenting with research possibilities and dimensions. In it, we provide exercises to let go of default prescriptions for "defining the field" so that you can engage in expansive but mindfully stepwise explorations of what is possible for your project. This first step is also where you'll start to practice the iteration and reflection you'll do from then on. Often, speculating and trying things out means that one's first leanings and intuitions are opaque and mysterious. Or they feel meaningful but it's not quite clear how they connect.

Imagining and experimenting with the elements of a project-in-process takes time. But the results can be groundbreaking—an outcome that is often best achieved in a collective space. You'll have lots of chances to imagine and reimagine, and in the end, you'll have imagined a project into view.

The imaginative and iteratively productive process of multidimensional design allows you to invest fully in what is unfolding and not just in end products. ¹³ Leaning into process with curiosity helps to keep Courtney Morris's question to anthropologists at the forefront: "What if we did the work as though our lives and the lives of others depended on it?" ¹⁴ This is not just a call to imagine outside of the box, but to leap out of it as Frantz Fanon invokes when he writes, "I should constantly remind myself that the real leap consists in introducing invention into existence." ¹⁵ Thinking processually with Fanon may include "reconfiguring the conditions of (our) own inner lives, reconfiguring the conditions of (our) immediate surroundings, and ultimately, reconfiguring the conditions of how we live our societies on Earth." ¹⁶

adrienne marie brown and Walidah Imarisha underscore the farreaching revolutionary value of imagining when they write that "the decolonization of the imagination is the most dangerous and subversive form there is: for it is where all other forms of decolonization are born. Once the imagination is unshackled, liberation is limitless."¹⁷ And so it is in the spirit of this deeper vision and call to manifest what is possible that we approach multidimensional design as a mode, based on nonlinear, nonhierarchical interrelational practice.

Getting out of Vertical Scaling and into Multidimensional Space

In this handbook, we work in a multidimensional space; we view this as an alternative to staying within what we call the "vertical scaling" of normative research design. The Western "scale" concept is loaded with normative histories and connotations. Standard positivist "scaling" takes relative dimensions of things, such as color or size or distance, and grades them into hierarchically and sequentially ordered ranges, such as "low to high" or "near and far." These graded ranges can transmit dominant logics of inherent relative value, such as when "low" is subjugated to "high" or "near" is designated as more real than "far." The term can also reify hegemonic assumptions about intrinsic scalar difference, such as when the category of time is scaled into past-to-future and the category of space is scaled into near-to-far, and the two categories are kept separate. The precept that scales are inherently and intrinsically ordered and separate invokes images of ranked transcendence, such as that of an arithmetic progression, racial description, ladder, or tower. As a result, standard scaling can reify low-high hegemonic notions of difference, development, and value. Here we discuss how vertical scaling works and what multidimensioning offers otherwise.

In research design, researchers who approach design in terms of vertical scaling can end up framing sites and things within linear scalar orders with binarized poles. To name just a few of these orderings: standardized spatial schemas like local/global or home/nation; hierarchical forms of divided ontologies, such as that of body/society; progressive orderings of conceptualization that separate materiality from cognition, such as fieldwork/analysis or people/ideas; and the authoritative separation of theory-making from experiential learning, which actually depend on each other for knowledge production.¹⁸

We describe these standard linear scalar schemas as "vertical" because they generally reflect Western models of lowness-to-highness. Scholars and critics have used other terms to describe how this form of ordering is culturally and politically situated. Social scientists point to the historical construction of Western scalarity and its incommensurability with diverse nonlinear



and nonmonocentric processes of relating and living. Feminist and feminist-Indigenous anthropological work, in particular, opens perspectives on the shape and extent of vertical scaling. Marilyn Strathern refers to the "holographic" nature of things-in-relation that do not map onto the West's discrete linear scales. Anna Tsing describes how the amorphous meshworked fields of organisms like mushrooms-in-relation-with-other-species cannot fit into the precisely hierarchized scales of Western biology and capital. Attending to the unbounded spatialities of more-than-human and morethan-terrestrial spaces, Zoe Todd writes about how Indigenous understandings of fish lives are based on perceiving animals as multifaceted "active sites of engagement" within multitudes of relations rather than as separate individuals existing along linear geospatial routes and scales. In her work on astronomical observatories in Hawaii, Hi'ilei Julia Hobart shows how scale-making technologies like telescopes simultaneously occupy Indigenous spaces and render outer space as a continuation of occupiable space. Her analysis calls attention to the tactics of scientific scaling versus otherwise senses of near and far.19

Even as vertical scale models become problematized, many ethnographers, including us, continue to rely on vertical scalarity to scaffold our inquiries and to communicate a shared sense of how phenomena connect. We acknowledge that normative social scientific uses of proportional and linear scalarity still have discursive traction. However, even when researchers are clear that such low-to-high or small-to-large orderings are socially produced, they often continue to track their project elements up and down the multiple nodes of linear or hierarchical scales. These scalar lines emanate from the here-there or this-that binaries that are common in ethnographic research and communication.

Let's circle back to an example of vertical scaling mentioned in the beginning of this section: "local/global." Ethnographic project designs often use vertical scaling to organize plans for data collection around a progressive binary. The elements of a vertical local/global scale look something like: the home \rightarrow the local \rightarrow the urban or rural \rightarrow the regional \rightarrow the national \rightarrow the transnational \rightarrow the global. Embedded in that scale are terms like home that take a predetermined spot on a seemingly normal/natural schema of small-to-large or here-to-there forms of living and belonging.

As an example, imagine a project focusing on unhoused people in San Francisco, California, a West Coast city in the United States. The researcher might take a standard approach to defining the scope of the project by placing

the *unhoused individual* into a local/global vertical scale. In this scale, *home* is put into a conceptually nested or descending situated order of empirical and theoretical sites. The scholar might follow this scalar order by researching how a person becomes houseless, how houseless people utilize shelters or other dwelling places, how they search for jobs and housing, how they find joy and care in their lives, and then how Western houselessness can be contextualized in terms of national and global territory. This is a vertical processural understanding of how a single ethnographic research object ("the houseless individual") moves up or down through progressive spatial scalar nodes, that is, the local home to national territory. We represent this vertical schema and its data-collection planning in Table I.1.

TABLE I.1 Vertical Scaling

Vertical Scaling Framework Follow the Being or Thing Up or Down	Project Elements in Relation	Vertically Oriented Data Collection Questions
National or global	Unhoused individuals <i>in relation</i> to the nation	How are the unhoused in San Francisco situated in relation to national forms of belonging?
\$	Unhoused individuals <i>in relation</i> to private property regimes	How are the unhoused in San Francisco situated in relation to private property regimes?
\$	Unhoused individuals within social coping processes	How do the unhoused in San Francisco respond to the West- ern national politics of bare life?
Unhoused individuals in relation to the workplace		How do the unhoused in San Francisco search for and hold jobs and housing?



\$	Unhoused individuals in shelters	How do the unhoused in San Francisco utilize shelters or other dwelling places?
Local	Individuals in relation to homes	How do individuals in San Francisco become houseless?

Don't get us wrong: there is nothing inherently problematic with a vertical conceptual schema like this and its thorough fieldwork aims! However, for the ultimate purpose of theory-making, vertical scaling often tracks one central social group/thing/process (e.g., houseless people) in a way that reproduces a predetermined spatial and ontological "scale of things in the world." If you adopt only this approach, you might overlook ways to study houselessness by constellating it within a less regimented linear conceptual framework. In addition, you might fall into a pattern of adhering to normative perspectives on what is central or "ex-centric" to lived experience. You might find your curiosity being foreclosed.

Multidimensional design allows researchers to create a conceptual framework that assembles a variety of elements—including places, people, processes, and things—that might officially "belong" to different scalar or ordering schemas, or to no scales or orders at all, without imposing a hierarchical or centering order on the whole project.

You may still be wondering about how to hold this kind of perceptual space given how complex a project is. You may be thinking "It's impossible to cover it all! I can't do everything!" The ethnographer's way is not about covering or doing everything. No project begins and ends with "everything" in the frame—to try to do so would mean, as we have heard wise scholars such as Sean Brotherton say to students, that you never get out of the field! The ethnographer's way is about finding a manageable framework of multi-dimensional connections that allows you to engage the enormity, complexity, and dimensionality of the project's unbounded lifeworlds. It is about creating a project that can *actually* be done! This is important because having a diverse collection of elements isn't necessarily "too much" for a project to contain. Rather, the problem is the quality of the assemblage that allows concepts and fieldwork to hang congruently together. Therefore, when we talk about multidimensional space, we are referring to an actual construct

that you create and within which you can manage, complete, and care for a successful project.

For example, a multidimensional project on houselessness in San Francisco could constellate inspired curiosity about relationships between liveswithout-homes and the imperialist housing industry. Such a project would invite a framework that connects a broad but not necessarily linearly defined scope of processes and contexts. This might result in a slightly different take on, and potentially more unusual and innovative divergence from, the vertical schema above. To do so, a research project designer might place houselessness, as a constructed conceptual condition and political economic category, into promising ethnographic relations with other key elements: people and other beings, places, things, and contexts. These elements could be found in the following processes and sites, just to name a few: the fluctuating dynamics of unregulated real estate capital within transnational speculative real estate markets; racialized redlining as an enduring logic of slavery, militarization, carcerality, and colonial ordering; government-business complicities in racialized and classed gentrification; the way the production and responses to houselessness erase Indigenous as well as otherwise concepts of homespace and belonging; the relationship between houselessness and the denial of home-space to more-thanhuman-beings; and frozen wage labor in relation to climbing housing costs under changing capitalisms. All of these have local-to-global or small-to-big dynamics, but the research site plan and data-collection questions don't have to orient at that level.

As a result, the framework of inquiry might include some or all of the vertically oriented processes named in Table I.1 but could also add additional dimensions that *scope out* the meaningful place of houselessness within contemporary spatial and temporal structures of US property and territoriality. Table I.2 indicates some possible multidimensional project foci.

This kind of multidimensional investigation could result in original theoretical insights on race, class, territorial, and speciesist formations that structure particular kinds of chronic houselessness *and* chronic homebuilding. This kind of unexpected but powerful research connection-making is what can make ethnographic work so mind-blowing and lastingly impactful. It is what well-practiced ethnographers learn to create over time, which we present here as something available to all at early experiential stages.

Designing projects that include multidimensional conceptual connections open up new modes of curiosity and new analytical possibilities. While



TABLE I.2 Multidimensional Frameworks

Multidimensional Framework Interconnecting Project Concepts	Project Elements in Relation	Dimensionally Oriented Data-Collection Questions
Real estate sales and loan practices Transnational speculative real estate markets	Homes as residences in relation to homes as financialized forms	How do San Francisco real estate and banking practices connect to broader unregulated real estate speculative processes?
Government policies Gentrification	Government un/reg- ulation of real estate practices in relation to the corporate housing industry	How do government- business complicities in San Francisco shape the gender, race, class dimen- sions of houselessness?
Rural dispossession and development processes Urban houselessness	Colonial territorializa- tion in relation to "house- lesssness" as a marker of unpropertied life	How do government and development processes in San Francisco connect to US historical colonial projects to manage territory as white property?
The management of more-than-human spatial homing/displacement The management of human spatial homing/ displacement	Human houselesssness in relation to more-than-human displacements	How do the experiences and spaces of human houselessness relate to the government and corporate management of plants and animals?
Labor spaces ↔ Home spaces	Housedness and houselessness in relation to labor and production	How do houseless people in San Francisco fit into or escape labor structures?

UNIVERSITY PRESS

anthropologists are quite conscious of binaries and progressive hierarchies, they can be trapped in unexamined attachments to vertical-only conceptual and data-collection schemas. Such trappings can lead to an analytical method that reproduces the very thing that they want to avoid—a preordained, foreclosed model of a linear or binary-ordered world. A totalizing politics is at work in this placeholder default: the hegemonic imaginary of the body in the world or in the globe or on the planet conjures certain particular spatial and scalar progressions, as well as the ordered relations of (white) Western nationalism, that continue to be naturalized and used in discourse.

In this handbook, we provide many examples of multidimensional project design, from straightforward examples to those that are stunningly audacious. All examples refuse boundaries that prescribe what is inherently and intrinsically relatable across categorical differences.

But before we get to these examples, we offer a moment to imagine multidimensionality. To orient your curious imagination, we ground in the nonlinear, nonvertical, and nonorderly relations that may greet us in more-than-human worlds we walk through. We hope this brief meditation draws attention to a broad noncentered expanse of temporal, material, and spatial multidimensionality. Going into this imaginative zone will evoke an elementally and organically entangled, rather than a quantitative, minimum-maximum awareness.

To begin, imagine something scaly as a living being in a set of multidimensional relations, rather than thinking of it in a quantitatively scalar way. Think of the vibrantly twisting, pushing, climbing, digging, coiling, overlapping, variegated scales of a living snake in motion.²¹ Its scales have different sizes and are arranged in chains that enhance perceptions of its snaky length, position, and movement. Most forms in social worlds are made up of elements like the snake's exterior scales: interconnected parts that call attention to something's relative shape and position vis-à-vis other parts of the form or other things. The snake interacts with these things not in any other order than what it experiences at the center of its own experience.

Now, perceive the snake in its multidimensional setting. Its life intersects with stands of trees, flows of air, roads with traffic, earth moved by weather or machines, settlement, genocide, revolution, property, extraction, community. Depending on what you are curious to understand about this snake, a snake-centered project can be designed to include, and to relate, such different things and processes with their unique dimensions. Such a design can be done without resorting only to a total scalar ordering that



situates snakes in preexisting orders like body/nature, animal/human, local forest/whole nation. Nor does it require, for example, an ordering that would "scale" snakes as inherently *local* and air as inherently *global* (or, conversely, snakes ordered as globally responding to unspecifically local airs). Snakes and human communities and air relate in dimensional ways that are connected but different, and they require attention to those differences in order to tell an ethnographic story about their relationship. Snake-life is snake-in-relation, sometimes with things-in-relation that we can perceive easily and sometimes with things that we sense and that come to us when we drop preconceived notions and take it all in.

The disciplinary challenge for multidimensional ethnographic project design comes with the task of identifying a manageable set of elements-in-dimension to relate, and finding a conceptual "object"—like snake-life in motion—with which to hold everything together.

Identifying a Multidimensional Object

We have found that the most promising research projects are multidimensional in ethnographic as well as theoretical and disciplinary terms. As we have indicated so far, this means that they bring different kinds of concepts and scholarly literatures into relation with one another. In order to make this kind of project feel coherent and congruent to yourself and others, you must articulate how the project's empirical conceptual dimensions (e.g., the people, places, parts, and processes you will actively study) integrate with its broader conceptual and contextual dimensions (e.g., its disciplinarily relevant theoretical scope and its capacity to illuminate broadly extensive conditions in the world).

We have found a way for research designers to get, keep, and communicate this integration of disparate parts: articulating a short phrase we call the multidimensional object (MO). The MO extends the "object of study" in social science research into broader multidimensional territory.²² An effective MO conveys both the cohesion and the tension among project concepts. In short, it conveys a project's tensegrity.²³

Tensegrity is an idea we find useful when it comes to doing multidimensional concept work. Tensegrity is a term from architecture and art, particularly the work of R. Buckminster Fuller in architecture and Kenneth Snelson in art.²⁴ Recently it has provided a way to describe the integrated (fascial and

other) structures of mammalian and unicellular organisms, and in these contexts it is designated as *biotensegrity*. In such forms—which include bacterial bodies, human bodies, and geodesic domes—nails, brackets, and skeletons aren't the things holding these forms together. Rather, the *forces* of interrelational tension and situated compression keep the parts of bacterial cells in touch with one another without skeletons; enable vertebrate and invertebrate bodies to stay integrated when their tendons, muscles, and bones push and pull against one another; and enable geodesic domes to stand open and unsupported by central beams.

Tensegrity results in nonhierarchical connectivity that distributes throughout elements evenly, creating a hanging-togetherness. Unlike in a vertical scaling process, which requires a hierarchical and linear structure like local/global or center/periphery to hang a project on, our process allows project concepts to stay in a harmonious- and tension-integrated dynamic. Tensegrity, therefore, is a sense-based term to remind ourselves that unusually strong ethnographic projects have parts that may not all seem to belong together in linear or positivistic terms.

In Module 6 you will creatively articulate a multidimensional object (MO) that evokes the dynamic relationship of your project's key concepts and keeps them together in a cogent, congruent assemblage. The job of the MO is to make perceptible the connections between project elements, from the literatures to the project description to the research questions. Unlike an unwieldy project description, the short and sweet MO is *wieldy*; it helps you handle project complexity and breakdown. It's flexible and can be revised as you iterate your project concepts and elements. But more than having design functionality, it's also a vibrant phrase that can inspire you and others about your project. (We hasten to reassure you that your project's tensegrity will withstand bouts of reorganization without completely going back to the drawing board!)

Here are the stories of how several Mos emerged in design courses we taught. In this handbook, we include student project examples, with permission, that we render to illustrate processes and exercises. We obtained permission from these researchers to refer to their projects, and they reviewed and approved the examples we rendered. Those projects continue to change as the researchers produce ongoing data and write their ethnographies. We are extremely grateful to them for partnering with us to feature their projects. Throughout the handbook, we expand on these and other examples to orient you to multidimensionality and the Mo.



Tariq Rahman, whom we described in the prelude, wanted to design an ethnography of contemporary Pakistani social life. His project took into account an experience-based intuition about two distinct but intersecting processes: real estate trading and global processes like transnational financial networks and imperialist militarism. During his fieldwork, he intuited that there was a vital connection to understand between new ways and reasons for buying and selling plots of land in Pakistan (dimensions: economy and territory), financialization technologies (dimensions: technology and actuarial practices), and US imperialist policies implicating the nation (dimensions: law, politics, and militarization). Typically, he would have to make a choice to center one or two dimensions and make the others secondary. To design a project that holds such seemingly disparate connections in equal tension with one another is challenging or might be deemed a "stretch." Yet a multidimensional project design can hold together such processes.

Rahman's concept work allowed him to design a plan to investigate the interrelation of financialization and the war on terror, even if that relationship was happening at a geopolitical distance from the urban plot market in Lahore. To do so, he needed to add more theoretical dimensionality to what a "real estate plot" is in the worlds he works in. He also had to understand the relational properties of plots that connect plots to geopolitical processes. In doing exercises about this, he achieved a conceptual breakthrough. He found that several emerging events, dynamics, and technologies drive plots to be traded less like concrete forms of *land* and more like fluid forms of *market stock*. This allowed him to identify the project's multiple dimensions: land speculation as halal in Islamic practice in Pakistan (versus other forms of investment that are forbidden), the war on terror driving specific speculative practices, digital media used by diasporic Pakistani investors to drive market values, and government officials who digitize landownership while holding on to the long-term memory of land among generations.

At this point, Rahman had the beginnings of a succinct research description (RD), which we define as a short narration of what the project is about and its potential significance. In our process, the RD (Module 5) is not the end of the congruence-making process: it's the beginning. The next step is to identify an MO. As Rahman completed several iterations of an MO, he refined his original dimensional connection between land and stock.

Using "liquid land" as his MO, Rahman's multidimensional design allowed him to do a project based on a radically different investigation of financial speculation, whose forms and analysis are often limited to the generalities of

North American, European, and East Asian markets. He was able to retheorize "land" and "liquidity" as financialized *processes* emerging in everyday structural and cultural settings as well as in relation to hegemonic and imperialistic processes of labeling places as sources or targets of (counter)terrorism.

Multidimensional objects can take various forms and can help multidimensional projects, whether they take place in single or multiple fieldsites. Remember Forest Haven's project that brought the environmental and sensory dimensions of food politics together? Her MO was "food sensing." We come back to her project several times in the modules ahead to illustrate how this MO helped her design a unique project on Native food sovereignty. Let's look at two additional MO examples.

Jason Palmer, another researcher, designed a study of Mormon conversion that prompts pilgrimage or migration from a sacred site in Peru (as noted in the Book of Mormon) to Mormonism's Zion, Salt Lake City, Utah. More broadly, he focused on how Peruvian Mormons navigate trans-American ties through the production of sacred places, where evangelization based on heavenly notions of borderless relationality encounters the obstacle of the sovereign US border. By doing concept-work exercises that enabled him to creatively conjoin the legal, economic, and spiritual stakes of the project on equal footing rather than in a hierarchical way (e.g., assuming the economic is more salient than spiritual), Palmer devised this Mo: "im/mobile memberships." Here the contingent mobilities of pilgrimage and migration relate across processes within family, congregation, state, and earth/heaven. He could ask questions and look at experiences and objects that didn't force a choice between attending to either national or religious forms of belonging.

Holding all these differently scalar elements of the project together via "im/mobile memberships" allowed Palmer to relate two seemingly disparate dimensions of life: the Mormon religious definition of and care for its members' souls, and processes of national membership and border maintenance. By bringing these dimensions together, he could do two things. He could design a project that attended to the laboring, material, and traveling person moving up or down an economic vertical scale. But he could also go further. Palmer's Mo, with its attention to the embodied and soul "member," allowed connections between multiple and nonintuitive project dimensions: religious experience, economy, migration, hemispheric geopolitics. That, in turn, opened up imaginative thinking about the soul as connected to encounters with the state. Palmer's multidimensional project will contribute to retheorizations of religious experience that are informed and directly con-

nected to these other domains, thus retheorizing the dimensionality of those domains as well.

Another researcher, Kimberley D. McKinson, set out to study how violent crime is represented and instantiated in Kingston, Jamaica. Instead of rendering a vertically aligned urban anthropological project that centered *criminal* or *victim* along the pathway of crime \rightarrow court \rightarrow state \rightarrow nation → geopolitics, McKinson did something very different. She followed her curious hunch that contemporary forms of security involved different spatial and temporal dimensions of experience: the historical legacies of control in slavery and plantation life, the relations of people in systems, and the uses and reuses of everyday building materials. This allowed her to include in her project her intuitive interest in the metallurgical and architectural designs (like gates and fences) of securitization in Kingston residences. Her MO, then, was "security ecologies," a framing that allowed her to draw together the multiple dimensions of her study: the historical disciplinary use of metal during colonial slavery; the aesthetic and recycling use of colonial and contemporary materials in residential fortification: the varied use of surveillance and security technologies to avert crime; community practices around ideas of safety, such as neighborhood watches; and the use of slavery's security technologies such as patrols, passes, and curfews.

With the Mo "security ecologies" holding these ethnographic and historical project elements together, McKinson was able to pose unusual questions about historically and relationally racialized subjects (that discipline and are disciplined by security technologies and practices)—ones who performatively reengage the territorial and material conditions of colonial slavery in the context of discourses about "security." If the Mo had been "landscapes of criminality," it would have directed her to conduct an ethnography of crime, a standard colonial and racialized concept, in relation to land and property. But because she attached the word *ecology* to *security* she created an effective multidimensionality in her project that enabled her to craft a genealogy of the Black body's relationship to violence and material transformations over time in Jamaica, from slavery to the contemporary postcolonial moment.

It is important to note that even though these three examples happen prior to fieldwork, they emerge from deep engagement with the field and they often change over time.

We have found that both students and colleagues consistently experience the "truth" of a congruent MO in their own bodies. There is an experience of elation, joy, and sudden lightness that resonates powerfully—much

like an apprentice begins to get a feel for effortlessly and intuitively enacting her craft. This deep knowing emerges after a lot of trial and error of connecting project elements together and testing for congruence across dimensions and then finding that it just doesn't seem right yet. Moreover, researchers doing concept work together find a literal resonance among all bodies in the group as they arrive at project congruence. Because our orthodox vertical foundations for building projects are not there, the body stands in as the tuning fork that intuits and resonates with what feels right.

Another aspect of research design and felt tensegrity that a multidimensional design process clearly addresses is that of how and why to articulate questions.

Relating Multidimensional Zones of Inquiry

Our handbook brings you to the research question—asking stage midway through the design process, rather than forcing questions to emerge before you have the strongly felt sense of a project's elements, processes, contexts, and concepts that the MO represents. Often research designers don't acknowledge that there are different kinds of "research questions," that they have different forms and functions, and that those differences need to be clearly distinguished. In Modules 7, 8, and 9, we help articulate three different kinds of research questions necessary to create a well-defined and congruent framework of inquiry. We make the question-type distinctions clear and highlight the project design pitfalls in not understanding them. These question-type distinctions are embedded in different zones of inquiry—what we refer to as the scoping, connecting, and interacting zones.

In the scoping zone, designers will develop an overarching scoping question for their projects; in the connecting zone, they will formulate datagathering questions that pertain to project-clustered concepts; and in the interacting zone, pertinent field-based questions (interviews, archival, etc.) will be generated. Multidimensional research emerges when each inquiry zone is consistently and ethically put in relation with the other. The scoping zone defines the overarching theoretical and social field, as well as the project's big question and overall significance. The connecting zone opens all the interrelated possibilities (obvious and intuitive) of data collection in relation to all the project elements. The interacting zone focuses on the intellectual and social aspects of fieldwork, allowing designers to plan modes of pur-



poseful and ethical inquiry through observations, interviews, and participation. We come to methods last in this handbook for a reason: methods are meant to be in service to the project conceptualization process and not as the determiners of it.

As the conceptual and ethnographic element that links these zones, the MO helps you go back and forth among these and other module elements as you enhance your project's aims and congruence.

Project Listening: Attending to What's There and What's Possible

By now you may be imagining the expansive possibilities of multidimensional research design. In general, projects must emerge and expand in order to get their scope. But the expansion process can become unwieldy in every phase: design, fieldwork, archival research, postfield analysis, writeup. To manage productive expansion and contraction, you need to continually iterate and refine your research description, MO, research questions, and data-collection foci. This helps you to maintain an ongoing feel for the project and helps you navigate your intuitive and emotional relationship with the necessary upheavals and transformative moments of project design. We provide ways throughout this process to help you stay aware of the project's internal congruence and its external relationships with other projects and processes. Project listening is the process of attending to these dynamics in your own project and those of others.

We like "listening" because it expressly pushes against—but also adds to—the "speaking" or "writing" processes of expression. Project listening is not about hearing in a biological sense; it is about adopting a stance of curiously perceptive stillness and intentional spaciousness. Stillness allows unwavering attention without distraction, and it can help free the mind from immediately analyzing its encounter with some aspect of the project. When you are feeling stuck or unsure about your project, stillness enables you to have a direct, embodied experience with the elements, questions, ideas, and connections that animate your work. It also stops you from defaulting to abstract or analytical "solutions" that are not grounded in the project elements themselves. Spaciousness offers literal and metaphorical room to widen our views; it helps us learn when to pause, stop, push forward, and hold on to our concept work, leading to openness and receptivity. Taken together, stillness

and spaciousness are key to cultivating wisdom (not just knowledge) about our research.

In this handbook, we provide many project listening exercises that help you to slow down, reflect, and assess in order to reconnect with the project's interconnected dynamics. For example, after you identify your literatures and project concepts in the first three modules, Module 4 allows you to revisit that process in relation to key previous developments, namely your literature selection. Iterating these key design features creates a productive tension that allows the project to expand when it can and contract when it must (thus, again, this is not about bringing "everything" in). This maintains the project's congruence and its possibility for significance.

How does project listening help you feel and support project tensegrity? Project listening makes it possible to "stay present with the project" throughout its life stages: open-ended imagining, curiosity-based designing, conducting research, analyzing, and writing up. It helps researchers stay in touch with the relationship between personal and broader stakes and intentions. Staying present with the project is therefore also a way to stay present in community. With others, we develop skills to be present with the project as it emerges: paying attention, practicing conceptual unfolding, untangling layers, and allowing insights to shape new directions.²⁵

Project listening attends to the lifeworld of ethnographic research, making space to open centuries of subjugated knowledge while valuing our collaborators in knowledge and theory-making. If the creative works that we make together in this mode can be thought of as aspects of living consciousness, then we are staking out a path to wake up to necessary ways of perceiving and understanding the multitudes of worlds.

Overview of the Multidimensional Design Elements and Processes

This handbook is designed to help you begin a project or rework one that you've been dealing with for years. Each of the ten modules contains a short explanation of the project element you will design and its purpose; exercises that help you attain those outcomes (with examples provided); and prompts for how to process your work in groups. We guarantee exciting and unique breakthroughs. At the end of each module, you will summarize your project elements in a concise project grid. You will have a fully fleshed out, but



cogent, view of your project that will be immensely helpful in orienting you toward writing a project proposal, thesis proposal, grant proposal, dissertation, or book. Table I.3 provides an overview of each module's project elements and processes.

TABLE 1.3 Handbook Overview

Symbol	Section	Project Element	Process and Purpose
	Interlude 1	Community Work Plan	Consider your and your groups' needs; learn to set up a community feedback space.
>\c	Module 1 Imagining Research	Research Imaginary	Narrate your project's research processes and possibilities; and create space for known, intuitive, and unknown project concepts.
8	Module 2 Focus on Literatures	Literature Relationships	Link project concepts found in the research imaginary to three project-defining literatures.
ိုင်ငံ	Module 3 Map Concepts	Concept Map	Create a one-page map of your project's key concepts.
%	Module 4 Create Multidimensional Concept Combos	Concept Combos	Locate a key concept combo that represents your project's multidimensional contribution to literatures.
J	Module 5 Describe Your Research	Research Description	Develop a succinct research description that includes broad key concepts; clarify your project's core multidimensional form and possibilities.

*	Module 6 Perceive Your Multidimen- sional Object	Multidimen- sional Object	Craft a phrase that evokes the project's conceptual multidimensionality and structural tensegrity.
	Interlude 2	Inquiry Zones	Learn about project inquiry zones and how to integrate them.
\cap	Module 7 The Scoping Zone	Scoping Question	Scope out the project's overarching research question and significance.
w	Module 8 The Connect- ing Zone	Data- Gathering Questions	Form data sets and data-gathering questions that will provide the data needed to answer and theorize the scoping question.
)~(Module 9 The Interact- ing Zone	Interacting Questions and Methods Plan	Generate field-based questions that connect directly to methods and data-gathering questions; transition to the communicating and planning phases of project work.
柒	Module 10 Mobilize Your Research Project Grid	Gridwork	Use your project grid to prepare ethics boards applications, write grant proposals, and do multidimensioning during field research.

We suggest that you do the modules in order. The exercises in each module build on the previous in an iterative manner and also involve doing reflections on previous work, which we show you how to do in Module 1. These intentional processes help you to develop strong intuitive mastery of project design—the ultimate goal of this book—and not just a great research project.

As you move through the modules, you'll find that we use the term *multi-dimensional* as a noun, an adjective, and even a verb. Sometimes we want to remind you that you are not just making a multidimensional project, but you



are also actively multidimensioning literatures, project elements, and other project features. Your multidimensional design is an action and way of positioning yourself in a creative space as much as it is a concept-work product!

The connective tissue of this design process—concept work, imaginative and intuitive curiosity, multidimensioning, project listening, and working in community—conveys the enlivened spirit that animates *The Ethnographer's Way*. Know that the liberatory possibilities for research, and life that you wish to live, can be imaginable and shareable.



UNIVERSITY PRESS

Prelude

10

- 1 Irani and Silberman, "Stories We Tell about Labor"; Ruha, Race after Technology.
- 2 Vinsel, "Design Thinking Is a Boondoggle."
- 3 Escobar, Designs for the Pluriverse; Suchman, "Design."; Chin, "On Multimodal Anthropologies from the Space of Design."
- 4 Penrod and Plastino, *The Dancer Prepares*; Hersey, *Rest as Resistance*; Williams, Owens, and Syedullah, *Radical Dharma*.
- 5 Cameron, The Artist's Way; Chavez, The Anti-racist Writing Workshop.
- Clifford and Marcus, Writing Culture; Marcus and Fischer, Anthropology as Cultural Critique. Asad, Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter; Caulfield, "Culture and Imperialism"; Gough, Anthropology and Imperialism; Lewis, "Anthropology and Colonialism"; Said, Orientalism; Wagner, The Invention of Culture.
- Abu Lughod, "Writing against Culture"; Harrison, Decolonizing Anthropology; Mahmood, The Politics of Piety.
- Boyer, Faubion, and Marcus, Theory Can Be More Than It Used to Be; Faubion and Marcus, Fieldwork Is Not What It Used to Be; Rabinow, Marcus, Faubion, and Rees, Designs for an Anthropology of the Contemporary.
- Choy, Ecologies of Comparison; Behar and Gordon, Women Writing Culture; Carr and Lempert, Scale; Clarke, Affective Justice; Gupta and Ferguson, "Beyond Culture"; Helmreich, Alien Ocean; Masco, The Nuclear Borderlands; Marcus, Ethnography through Thick and Thin; Ong and Collier, Global Assemblages; Strathern, In Relation; Tsing, The Mushroom at the End of the World.
 - Cantarella, Hegel, and Marcus, Ethnography by Design; Dumit, Playing with Methods; Elliot and Culhane, A Different Kind of Ethnography; Hardin and Clarke, Transforming Ethnographic Knowledge; Pandian, A Possible Anthropology; Sunder Rajan, Multi-situated.

UNIVERSITY

- See for example, Esposito and Evans-Winters, Introduction to Intersectional Qualitative Research; Bejarano, Juárez, Garcia, and Goldstein, Decolonizing Ethnography; Lincoln, Yvonna S., and Elsa M. Gonzalez y Gonzalez, "The Search for Emerging Decolonizing Methodologies in Qualitative Research"; and Turk, "Suspending Damage."
- See, among others, brown, *Emergent Strategy*; brown and Imarisha, *Octavia's Brood*; Cox, *Shapeshifters*; Kelly, *Freedom Dreams*; Shange, *Progressive Dystopia*; Sojoyner, "Another Life Is Possible"; and Thomas, *Political Life*.
- For good guides on pedagogical openness and encouragement, see hooks, Teaching to Transgress; and Freire, Pedagogy of the Oppressed.
- 14 Weston, Families We Choose.

Introduction: Multidimensional Concept Work

- By *congruent* we mean diverse project concepts that together express a sense of agreement or harmony; this is opposed to *coherence*, which conveys a more rigid quality of the Western logics of consistency.
- For different perspectives of anthropology and the otherwise, including abolition otherwise, see, among others, Berry, Argüelles, Cordis, Ihmoud, and Estrada, "Toward a Fugitive Anthropology"; McTighe and Raschig, "An Otherwise Anthropology"; Meek and Morales Fontanilla, "Otherwise"; Povinelli, "Routes/Worlds"; and Restrapo and Escobar, "Other Anthropologies and Anthropology Otherwise."
- Sanabria, "Imagining Otherwise Encounters after Epistemicide," 5; emphasis in original.
- 4 Seminal works that support this attitude include writings by, among others, Jean-Paul Sartre, Jacques Lacan, and Charles Taylor.
- Akómoláfé, The Allegory of the Pit; Chandler, Toward an African Future; Ferreira da Silva, A Global Idea of Race; Wynter, "Unsettling the Coloniality of Being/Power/Truth/Freedom."
- We are cautioned here by Báyò Akómoláfé's analysis that even when one tries to uninhabit these liberal frameworks, researchers can reproduce ontoepistemologies of Man (Wynter, "Unsettling the Coloniality of Being/Power/Truth/Freedom")—the very thing often being, ironically, refuted (Akómoláfé, The Allegory of the Pit).
 - Glissant, *Poetics of Relation*. We are referring here to European imperial languages like English, French, or German.
- 8 Hurston, Dust Tracks on a Road; Hurston, Of Mules and Men.



- 9 Mills, The Sociological Imagination.
- See, among others, *The Asthma Files*; Boellstorff, Nardi, Pearce, and Taylor, Ethnography and Virtual Worlds; Cantarella, Hegel, and Marcus, Ethnography by Design; Chin, "On Multimodal Anthropologies from the Space of Design"; Dumit, "Writing the Implosion"; Elliott and Culhane, A Different Kind of Ethnography; and Holmes and Marcus, "Para-ethnography and the Rise of the Symbolic Analyst."
- Ballestero and Winthereik, Experimenting with Ethnography; Centre for Imaginative Ethnography, https://imaginative-ethnography.com; Murphy and Marcus, "Epilogue"; Nye and Hamdy, "Drawing the Revolution."
- For works regarding marronage and fugitivity, see Gordon, *The Hawthorne Archive*; Harney and Moten, *The Undercommons*; Harrison, *Decolonizing Anthropology*; and Robinson, *Black Movements in America*.

For feminist approaches to a range of anthropological inquiry topics, see Craven and Davis, Feminist Activist Ethnography; Davis and Craven, Feminist Ethnography; Fleuhr-Lobban, "Collaborative Anthropology"; Lewin and Silverstein, Mapping Feminist Anthropology in the Twenty-First Century; and McClaurin, Black Feminist Anthropology.

For studies of Indigenous political cultures, see Coulthard, "For Our Nations to Live, Capitalism Must Die"; Wildcat, McDonald, Irlbacher-Fox, and Coulthard, "Learning from the Land"; A. Simpson, Mohawk Interruptus; L. Simpson, As We Have Always Done; and Tuck and Yang, "Decolonization Is Not a Metaphor."

For multispecies work, see Akómoláfé, I, Coronavirus; Gagliano, Thus Spoke the Plant; Gumbs, Undrowned; Haraway, When Species Meet; Kimmerer, Braiding Sweetgrass; Kohn, How Forests Think; and Parreñas, Decolonizing Extinction.

- Dara Culhane, in the introduction to A Different Kind of Ethnography, asserts that, "when approached as a process or practice, as something relational and productive, imagination leads to new spaces of inquiry, spaces that are dependent upon the collaborative nature of anthropological knowledge. Such an approach situates imagination as a pedagogy, and one with the potential to open up and to make visible the unknown," 16.
- 14 Morris, "Where It Hurts," 540.
- 15 Fanon, Black Skin, White Masks, 229.
- 16 Batchelor, Faith and the Imagination in Dharma Practice.
- brown and Imarisha, Octavia's Brood, 4.
- For a review of anthropology and the imagination, see Sneath, Holbraad, and Pedersen, "Technologies of the Imagination."

- Hobart, "At Home on the Mauna"; Strathern, The Relation; Todd, "Fish Pluralities," 217; and Tsing, The Mushroom at the End of the World. See also Tsing, "On Nonscalability," and Trouillot, Silencing the Past.
- 20 See Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, and Harrison, "Theorizing in Ex-centric Sites."
- 21 We thank Emilia Sanabria for this helpful metaphor!
- We especially follow Michel-Rolph Trouillot's (2001) critique of "object of study" and what we view as his multidimensional reconceptionalization of this term.
- Thanks to Joe Dumit for helping us think with tensegrity.
- Pugh, An Introduction to Tensegrity; Snelson, "The Art of Tensegrity."
- For inspiration on staying present in community for liberatory times, see Prentis Hemphill's podcast, *Finding Our Way*, and the website of the Embodiment Institute, theembodimentinstitute.org.

Interlude 1: Creating a Collective Concept Workspace

- adrienne marie brown, interview with Prentis Hemphill. The Emergent Strategy podcast, May 27, 2021, https://open.spotify.com/episode/3BkJglLio5svyluQbmxqck?si=m9wuoqXxT3GL_PsPo4Zjug&nd=1.
- adrienne marie brown, interview with Prentis Hemphill. The Emergent Strategy podcast, May 27, 2021, https://open.spotify.com/episode/3BkJglLio5svyluQbmxqck?si=m9wuoqXxT3GL_PsPo4Zjug&nd=1
- For further ideas on agreements, see the East Bay Meditation Center Agreements, https://eastbaymeditation.org/2022/03/agreements-for-multicultural-interactions/. Accessed August 10, 2023. Note that practicing these agreements helps to hone participant observation and interview skills as well.
- Writers at Work, https://writersatwork.com.
- 5 Chavez, The Anti-racist Writing Workshop; Lerman, The Critical Response Process.

Module 1: Imagine the Research

Behar, The Vulnerable Observer; Hurston, Dust Tracks on a Road; Powder-maker, Stranger and Friend; Strathern, The Gender of the Gift.

