National Centre for Research Methods Working Paper

08/13

Social studies of social science: A working bibliography

Michael Mair, University of Liverpool

Christian Greiffenhagen, Loughborough University

W.W. Sharrock, University of Manchester

NiCRM
National Centre for
Research Methods

E·S·R·C
ECONOMIC
& SOCIAL
RESEARCH
COUNCIL

Social Studies of Social Science: A Working Bibliography

Dr. Michael Mair
Sociology, Social Policy and Criminology
University of Liverpool
michael.mair@liverpool.ac.uk[1]

Dr. Christian Greiffenhagen
Sociology
Loughborough University

Prof. W.W. Sharrock
Sociology
University of Manchester

Abstract

The social sciences are currently going through a reflexive phase, one marked by the appearance of a wave of studies which approach their disciplines' own methods and research practices as their empirical subject matter. Driven partly by a growing interest in knowledge production and partly by a desire to make the social sciences 'fit-for-purpose' in the digital era, these studies seek to reinvigorate debates around methods by treating them as embedded social and cultural phenomena with their own distinctive biographical trajectories – or "social lives". Empirical studies of social scientific work and the role of methods within it, however, remain relatively scarce. There are several reasons for this but, for one thing, it can be difficult to find examples of how such studies might be undertaken. This contribution draws together a literature scattered across various social science disciplines and their sub-fields in which social science methods have been studied empirically. We hope this working bibliography will provide a useful resource for those who wish to undertake such studies in the future. We also hope to show that the more recent literature can be connected to, and stands to be informed by, a much broader literature. We do not pretend that our bibliography is complete and comprehensive but we do think it represents a starting point for those who wish to pursue these issues for themselves.

Keywords: social studies of social science; social life of methods; ethnomethodology; conversation analysis; anthropology; mixed methods; sociology of knowledge; data; analysis; methodology; qualitative methods; quantitative methods

Introduction

Although it was foreshadowed in many respects, and we could point to previous moves in this direction (e.g. LaPiere 1934, Benney & Hughes 1956[1], Sorokin 1956, Toulmin 1958, Winch 1958, Mills 1959, Hammond 1964), there have been a series of attempts to reappraise the 'problem' of method and research practice in the social sciences in recent decades, beginning in the late 1970s and gradually gaining momentum from there. Social science methods (fieldwork, interviewing, surveying, analysis, writing, etc.) are less and less being seen (or, at least, are less likely to be

---

[1] Corresponding author

claimed to be seen) as discrete technical devices or armaments that enable those who deploy them to step outside the societies and cultures they study so as to view them objectively from afar. Instead, they are increasingly being treated as part-and-parcel of those societies and cultures, and constitutive elements of the knowledge-making practices that operate at their very centre. Taking a lead from the sociology of scientific knowledge and science and technology studies (Bloor 1976, Lynch 1993, Maynard & Schaeffer 2000), the general thread running through this body of work, put simply, is that method is what connects the social scientist into the lives of their societies and cultures[2], it is not what enables the social scientist to detach themselves from them and thereby escape their 'messy', 'earthly' entanglements (Law 2004, Latour 2007). Indeed, methods are increasingly being seen as productive or 'performative', i.e. as 'enacting' the very societies, cultures and systems of exchange they offer accounts of (see e.g. Briggs 2007, Mackenzie, Muniesa & Siu 2007, Majima and Moore 2009, Benzecry & Krause 2010, Savage 2013). Thus, and to take just a few examples, opinion polls are treated as producing that which they measure, i.e. public opinion, surveys, surveyable populations, interviews, interviewable subjects and economic analyses, markets: 'public opinion', 'population', 'the subject' and 'the market' are claimed not to pre-exist their deployment but are themselves 'brought into being' in and through their use (as in, e.g., Mackenzie, Muniesa & Siu 2007, Ruppert 2007, Law 2009).

Not only have the 'technical' practices of social scientists been reconfigured, in a reflexive move, as objects of inquiry, those working within this particular area of research – an area we might loosely term 'social studies of social scientific research practices' given their wide disciplinary cast – have also begun to actively advocate experimentation and a move away from established methodological prescriptions and ideas as a consequence of undertaking their inquiries (Fisher & Marcus 1986, Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992, Evans & Foster 2011, Mason 2011, Back & Puwar 2012, Gane 2012, Lury & Wakeford 2012). What we have seen, as a result, is an interest in the 'social life of method' (Law, Savage & Ruppert 2011, Savage 2013) being increasingly coupled to a concern for the 'politics of method'[3] (Clifford & Marcus 1985, Savage 2010, Adkins & Lury 2012) as well as an interest in how the social sciences have, at various points in time, set about finding ways of making themselves 'relevant' (Burawoy 2005, Savage & Burrows 2007, Rose, Osborne & Savage 2008, Savage 2013, Evans & Foster 2011, Gane 2012). Partly a response to a distinct *politicisation* of method in various areas of social life[4], these reflections on method as political are also predicated on the idea that the social sciences are increasingly methodologically flatfooted (Beck 2005, Burawoy 2005, Adkins & Lury 2012, Gane 2012, Lury & Wakeford 2012), no longer able to keep pace with the speed with which contemporary social and cultural life is changing. In some cases, these changes, particularly those connected to 'digitisation' and 'big data', are seen as changes to the nature of 'the empirical' itself (see e.g. Adkins & Lury 2009). The social sciences, partly because they refuse to acknowledge their embedded and participant status by clinging to positivistic conceptions of method as detached, are said to be making themselves peripheral to – or "voluntarily estranging" themselves from, in Latour's formulation (2010: 148) – that which provides *their* animus: social and cultural life.

These literatures may move in a variety of directions and from a variety of different starting points but one strand that links them is an interest in how social science has been practiced, is being practiced and will be practiced, and all that may follow from

that. As we found out when approached about the possibility of undertaking a comparative fieldwork study of reasoning work in quantitative and qualitative research in 2009[5] (see Greiffenhagen, Mair & Sharrock 2011), however, it is difficult to locate examples of how such studies themselves might be practiced. 'Model' studies are difficult to find, particularly in an area of research where the contributors are scattered across many different fields and have addressed quite different concerns and audiences (Guggenheim & Krause 2012)[6]. As a consequence, beyond the work we were most familiar with, work in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis, we found ourselves reading across different fields of inquiry – primarily, but not solely, sociology, anthropology, history, archaeology, philosophy and the sociology of scientific knowledge/science and technology studies – in order to get a sense of how such studies had been approached by others. Unlike social studies of science, where debates spanned disciplinary divides from the start, social studies of social science have been only been fitfully ecumenical. While there are lines of 'cultural' exchange across social scientific diasporas (Barth 1967), by and large researchers have not taken up or responded to the insights that have emerged from studies located in fields seen as distant, and therefore of only tangential relevance, to their own.

In the spirit of cross-disciplinary dialogue and debate, we thought it would be useful to provide the list of references we have compiled in the course of our research as a resource for further discussion and work in this area. We make no claim to completeness or comprehensiveness – we are sure that those who consult it will spot many omissions, blind spots and oversights. It is, however, a *more* complete list of references than we have found anywhere else. We do not wish to claim sole credit for this as we have built on the work of Elisabeth Simbuerger (2009), the researchers in the Methods Lab at Goldsmiths College, London, Paul ten Have's EMCA (ethnomethodology and conversation analysis) website and contributors to the Lang-Use mailing list, all extremely helpful when it came to identifying the studies we present. Beyond that, we have done a lot of digging, using reference lists within books, articles and reports to locate additional materials. New bibliographic tools have been useful but most important were old-fashioned spade work and actually reading what we found because searches frequently turned up materials that appeared relevant at first glance but on closer inspection were not.

Social Studies of Social Science: An Overview

What, in overview, can we take from the exercise as a whole? We can see two things at work from quite an early stage: firstly, an interest in putting the social sciences in – and attempting to establish empirical accounts of how they are shaped by and depend for their intelligibility upon but also how they shape and lend intelligibility to – social, cultural and historical contexts, an interest which traces back to, among others, Weber (1978 [1922]), Mannheim (1936) and Schutz (e.g. 1963); and we can also see, secondly, attempts to treat what social scientists do as itself a form of social and cultural practice capable of, and likely to be illuminated by, being studied like any other. Ethnomethodological and conversation analytic studies from the 1960s and 1970s, while never a unified front and with important differences in the programmes of Garfinkel, Sacks and Cicourel very much in view, were amongst the first to seek to conduct research of this kind empirically, something ethnomethodologists and conversation analysts have continued to do in the period since[7]. Then, from the 1970s on, and perhaps most prominently in anthropology where questions relating to what

anthropologists ought to study, the ways in which they ought to study it and how they ought to present the results of that work acquired a particular visibility and force (Clifford & Marcus 1986), self-scrutiny increased across social science disciplines. For instance, Bourdieu's accounts of his struggles with structuralism in *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (1977, a subject he returned to in *The Logic of Practice* (1990)) and Rabinow's *Fieldwork in Morocco* (1977) offered new ways of thinking about the work of the researcher, here the ethnographer, and their role in the production of knowledge[8]. What might be thought of as 'ethnomethodological' themes also began to surface in the anthropological literature at this point, as in Marcus' early paper 'The Ethnographic Subject as Ethnographer' (1980, compare Moerman 1969, Sharrock 1974, Sharrock & Anderson 1982). While these initial developments in anthropology – as in an earlier and less well known sociological literature (see, e.g., the list above) – were predominantly 'auto-critical', attention shifted in the 1980s to the question of ethnographic authority and, more specifically, ethnographic authori*ties*, most famously Malinowski. While taking up the problem of writing as its leitmotif, as in the enduringly influential *Writing Culture* (Clifford & Marcus 1986, but see also, e.g., Marcus & Cushman 1982, Herzfeld 1983), this was never solely about the representation of research practices *simpliciter* but also about recasting ethnography itself as a co-production emerging from interactions between anthropologists and those they studied that took place within particular social, cultural and political contexts. Although not an entirely new theme, (see, e.g., Miner 1956), the problem identified was that the nature of ethnographic research had been obscured by the authoritative narratives produced by anthropologists. As a consequence, ways had to be found of experimenting with method – methods of fieldwork, methods of analysis, but also methods of writing (e.g. Fisher & Marcus 1986) – in order to overcome the ideological, political and indeed empirical failings of the past[9]. These are themes which have continued to exercise anthropologists, leading to, among other things, reconceptualisations of the 'field' and consequently ethnographic practice (Gupta & Ferguson 1997) along the way. The concern with developing an ethnographic orientation to fieldwork has also recently been the subject of a series of lively debates in archaeology, a field closely allied to that of anthropology, particularly in the US (see, e.g., Edgeworth 2006 and below). We would also note that a series of high profile disputes which either began or were revisited from the 1980s onwards – e.g. Redfield versus Lewis, Mead versus Freeman, Obeyesekere versus Sahlins – and which were organised around 'hostile readings' of evidence, inference and knowledge claims in specific ethnographies, have provided a different, rather more antagonistic, dimension to the reflexive turn within recent anthropological work (see, e.g., Heider 1988, Freeman 1989, Heider 1989, Rhoades 1989, Orans 1996, Borofsky 1997, Freeman, Orans & Côté 2000).

This work gelled with developments in the philosophy and sociology of the natural and social sciences. Building on the ideas of Ludwig Wittgenstein (1953), Peter Winch (1958), Thomas Kuhn (1962), Michel Foucault (e.g. 2002a[1966], 2002b [1969]), Jacques Derrida (1966), David Bloor (1976), Nelson Goodman (1978), Ian Hacking (e.g. 1968, 1975, 1983) and others, sociological researchers began to undertake empirical studies of the natural sciences in the late 1970s, e.g. Latour and Woolgar (1986[1979]). Although not specifically concerned with the social sciences, from an early stage the problem of 'symmetry' in such accounts quickly came to the fore. If 'facts' are products, what is the status of social scientific accounts of their making? Are they not constructions too and, if so, how can the social sciences be

exempted from similar forms of study?[10] It is perhaps this question that the recent wave of studies on the social life of methods takes up most directly. However, 'laboratory studies' were not the only way in which the work of the social sciences was beginning to be reappraised. Although normally cited for its theoretical and substantive interest, Foucault's work (e.g. 1975, 2002a, 2002b) helped set the stage for a new body of studies of enumerative, measurement and classificatory practices, particularly within statistics. Foucault's work, along with that of Wittgenstein, has been cited as a major influence by Ian Hacking who took up the issues Foucault had started to excavate and delved deeper into the historical emergence of the sciences of probability (see e.g. 1990, 2002). Hacking's histories, in turn, link with other historical and sociological work by Donald Mackenzie (1981), Theodore Porter (1986, 1996), Alain Desrosières (e.g. 1998), Geoff Bowker and Susan Leigh Star (1999), and others (e.g. Stigler 2002, Espeland & Stevens 2008). Taken collectively, this body of work has given rise to studies that seek to tell us something about the way in which statisticians and their collaborators make things knowable – features of statistical practice statisticians themselves have addressed but from different though equally interesting angles (see, e.g., Chatfield 2002).

These issues have been taken up in many innovative ways since the 1980s, but three alternative approaches that emerged from the early work discussed above still tend to provide the point of departure for contemporary research. The 'field' as it stands might thus be seen as organised around (1) historical-genealogical studies, (2) 'auto-critical' and 'reflexive' studies (something which incorporates 'confessional' accounts of the past and present), and, finally, (3) studies of 'live' social scientific practice, mostly fieldwork, interview or survey based. Although it would be misleading to characterise these studies as narrowly fixed on one aspect of research at the expense of others, across these areas we find different areas of research practice provide the analytical focus for investigation. Broadly speaking these are: (1) studies of the production of the raw materials of research, i.e. data, and the ways in which the social world is made into an object of social scientific inquiry; (2) studies of analytic work, the ways in which data can be and are variously turned into findings and so are made to speak of and to social worlds; and (3) studies of writing, de/inscription and representational work, including such things as critical-exegetical examinations of the 'discursive' constitution of social facts, de-constructionist dissolutions of authoritative 'writing'/depiction and studies of, e.g., writing itself as a practical activity. We have then and in sum, studies of data collection, analysis and 'writing up' in all their complexities[11] undertaken either through a process of reflection on first-hand experience, through studies of the artifacts social scientists work with and produce, or by following researchers themselves to find out what doing research involves[12]. These three areas of practice have been examined differently by those who adopt one of the different approaches to the social study of social science we identify above. There is no straightforward way of mapping between, say, fieldwork studies and the practice of data collection, or historical studies and the practice of writing, giving rise to some complex and interesting cases in what is an increasingly diverse field. We hope that diversity comes across strongly in the bibliography.

Methodology

It would be difficult to describe the long, slow accretion of materials over a four year period through the ongoing search for further examples and the pursuit of leads as an

explicit methodology. Nor we do we wish to lend it a retrospective coherence by offering a reconstructed logic of what was involved (Kaplan 1968). We were not operating with formal inclusion and exclusion criteria. Rather, we were sure that we would know what we were looking for when we saw it, with relevant materials appearing in and through the process of being sought out (Garfinkel 1967, Hill and Stones-Crittenden 1968). Nonetheless, we have tried to ensure that the lists we provide below include empirical work rather than theoretical discussions and programmatic statements: what we think of as the closest cousins we could find in the social sciences of the more established body of laboratory studies and histories of natural science practices. Discerning the difference between an empirical study and a theoretical or philosophical treatise is not always easy. The dividing line between the two can be difficult to judge, as in cases where programmatic statements are tied into empirical claims about the way research actually is or has been practiced (see, e.g. Back & Puwar 2012 or Savage 2013). By and large, however, we have tried to exclude work which is straightforwardly (meta)theoretical or falls within the purview of the (institutional and material) history of ideas and disciplines rather than the historical study of research practices – a different kind of exercise[13]. Although we have tried to tread that line carefully, many of our selections, and the rationales guiding inclusion and exclusion, will undoubtedly appear idiosyncratic to some.

We are also aware that there are many possible ways in which a bibliography of this kind might be set out. We could differentiate the work we list by disciplinary background, theoretical orientation, methodological approach, methods employed, focus of inquiry, kinds of data, scope of the study, field, audience, and so on, and also by whether we choose to focus on those undertaking the study or those being studied. We have opted to organise the results of our ongoing work in the following way. We begin, firstly, by listing what we are terming social studies of social scientific practice, past and present, including work on statistical practices; secondly, we list ethnomethodological and conversation analytic work on the same topic; and, thirdly, we list anthropological contributions, including recent ethnographic studies of archaeological fieldwork – three areas we see as sufficiently different to one another to warrant separate treatment. Following this, we change tack slightly and present a list of empirical contributions to debates around a particular approach to research: 'mixed methods'[14]. We are sure further, complementary lists could be provided for areas like history, geography, cartography, socio-legal studies, archival scholarship and many, many others – and we would welcome them. We are also aware that our list provides a limited guide to an increasingly innovative body of quantitative studies of social science research practices, including those that employ bibliometric techniques and novel forms of data-mining. However, these are not areas we have had the opportunity to explore ourselves and so we leave the task to others.

Finally, our lists are of course selective and betray our own leanings, preferences and practical purposes in seeking out these studies in the first place. However, we have not excluded work that takes a different approach to our own. With Paul Feyerabend (1973), we see disagreements, differences and disputes as healthy, helping to stimulate thinking and sharpen argument and analytical clarity. We have enjoyed engaging with this body of work for that very reason and we hope those who use this working bibliography will do so too.

Notes

[1] Benney and Hughes put things very well: "[T]he interview, as itself a form of social rhetoric, is not merely a tool of sociology but a part of its very subject matter. When one is learning about the interview, he [sic] is adding to sociological knowledge itself." (1956: 137-138)

[2] Though rarely, we would add, in clearly delineable or expected ways, see e.g. Beck 2005.

[3] An idea which connects to debates around 'ontological politics', see e.g. Law & Hassard 1999 but see also Anderson & Sharrock 2013 and Lynch 2013 for rejoinders.

[4] As demonstrated by, among the many possible examples, the ongoing controversies around climate change (e.g. Rogers & Marres 1999, Edwards 2010, Rajão & Vurdubakis 2013), the aetiology of HIV/AIDS (Green 2009), techniques for counting votes in the United States (e.g. Hiltgartner, Lynch & Berkowitz 2005, Martin & Lynch 2009), randomised control trials (Goldacre 2008, 2012), the seismologists sentenced for manslaughter for failing to predict an earthquake in L'Aquila, Italy (Jones 2012), or the French psychiatrist given a suspended sentence because one of her patients committed murder after being cleared for release (BBC 2012) – all cases where questions of method and the warrant for scientific claims have become public concerns (see also Beck 2005, Latour & Weibel 2005). Disputes around social scientific analyses of the 2011 riots in the UK – when Boris Johnson complained he had "heard too much sociological explanation and not enough condemnation" – might seem to provide a more directly social scientific case in point (Cooper & Nichols 2011), but it is worth noting that, in the other cases mentioned above, it was the repercussions of acting on claims based upon the application of particular methods that generated the controversy – in this sense 'the politicisation of method' goes hand-in-hand with the 'socialisation of science', the linked claim that the sciences as a whole are inside not outside society and thus are socially, culturally, politically and economically accountable and in a variety of ways. Other controversies within social science disciplines are perhaps more illustrative. We might think here of anthropology and both the Yanomami scandal and its fall out (Borofsky 2005) as well as the 'human terrains system' controversy centring on the role of anthropologists in facilitating the 'war on terror' (see, e.g., Forte 2011) where particular ways of doing anthropological research and the potential/alleged/real harms associated with them were subject to considerable scrutiny. The election of Napoleon Chagnon, the main protagonist in the Yanomami controversy, to the US National Academy of Science, alongside its support for military research of the kind exemplified by the human terrain systems programme, were recently cited by Marshall Sahlins as his main reasons for resigning from the same body in a show of public protest (2013a, 2013b). Social scientists have found or sought to make themselves parties to public disputes of different kinds too. Legal cases where social scientists have been called upon and asked to defend their claims as experts provide a particularly interesting example (see, e.g., Ruse 1986). A number of sociologists, including Diane Vaughan, Steve Fuller and Simon Cole among others, have participated in public inquiries or trials as expert witnesses and with varying degrees of success. While Vaughan's work on the Columbia disaster board of inquiry was lauded (Vaughan 2005, 2006), Fuller and Cole had a much harder time negotiating cross-examination and convincing judge or jury that their 'expert' contributions added anything meaningful to proceedings (see

e.g. Lynch & Cole 2005, Gorman 2006, Cole 2006, 2009, Lynch 2006a, Lynch 2006b, 2007, 2009b, 2009c, Fuller 2006, 2008a, 2008b, 2009 as well as, e.g., Bal & Mastboom 2007). There have alsoe been instances where social scientists with opposing views have found themselves pitted against each other in court (Peyrot & Burns 2001). Analyses of these cases give us interesting insights into knowledge-making and knowledge-claiming practices in the social sciences and the degree to which they survive legal examination and deconstruction.

[5] The research was part of a National Centre for Research Methods Collaborative Fund Project, and involved work with the Realities and BIASII NCRM Wave II Nodes.

[6] In Lewis Coser's summary: "It is indeed curious, as Robert K. Merton has remarked, that while historians of science have increasingly come to use in their own work sociological conceptualizations and methodological tools, historians of sociology have largely been remiss in this respect, if one can judge from the dearth of any serious sociological study of sociologists. This suggests an extension of the well-known impression that sociologists feel most at ease studying status inferiors, be they workers or students, army privates or thieves, while they find it much more difficult to study status superiors, whether top managers or university presidents, generals or senators. But apparently sociologists find it still easier to study status superiors than to study themselves." There are several reasons for this reticence. On the difficulties of studying 'thinking work' of the kind social scientists routinely engage in, see e.g. Garforth 2012. On the 'village politics' that social scientists studying other social scientists can become embroiled in, see Williams 2002.

[7] The interest in social science methods as practiced is clear in Sacks (1963), Cicourel (1964) and Garfinkel (1967, Hill & Stones-Crittenden 1968, Garfinkel & Sacks 1970) on the manner in which social scientists make their phenomena of interest available for study (see also Turner 1974). From these early works, ethnomethodology has retained an ongoing commitment to explications of vernacular forms of practical sociological reasoning in the sites and settings – ordinary and specialised – those forms of reasoning are 'indigenous' to, including those in which professional sociologists do their work. Ethnomethodology is often thought of as being sceptical about the claims of social science to adequately capture the social world but as Benson and Hughes put it, it "is not that [ethnomethodology claims social science] ... fails to make 'adequate' reference to the world, rather what becomes of interest is the manner in which it does so" (Benson & Hughes 1991: 125). This involves examining, in detail, the "myriad of practical decisions, judgements and interpretations ... [which] have to be made to get the [often unpromising] material to speak" (Benson & Hughes 1991: 122), part of the enduring rationale guiding social studies of the social sciences.

[8] For a particularly useful interrogation of the reflexive turn in anthropology, see Macbeth 2001.

[9] Interestingly, we see here, but at a much earlier stage than in the recent sociological literature, how an interest in treating research as a practice engaged in by particular people in particular places at particular times in particular ways is connected to attempts to break with those practices and find new ways of doing research.

[10] Latour and Woolgar, for instance, included a picture of the roof of the laboratory Latour had undertaken his fieldwork within as part of their account (1986: 93), asking their readers whether they had questioned its inclusion or conceded its propriety. This attempt to problematise the accounts being offered from within as they are being produced has itself become a familiar technique (e.g. Gilbert & Mulkay 1984, Ashmore 1989).

[11] This characterisation opens up a variety of related aspects of what researchers do for study. For instance, attending to how researchers learn to engage in and organise research as a practical activity, and the numerous unremarked skills and competencies required of a researcher as part of that, is particularly instructive, enabling us to see aspects of research work often taken-for-granted (see here Goodwin 1994, 2006). The adoption and use of different devices and tools by social science researchers, as well as how they subsequently incorporate them within their routine research practices, provides a useful focus in this regard (see, e.g., Lofgren 1990, 2013, Lury & Wakeford 2012, Back & Puwar 2013, Krajowski 2013, Savage 2013). Alternatively, it is also possible to examine particular moments in the career of a research project and examine what they might have to tell us about social scientific work. Review processes, including ethical review, have a particular interest in this regard, not least because they are one place where social scientists must describe and explain the practicalities of their work to (not always sympathetic) others, modelling their research in ways that enable its logic to be seen and evaluated (see, e.g., Camic, Gross & Lamont 2011, Stark 2011, Nind, Wiles, Bengry-Howell & Crow 2012, Coffey, Robison & Prosser 2012 but also Hacking 1983).

[12] It is worth stressing that texts are not the only things that social scientists produce and make use of in the course of their work, but take their place alongside numbers/statistics, visual artifacts (photographs, videos, tables, diagrams, graphs, maps, pictures and so on), audio recordings of many different kinds (as in the ethnographic, compositional and documentary work of Rupert Cox for instance, see e.g. Cox 2008, 2010) but also such things as models and, increasingly, code, databases, algorithms, software programmes and online or virtual 'spaces'. They may even include contributions to the built environment as well as experimental sites and settings (see e.g. Gieryn 2002, 2006 and Bates 2010). Social studies of social science research practices have extended to considerations of all manner of productions and thus are far from being text-centric in their concerns.

[13] Thinking about, e.g., sociology sociologically can involve different kinds of things: it can be treated as an occasion for theorising, for methodological reflection, for engaging in sociological analysis or as furnishing opportunities for empirical inquiry. Again, while far from discrete or always easily distinguishable activities, we have tried to focus our bibliography on studies of sociological practices. This is not because we question the value of other ways of approaching the question of the status of the social sciences but because we have had to make our task more manageable. We have, therefore, left out the considerable literature on the 'sociology of sociology', 'metasociology' and critical sociologies of knowledge, including work that takes up the contributions of the likes of Furfey (1965), Habermas (1967), Abrams (1968), Friedrichs (1970), Gouldner (1970), Coser (1971), Giddens (1971) and many others. For recent work in this area, see, e.g., Wagner & Wittrock 1991, Heilbron, Magnusson & Wittrock 1998, Calhoun 2007 and UNESCO 2010. Equivalent

literatures will be found across the social sciences but the studies we are primarily interested in are not 'metatheoretical' exercises (Ritzer 2006) although they may well have (meta)theoretical implications.

[14] When set alongside the others, 'mixed methods' may appear slightly out of place. However, it is an interestingly 'reflexive' area – with a number of those who describe themselves as mixed methods researchers undertaking studies of how researchers practically mix methodologies in the course of doing their work. In that sense, it provides a good sense of how contemporary researchers have approached the task of conducting studies of methods, methodology and research practices. The question as to why questions of method, methodology and research practice have been such a concern in mixed methods is itself of interest. As those who have engaged with the literature will know, a great deal has been written on the subject of mixed methods but it, somewhat paradoxically, remains a rather nebulous pursuit. Mixed methods is a field of research in the process of organising itself, of finding a suitable narrative, and, by that, trying to demonstrate its coherence and stake out its own place in the landscape of the social sciences. This has involved providing back-stories that, among other things, show off its particular values, its coherent theoretical, epistemological and ontological underpinnings (i.e. the idea that mixed method operations are justifiable philosophically), its venerability, etc., and give those new to the field some idea of its scope, its boundaries and its prospects. Such activity has also been about providing rules, recipes and how to guides – something which makes the literature seem overly preoccupied with what might be thought of as the 'proper' way of doing mixed method research. Despite these ongoing debates over its character, mixed methods research is increasingly being spoken of as a definable methodological 'kind' and those involved in research that falls within that kind are trying to move beyond a programmatic phase. As a research culture very much in the making, practitioners are faced with certain problems less prominent in more established areas, one of which is knowing what those who call themselves mixed methods researchers actually do. Tashakkori and Teddlie (2010: 271), in an account of their rationale in putting together the *Handbook of Mixed Methods Research*, say the following: "We initiated the Handbook in the late 1990s ... with some trepidation and uncertainty about its salience ... We asked ourselves, "Doesn't everyone do this?" ..." Establishing what 'everyone' does has proven far from straightforward, however, so those in mixed methods are in the process of pinning down what mixed methods researchers, at least, do – a considerable task in and of itself.

References

Abrams, P. (1968) *The Origins of British Sociology, 1834-1914: An Essay with Selected Papers*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press

Anderson, R.J. & Sharrock, W.W (2013) PostModernism, Social Science & Technology, available from the Anderson and Sharrock Archive, http://www.sharrockandanderson.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/PostModernism-Social-Science-Technology-2012.pdf

Ashmore, M. (1989) *The Reflexive Thesis: Wrighting Sociology of Scientific Knowledge*, London: University of Chicago Press

Bal, R. & Mastboom, F. (2007) Engaging with Technologies in Practice: Travelling the Northwest Passage, *Science as Culture,* 16(3): 253-266

Barth, F. (1967) 'On the Study of Social Change, *American Anthropologist*, 69(6): 661-669

BBC (2012) 'France psychiatrist guilty over murder by patient', 18th December, http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-20774516

Berger, P.L & Luckmann, T. (1966) *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*, Garden City, NY: Anchor Books

Bloor, D. 1976. *Knowledge and Social Imagery*, London: University of Chicago Press

Bowker, G. & Star, S.L (1999) *Sorting Things Out: Classification and its Consequences*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press

Calhoun, C. (2007) *Sociology in America: A History*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press

Cole, S.A. (2009) 'A Cautionary Tale About Cautionary Tales About Intervention', Organization, 16(1): 121-141

Cooper, G. & Nichols, A. (2011) 'What caused England's riots? The campaign for Social Science is holding a conference to reflect on the causes of the riots over the summer, and to suggest ways forward', *The Guardian*, 12th October

Coser, L. (1971) *Masters of Sociological Thought: Ideas in Historical and Social Context*, New York, NY: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc

Derrida, J. (1966) 'Structure, Sign and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences', pp. 278-294 in Derrida, J. (1978) *Writing and Difference*, London: Routledge

Desrosières, A. (1998) *The Politics of Large Numbers: A History of Statistical Reasoning*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Edwards, P.N. (2010) *A Vast Machine: Computer Models, Climate Data, and the Politics of Global Warming*, Cambridge, MA: MIT University Press

Feyerabend, P. (1993) *Against Method*, London: Verso

Foucault, M. (2002a[1966]) *The Order of Things*, London: Routledge

Foucault, M. (2002b[1969]) *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, London: Routledge

Foucault, M. (1975) *Discipline and Punish*, London: Penguin

Fuller, Steve (2006) 'A Step Toward the Legalization of Science Studies', *Social Studies of Science*, 36(6): 827-34

Fuller, S. (2008b) *Dissent Over Descent: Intelligent Design's Challenge to Darwinism*, London: Icon

Friedrichs R.W. (1970) *A Sociology of Sociology*, Free Press, New York

Furfey, P. H. (1965) *The Scope and Method of Sociology: A Meta-Sociological Treatise*, New York, NY: Cooper Square

Giddens, A. (1971) *Capitalism and Modern Social Theory: An Analysis of the Writings of Marx, Durkheim and Max Weber*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Gilbert, N. & Mulkay, M. (1984) *Opening Pandora's Box: A Sociological Analysis of Scientists' Discourse*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Goldacre, B. (2008) *Bad Science*, London: Fourth Estate

Goldacre, B. (2012) *Bad Pharma: How Drug Companies Mislead Doctors and Harm Patients*, London: Fourth Estate

Goodman, N. (1978) *Ways of Worldmaking*, Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing Company

Gouldner, A.W. (1970) *The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology*, New York, NY: Basic Books

Green, L.J.F. (2009) 'Challenging Epistemologies: Exploring Knowledge Practices in Palikur Astronomy', *Futures*, 41(1): 41-52

Habermas, J (1988 [1967]) *On the Logic of the Social Sciences*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Hacking, I. (1965) *The Logic of Statistical Inference*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Hacking, I. (1975) *The Emergence of Probability*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Hacking, I. (1983) *Representing and Intervening: Introductory. Topics in the Philosophy of Natural Science*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Hacking, I. (1990) *The Taming of Chance*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Hacking, I. (2002) *Historical Ontology*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Heilbron, J., Magnusson, L. & Wittrock, B. (1998) *The Rise of the Social Sciences and the Formation of Modernity: Conceptual Change in Context, 1750-1850*, Dordrecht: Kluwer

Jones, T. (2012) 'Short Cuts', *London Review of Books*, 34(22): 19

Kaplan, A. (1964) *The Conduct of Inquiry: Methodology for Behavioral Science*, San Francisco, CA: Chandler Publishing Company

Knorr-Cetina, K.D. (1981) 'Social and Scientific Method or What Do We Make of the Distinction Between the Natural and the Social Sciences?', *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, 11: 335-359

Kuhn, T. (1962) *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, Chicago, IL; University of Chicago Press

Law, J. & Hassard, J. (eds.) (1999) *Actor Network Theory: and After*, Oxford: Blackwell

Macbeth, D. (2001) 'On "Reflexivity" in Qualitative Research: Two Readings, and a Third', *Qualitative Inquiry*, 7(1): 35-68

Mannheim, K. (1936) *Ideology and Utopia*, London: Routledge

Maynard, D.W. & Clayman, S.E. (1995) 'Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis', pp. 1-30 in Have, P-t & Psathas, G. (eds.) *Situated Order: Studies in the Social Organization of Talk and Embodied Activities*, Washington: University Press.

Mills, C.W. (1959) *The Sociological Imagination*, Harmondsworth: Penguin

Porter, T.M. (1986) *The Rise of Statistical Thinking, 1820-1900*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press

Porter, T.M. (1996) *Trust in Numbers: The Pursuit of Objectivity in Science and Public Life*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press

Rajão, R. & Vurdubakis, T. (2013) 'On the Pragmatics of Inscription: Detecting Deforestation in the Brazilian Amazon', *Theory, Culture & Society*, 30(4): 151-177

Ritzer, G. (2006) 'Metatheory', in Ritzer, G. (ed.) *Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology*, New York, NY: Wiley Blackwell

Rogers, R. & Marres, N. (1999) 'Landscaping Climate Change: Mapping Science & Technology Debates on the World Wide Web', *Public Understanding of Science*, 9(2): 141-63

Schutz, A. (1944) 'The Stranger: An Essay in Social Psychology', *American Journal of Sociology*, 49(6): 499-507

Schutz, A. (1963) Natanson, M.A. (ed.) *Collected Papers I: The Problem of Social Reality*, Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff

Sorokin, P.A. (1956) *Fads and Foibles in Modern Sociology and Related Sciences*, Chicago, IL: Henry Regnery

Stigler, S.M. (2002) *Statistics on the Table: The History of Statistical Concepts and Methods*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Toulmin, S. (1958) *The Uses of Argument*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

UNESCO (2010) *World Social Science Report: Knowledge Divides*, Paris, France: UNESCO Publishing

Wagner, P. & Wittrock, B. (1991) 'Analyzing Social Science: On the Possibility of a Sociology of the Social Sciences', *Discourses on Society: Sociology of the Sciences Yearbook Volume 15*, pp. 3-22

Weber, M. (1978[1922]) *Economy and Society*, London: University of California Press

Winch, P. (1958) *The Idea of a Social Science and Its Relation to Philosophy*, London: Routledge

Wittgenstein, L. (1953) *Philosophical Investigations*, Oxford: Blackwell

Working Bibliography of Social Studies of Social Science

A number of the articles we list are introductions to special issues on topics to do with methods and/or research practices, just as we cite a number of chapters within edited volumes. These are often contributions we have found particularly useful or which provide useful guides to other work, guides we would encourage readers to follow up for themselves. Occasionally, however, we simply cite the volume, particularly where we feel it is relevant in its entirety and no single article or chapter within it is more important than the others.

Social Studies of Social Science Research Practices

Abbott, A.D. (2001) *Chaos of Disciplines*, Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press

Adkins, L. & Lury, C. (2009) 'What Is the Empirical?', *European Journal of Social Theory*, 12(1): 5-20

Adkins, L. & Lury, C. (eds.) (2012) *Measure and Value*, London: Wiley-Blackwell

Ashmore, M., MacMillan, K. & Brown, S.D. (2004) 'It's a Scream: Professional Hearing and Tape Fetishism', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36(2): 349-374

Ashmore, M., Mulkay, M. & Pinch, T. (1989) *Health and Efficiency: A Sociology of Health Economics*, Milton Keynes: Open University Press

Ashmore, M. & Reed, D. (2000) 'Innocence and Nostalgia in Conversation Analysis: The Dynamic Relations of Tape and Transcript', *Forum: Qualitative Social Research/Sozialforschung*, 1(3)

Back, L. (2007) *The Art of Listening*, Oxford: Berg

Back, L. & Puwar, N. (eds.) (2012) *Live Methods*, London: Wiley-Blackwell

Baldamus, W. (1972) 'The Role of Discoveries in Social Science', pp. 276-302 in Shanin, T. (ed.) *The Rules of the Game*, London: Tavistock

Bates, L. (2010) 'Experimenting with Sociology: A View from the Outlook Tower', *Sociological Research Online*, 16(3): 9-12

Beck, U. (2005) 'How Not to Become a Museum Piece', *British Journal of Sociology*, 56(3): 336-343

Becker, H.S. (1965) 'Review of 'Sociologists at Work' (edited by P.E. Hammond)', *American Sociological Review*, 30(4): 602–603

Benney, M. & Hughes, E.C. (1956) 'Of Sociology and the Interview: Editorial Preface', *American Journal of Sociology*, 62(2): 137-142

Benzecry, C.E. & Krause, M. (2010) 'How Do They Know? Practicing Knowledge in Comparative Perspective', *Qualitative Sociology*, 33(4): 415-422

Bloombaum, M. (1967) 'The Logic-in-Use of Sociologists at Work', *The Pacific Sociological Review*, 10(2): 54-60

Bourdieu, P. & Wacquant, L. (1992) *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*, Cambridge: Polity Press

Brady, H. & Collier, D. (eds.) (2004) *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*, Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield

Burawoy, M. (2005) 'For Public Sociology', *American Sociological Review*, 70(1): 4-28

Burnett, J., Jeffers, S. & Thomas, G. (eds.) (2010) *New Social Connections: Sociology's Subjects and Objects,* Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan

Camic, C., Gross, N. & Lamont, M. (eds.) (2011) *Social Knowledge in the Making*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Chatfield, C. (1985) 'The Initial Examination of Data', *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A*, 148: 214-253

Chatfield, C. (1991) 'Avoiding Statistical Pitfalls', *Statistical Science*, 6: 240-268

Chatfield, C. (2002) 'Confessions of a Pragmatic Statistician', *The Statistician*, 51(1): 1-20

Crow, G. (2000) 'Developing Sociological Arguments Through Community Studies'. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 3(3): 173-187

Davis, M.S. (1971) 'That's Interesting: Towards a Phenomenology of Sociology and a Sociology of Phenomenology', *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, 1(4): 309-344

Desrosières, A. (1997) 'The Administrator and the Scientist: How the Statistical Profession has Changed', *Statistical Journal of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe*, 14(1): 31-50

Desrosières, A. (2000) 'Measurement and its Uses: Harmonization and Quality in Social Statistics', *International Statistical Review*, 68(2): 173-187

Desrosières, A. (2001) 'How Real are Statistics? Four Possible Attitudes', *Social Research*, 68(2): 339-355

Desrosières, A. (2009) 'How to be Real and Conventional: A Discussion of the Quality Criteria of Official Statistics', *Minerva*, 47: 307-322

Edling, C. (2009) 'We Always Know More Than We Can Say: Mathematical Sociologists on Mathematical Sociology', pp. 345-367 in Hedström, P. & Wittrock, B. (eds.) (2009) *Frontiers of Sociology: The Annals of the International Institute of Sociology, Volume 11*, Leiden: Brill

Espeland, W.N. & Stevens, M.L. (2008) 'A Sociology of Quantification', *European Journal of Sociology*, 49(3): 401-436

Evans, J.A. & Foster, J.G. (2011) 'Metaknowledge', *Science*, 331(6018), pp. 721-725

Hammond, P.E. (ed.) (1964) *Sociologists at Work: Essays on the Craft of Social Research*, New York, NY: Basic Books

Hedström, P. & Wittrock, B. (eds.) (2009) *Frontiers of Sociology: The Annals of the International Institute of Sociology, Volume 11*, Leiden: Brill

Igo, S. (2007) *The Averaged American: Surveys, Citizens, and the Making of a Mass Public*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Fourcade, M. (2007) 'The Politics of Method and its Agentic, Performative and Ontological Others', *Social Science History*, 31(1): 107-114

Fourcade, M. (2009) *Economists and Societies: Discipline and Profession in the United States, Britain, and France, 1890s to 1990s*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press

Fuller, S. (2008a) 'Science Studies Goes Public: A Report on an Ongoing Performance', *Spontaneous Generations*, 2(1): 11-21

Garforth, L. (2012) 'In/visibilities of Research: Seeing and Knowing in STS', *Science, Technology and Human Values*, 37(2): 264-285

Geiger, T., Moore, N and Savage, M. (2010) 'The Archive in Question', *Working Paper Series, Working Paper No. 81*, ESRC Centre for Research on Socio-Cultural Change (CRESC): Milton Keynes, UK

Gieryn, T. (2002) 'Three Truth-Spots', *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, 38(2): 113-132

Gieryn, T. (2006) 'City as Truth-Spot: Laboratories and Field-sites in Urban Studies', *Social Studies of Science*, 36(1): 5-38

Golden-Biddle, K. & Locke, K. (1993) 'Appealing Work: An investigation of How Ethnographic Texts Convince', *Organization Science*, 4: 595-616

Gorman, M. (2006) 'STS, Ethics, and Knowledge Transfer in the Courtroom: Personal Experiences', *Social Studies of Science*, 36(6): 861-66

Guggenheim, M. & Krause, M. (2012) 'How Facts Travel: The Model Systems of Sociology', *Poetics*, 40(2): 101-117

Konopásek, Z. (2008) 'Making Thinking Visible with Atlas.Ti: Computer Assisted Qualitative Analysis as Textual Practices', *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 9(2): Article 12

Kullenberg, C. (2012) *The Quantification of Society: A Study of a Swedish Research Institute and Survey-based Social Science*, Unpublished PhD Thesis, Gothenburg, Sweden: University of Gothenburg

Krajowski, M. (2013) 'Paper as Passion: Niklas Luhmann and His Card Index', pp.103-120 in Gitelman, L. (ed.) *"Raw Data" Is an Oxymoron*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press

Lamont, M. (2009) *How Professors Think: Inside the Curious World of Academic Judgment*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Latour, B. (1981) 'Insiders & Outsiders in the Sociology of Science; Or, How Can We Foster Agnosticism?', *Knowledge and Society: Studies in the Sociology of Culture Past and Present*, 3: 199-216

Latour, B. (1987) *Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers Through Society*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Latour, B. (2007) 'A Plea for Earthly Sciences', pp. 72-84 in Burnett, J., Jeffers, S. & Thomas, G. (eds.) (2010) *New Social Connections: Sociology's Subjects and Objects,* Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan

Latour, B. (2010) 'Tarde's Idea of Quantification', pp. 145-162 in Candea, M. (ed.) *The Social After Gabriel Tarde: Debates and Assessment*, London: Routledge

Latour, B. & Callon, M. (1981) Unscrewing the Big Leviathan: How Actors Macrostructure Reality and How Sociologists Help Them To Do So', pp. 277-303 in Knorr-Cetina, K.D. & Cicourel A.V. (eds.) *Advances in Social Theory and Methodology: Toward an Integration of Micro- and Macro-Sociologies*. Boston, MA: Routledge and Kegan Paul

Latour, B. & Woolgar, S. (1986[1979]) *Laboratory Life: The Social Construction of Scientific Facts*, Beverley Hills, CA: Sage

Latour, B. & Weibel, P. (eds.) (2005) *Making Things Public: Atmospheres of Democracy*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press

LaPiere, R.T. (1934) 'Attitudes vs. Actions', *Social Forces*, 13(2): 230-237

Law, J. (2004) *After Method: Mess in Social Science Research*, Abingdon: Routledge

Law, J. (2009) 'Seeing like a Survey', *Cultural Sociology*, 3(2): 239-256

Law, J., Ruppert, E.S. & Savage, M. (2011) 'The Double Social Life of Methods', *Working Paper Series*: *Working Paper No. 95*, ESRC Centre for Research on Socio-Cultural Change (CRESC): Milton Keynes, UK

Leahey, E. (2008) 'Methodological Memes and Mores: Toward a Sociology of Social Research', *Annual Review of Sociology*, 34: 33-53

Leahey E., Entwisle, B. & Einaudi, P. (2003) 'Diversity in Everyday Research Practice: The Case of Data Editing', *Sociological Methods and Research*, 32(1): 63-89

Leijonhufvud, A. (1973) 'Life Among the Econ', *Western Economic Journal*, 11(3): 327-337

Lury, C. & Wakeford, N. (eds.) (2012) *Inventive Methods: The Happening of the Social*, London: Routledge

Mackenzie, D. (1981) *Statistics in Britain, 1865-1930: The Social Construction of Scientific Knowledge*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press

McGinn, M. (2010) 'Learning to Use Statistics in Research: A Case Study of Learning in a University-Based Statistical Consulting Centre', *Statistics Education Research Journal*, 9(2): 35-49

Majima, S. & N. Moore (2009) 'Introduction: Rethinking Qualitative and Quantitative Methods', *Cultural Sociology*, 3(2) 203-216

MacKenzie, D., Muniesa, F. & Siu, L. (2007) *Do Economists Make Markets?*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press

Michael, M. (2004) 'On Making Data Social: Heterogeneity in Sociological Practice', *Qualitative Research*, 4(1): 5-23

Mulkay, M. (1984) 'The Scientist Talks Back: A One Act Play, With A Moral, About Replication in Science and Reflexivity in Sociology', *Social Studies of Science*, 14(2): 265-82

Mulkay, M. (1985) *The Word and the World: Explorations in the Form of Sociological Analysis*, London: Allen & Unwin

Nind, M., Wiles, R., Bengry-Howell, A. & Crow, G. (2012) 'Methodological Innovation and Research Ethics: Forces in Tension or Forces in Harmony?', *Qualitative Research Journal*, Doi:10.1177/1468794112455042

O'Neil, J. (1981) 'The Literary Production of Natural and Social Science Inquiry: Issues and Applications in the Social Organization of Science', *The Canadian Journal of Sociology / Cahiers canadiens de sociologie*, 6(2): 105-120

Osborne, T. & Rose, N. (1997) 'In the Name of Society, or Three Theses on the History of Social Thought', *History of the Human Sciences*, 10(3): 87-104

Osborne, T. & Rose, N. (1999) 'Do the Social Sciences Create Phenomena? The Example of Public Opinion Research', *British Journal of Sociology*, 50(3): 367-396

Osborne, T. & Rose, N. (2004) 'Spatial Phenomenotechnics: Making Space with Charles Booth and Patrick Geddes', *Environment and Planning D*, 22(2): 209-228

Osborne, T., Rose, N. & Savage, M. (eds.) (2008) 'Special Centenary Issue: "Inscribing the history of British sociology"', *Sociological Review*, 56(4)

Peneff, J. (1988) 'The Observers Observed: French Survey Researchers at Work', *Social Problems*, 35(5): 520-535

Potter, J., Wetherell, M & Chitty, A. (1991) 'Quantification Rhetoric: Cancer on Television', *Discourse & Society*, 2(3): 333-365

Puchta, C. & Potter, J. (2004) *Focus Group Practice*, London: Sage

Reed, D. & Ashmore, M. (2000) 'The Naturally-Occurring Chat Machine', *M/C: A Journal of Media and Culture*, 3(4)

Reynolds, L.T. & Reynolds, J.M. (eds.) (1970) *The Sociology of Sociology: Analysis and Criticism of the Thought, Research and Ethical Folkways of Sociology and Its Practitioners*, New York: David McKay Company

Roth, J.A. (1966) 'Hired Hand Research', *American Sociologist*, 1:190-196

Roth, J.A. (1973) 'Dissident Views of the Sociological Craft', *Journal of Sociology*, 9(3): 3-10

Ruppert, E.S. (2007) 'Producing Population', *Working Paper Series: Working Paper No. 37*, ESRC Centre for Research on Socio-Cultural Change (CRESC): Milton Keynes, UK

Ruppert, E.S. (2009) 'Numbers Regimes: From Censuses to Metrics', *Working Paper Series: Working Paper No. 68*, ESRC Centre for Research on Socio-Cultural Change (CRESC): Milton Keynes, UK

Ruse, M. (1986) 'The Academic as Expert Witness', *Science, Technology & Human Values*, 11(2): 68-73

Saetnan, A.R, Lomell, H.M. & Hammer, S. (eds.) (2011) *The Mutual Construction of Statistics and Society*, London: Routledge

Savage, M. (2010) *Identities and Social Change in Britain since 1940: The Politics of Method*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Savage, M. (2013) 'The Social Life of Methods: A Critical Introduction', *Theory, Culture & Society*, 30(4): 3-21

Savage, M. & Burrows, R. (2007) 'The Coming Crisis of Empirical Sociology', *Sociology*, 41(5): 885-899

Savage, M. & Burrows, R. (2009) 'Some Further Reflections on the Coming Crisis of Empirical Sociology', *Sociology*, 43(4): 762-772

Simbuerger, E.A. (2009) *Against and Beyond – For Sociology: A Study on the Self-understanding of Sociologists in England*, Unpublished PhD Thesis, Warwick, UK: University of Warwick

Stark, L. (2011) *Behind Closed Doors: IRBs and the Making of Ethical Research*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press

Van Maanen, J. (1995) 'An End to Innocence: The Ethnography of Ethnography', pp. 1-35 in Van Maanen, J. (ed.) *Representation in Ethnography*, Newbury Park, CA: Sage

Vaughan, D. (2005) 'On the Relevance of Ethnography for the Production of Public Sociology and Policy', *British Journal of Sociology*, 56(3): 411-416

Vaughan, D. (2006) 'NASA Revisited: Theory, Analogy, and Public Sociology', *American Journal of Sociology*, 112(2): 353-93

Wiles, R., Charles, V., Crow, G. & Heath, S. (2006) 'Researching Researchers: Lessons for Research Ethics', *Qualitative Research*, 6(3): 283-299

Wiles, R., Crow, G., Heath, S. & Charles, V. (2008) 'The Management of Confidentiality and Anonymity in Social Research', *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 11(5): 417-428

Wiles, R., Coffey, A., Robison, J. & Heath, S. (2012) 'Anonymisation and Visual Images: Issues of Respect, 'Voice' and Protection', *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 15(1): 41-53

Wiles, R., Coffey, A., Robison, J. & Prosser, J. (2012) 'Ethical Regulation and Visual Methods: Making Visual Research Impossible or Developing Good Practice?' *Sociological Research Online*, 17(1): Article 8

Woolgar, S. (1988a) 'Time and Documents in Researcher Interaction: Some Ways of Making Out What is Happening in Experimental Science', *Human Studies*, 11(2-3): 171-200

Woolgar, S. (1988b) *Science: the Very Idea*, London: Routledge

Woolgar, S. (ed.) (1988c) *Knowledge and Reflexivity: New Frontiers in the Sociology of Knowledge*, London: Sage

Woolgar, S. (1996) 'Psychology, Qualitative Methods and the Ideas of Science', pp. 11-25 in Richardson, J.T.E. (ed.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research Methods for Psychology and the Social Sciences*, London: Blackwell

Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis

Anderson, R.J. & Sharrock, W.W. (1982) 'Sociological Work: Some Procedures Sociologists Use for Organising Phenomena', *Social Analysis*, 11: 79-93

Anderson, R.J. & Sharrock, W.W. (1984) 'Analytic Work: Aspects of the Organisation of Conversational Data', *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 14(1): 103-124

Antaki, C., Biazzi, M., Nissen, A., & Wagner, J. (2008) 'Accounting for Moral Judgments in Academic Talk: The Case of a Conversation Analysis Data Session', *Text and Talk*, 28(1): 1-30

Benson, D. & Hughes, J. (1991) 'Method: Evidence and Inference – Evidence and Inference for Ethnomethodology', pp. 109-36 in Button, G. (ed.) *Ethnomethodology and the Human Sciences,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Bittner, E. (1973) 'Objectivity and Realism in Sociology', pp. 109-25 in Psathas, G. (ed.) (1973) *Phenomenological Sociology*, Chichester: Wiley

Bushnell, C. (2012) 'Talking the Talk: The Interactional Construction of Community and Identity at Conversation Analytic Data Sessions in Japan', *Human Studies*, 35(4): 583-605

Button, G. (1991) 'Introduction: Ethnomethodology and the Foundational Respecification of the Human Sciences', pp. 1-9 in Button, G. (ed.) *Ethnomethodology and the Human Sciences*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Carlin, A.P. (2002) 'Bibliographic Boundaries and Forgotten Canons', pp. 113-130 in Herbrechter, S. (ed.) (2002) *Cultural Studies: Interdisciplinarity and Translation*, Amsterdam: Rodopi

Carlin, A.P. (2003) 'Pro Forma Arrangements: The Visual Availability of Textual Artefacts', *Visual Studies*, 18(1): 6-20

Carlin, A.P (2003) 'Some Bibliographic Practices in Interdisciplinary Work: Accounting for Citations in Library and Information Sciences', *Accountability in Research*, 10: 27-45

Carlin, A.P. (2004) 'On Owning Silence: Talk, Texts, and the "Semiotics" of Bibliographies', *Semiotica* 146: 117-38

Carlin, A.P. (2006) 'Observations on Features of a Research Interview', *Ciências Sociais Unisinos*, 42(3): 177-88

Carlin, A.P. (2007) 'Auspices of Corpus Status: Bibliography* as a Phenomenon of Respecification', pp. 91-106 in Hester, S. & Francis, D. (eds.) (2008) *Orders of Ordinary Action: Respecifying Sociological Knowledge*, Farnham, Sussex: Ashgate

Carlin, A.P. (2009) 'Edward Rose and Linguistic Ethnography: An Ethno-inquiries Approach to Interviewing', *Qualitative Research*, 9(3): 331-354

Carlin, A.P. (2009) 'The Temporal Organization of Bibliographies', *The Library Quarterly*, 79(2): 161-73

Cicourel, A.V (1964) *Method and Measurement in Sociology*, New York, NY: Glencoe, The Free Press

Churchill, L. (1966) 'Notes on Everyday Quantitative Practices', Paper presented to the American Sociological Association Meeting, Miami Beach, Florida, August 1966

Drew, P., Raymond, G. & Weinberg, D. (2006) *Talk and Interaction in Social Research Methods*, London: Sage

Garfinkel, H. (1967) *Studies in Ethnomethodology*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall

Garfinkel, H. (2002) *Ethnomethodology's Program: Working Out Durkheim's Aphorism*, Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield

Garfinkel, H. & Sacks, H. (1970) 'On Formal Structures of Practical Actions', pp. 338-66 in McKinney, J.C. & Tiryakian, E. (eds.) *Theoretical Sociology*, New York, NY: Appleton Century Crofts

Gathman, E.C.H., Maynard, D.W & Schaeffer, N.C. (2008) 'The Respondents are all above Average: Compliment Sequences in a Survey Interview', *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 41(3): 271-301

Gephart, R.P. (1988) *Ethnostatistics: Qualitative Foundations for Quantitative Research*, London: Sage

Gephart, R.P. & Smith, R.S. (2009) 'An Invitation to Ethnostatistics', *Sciences de Gestion*, 70: 85-102

Goodwin, C. (1994) 'Professional Vision', *American Anthropologist*, 96(3): 606-633

Goodwin, C. (2006) 'A Linguistic Anthropologist's Interest in Archaeological Practice', pp. 45-56 in Edgeworth, M. (ed.) (2006) *Ethnographies of Archaeological Practice: Cultural Encounters, Material Transformations*, Lanham, MD: Rowman Altamira

Greiffenhagen, C., Mair, M. & Sharrock W.W. (2011) 'From Methodology to Methodography: A Study of Qualitative and Quantitative Reasoning in Practice', *Methodological Innovations Online*, 6(2): 93-107

Hester, S. & Francis, D. (1994) 'Doing Data: The Local Organization of a Sociological Interview', *British Journal of Sociology*, 45(4): 675-695

Hill, R.J. & Stones-Crittenden, K. (eds.) (1968) *Proceedings of the Purdue Symposium on Ethnomethodology*, Purdue, IN: Institute for the Study of Social Change

Hilgartner, S., Lynch, M. & Berkowitz, C. (2005) 'Voting Machinery, Counting and Public Proofs in the 2000 US Presidential Election', pp. 814-828 in Latour, B. &

Weibel, P. (eds.) (2005) *Making Things Public: Atmospheres of Democracy*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press

Housley, W. & Smith, R.J. (2011) 'Telling the CAQDAS code: Membership Categorization and the Accomplishment of 'Coding Rules' in Research Team Talk', *Discourse Studies*, 13(4): 417-434

Houtkoop-Steenstra, H. (1995) 'Meeting Both Ends: Standardization and Recipient Design in Telephone Survey Interviews', pp. 91-106 in Have, P.t. & Psathas, G. (eds.) *Situated Order: Studies in the Social Organization of Talk and Embodied Activities*, Washington, DC: University Press of America

Houtkoop-Steenstra, H. (1996) 'Probing Behavior of Interviewers in the Standardized Semi-open Research Interview', *Quality & Quantity*, 30(2): 205-230

Houtkoop-Steenstra, H. (1997) 'Being Friendly in Survey Interviews', *Journal of Pramatics*, 28(5): 591-623

Houtkoop-Steenstra, H. (2000) *Interaction and the Standardized Interview: The Living Questionnaire,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Hutchinson, P., Read, R. & Sharrock W.W (2008) *There is No Such Thing as a Social Science: In Defence of Peter Winch*, Aldershot: Ashgate

Irvine, A., Drew, P. & Sainsbury, R. (2013) ''Am I not answering your questions properly?' Clarification, Adequacy and Responsiveness in Semi-Structured Telephone and Face-To-Face Interviews', *Qualitative Research*, 13(1): 87-106

Livingston, E. (1987) *Making Sense of Ethnomethodology*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul

Livingston, E. (1992) *An Anthropology of Reading*, Bloomington and Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University Press

Lynch, M. (1985) 'Discipline and the Material Form of Images: An Analysis of Scientific Visibility', *Social Studies of Science*, 15(1): 37-66

Lynch, M. (1991a) 'Method: Measurement – Ordinary and Scientific Measurement as Ethnomethodological Phenomena', pp. 77-108 in Button, G. (ed.) *Ethnomethodology and the Human Sciences*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Lynch, M. (1991b) 'Laboratory Space and the. Technological Complex: An Investigation of Topical Contextures', *Science in Context*, 4(1): 51-78

Lynch, M. (1991c) 'Pictures of Nothing? Visual Construals in Social Theory', *Sociological Theory*, 9(1): 1-22

Lynch, M. (1993) *Scientific Practice and Ordinary Action: Ethnomethodology and Social Studies of Science*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lynch, M. (2000) 'The Ethnomethodological Foundations of Conversation Analysis', *Text: Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse*, 20(4): 517-532

Lynch, M. (2006a) 'Expert Metascientists', *Social Studies of Science*, 36(6): 867-868

Lynch, Michael (2006b) 'From Ruse to Farce', *Social Studies of Science*, 36(6): 819-26

Lynch, M. (2007) 'Expertise in Action: Presenting and Attacking Expert Evidence in DNA "Fingerprinting" Cases', *Villanova Law Review*, 52: 925-952

Lynch, M. (2009a) 'Ethnomethodology and History: Documents and the Production of History', *Ethnographic Studies*, 11(1): 87-106

Lynch, M. (2009b) 'Going Public: A Cautionary Tale', *Spontaneous Generations: A Journal for the History and Philosophy of Science*, 3(1): 213-219

Lynch, M. (2009c). 'Science as a Vacation: Deficits, Surfeits, PUSS, and Doing Your Own Job', *Organization*, 16(1): 101–119

Lynch, M. (2011) 'Harold Garfinkel (29 October 1917 – 21 April 2011): A Remembrance and Reminder', *Social Studies of Science*, 41(6): 927-942

Lynch, M. (2013) 'Ontography: Investigating the Production of Things, Deflating Ontology', *Social Studies of Science*, 43(4): 444-462

Lynch, M. & Bogen, D. (1997) 'Sociology's Asociological "Core"; an Examination of Textbook Sociology in the Light of the Sociology of Scientific Knowledge', *American Sociological Review*, 62(3): 481-93

Lynch, M. & Cole, S. (2005) 'Science and Technology Studies on Trial', *Social Studies of Science*, 35(2): 269-312

Lynch, M., Cole, S., McNally, R. & Jordan, K. (2008) *Truth Machine: The Contentious History of DNA Fingerprinting*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Mair, M. (2011) 'Deconstructing Behavioural Classifications: Tobacco Control, 'Professional Vision' and the Tobacco User as a Site of Governmental Intervention', *Critical Public Health*, 21(2), 129-140

Mainprise, S (2009) 'Entering the Native's Social World: Some Practical Methods Used in the Achievement of Adequate Ethnography', *Nexus*, 2(2): 12-25

Martin, A. & Lynch, M. (2009) 'Counting Things and People: The Practices and Politics of Counting', *Social Problems*, 56(2): 243-266

Maynard, D.W. & Schaeffer, N.C. (2000) 'Toward a Sociology of Social Scientific Knowledge: Survey Research and Ethnomethodology's Asymmetric Alternates', *Social Studies of Science*, 30(3): 323-370

Maynard, D.W., Houtkoop-Steenstra, H. Schaeffer, N.C. & van der Zouwen, J. (eds.) (2002) *Standardization and Tacit Knowledge: Interaction and Practice in the Survey Interview*, New York: Wiley

Maynard. D.W. (1996) 'From Paradigm to Prototype and Back Again: Interactive Aspects of 'Cognitive Processing' in Standardized Survey Interviews', pp. 65-88 in Schwarz, N., Sudman, S. (eds.) *Answering Questions: Methodology for Determining cognitive and Communicating Processes in Survey Research*, San Francisco: Jossey Bass

Maynard, D.W., Freese, J. & Schaeffer , N.C. (2011) 'Improving Response Rates in Telephone Interviews', pp. 54-74 in Antaki, C. (ed.) *Applied Conversation Analysis: Intervention and Change in Institutional Talk*, London: Palgrave Macmillan

Maynard, D.W. & Schaeffer, N.C. (1997) 'Keeping the Gate: Declinations of the Request to Participate in a Telephone Survey Interview', *Sociological Methods & Research*, 26(1): 34-79

Maynard, D.W. & Schaeffer, N.C. (2012) 'Conversation Analysis and Interaction in Standardized Survey Interviews', pp. 1048-1050 in Chapelle, C.A. (ed.) *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*, Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell

Mazeland, Harrie, Paul ten Have (1996) 'Essential Tensions in (Semi)Open Research Interviews', pp. 87-113 in Maso, I. & Wester, F. (eds.) *The Deliberate Dialogue: Qualitative Perspectives on the Interview*, Brussels: VUB University Press

McHoul, A.W. (1982) *Telling How Texts Talk: Essays on Reading and Ethnomethodology*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul

Moerman, M. (1969) 'A Little Knowledge', pp. 449-69 in Tyler, S. (ed.) *Cognitive Anthropology*, New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston

Moerman, M. (1988) *Talking Culture: Ethnography and Conversation Analysis*, Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press

Morrison, K. (1987) 'Stabilizing the Text: The Institutionalization of Knowledge in Historical and Philosophic Forms of Argument', *The Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 12(3): 242-274

Olszewski, B., Macey, D. & Lindstrom, L. (2007) 'The Practical Work of Coding: An Ethnomethodological Inquiry. *Human Studies* 29(3): 363-380

Peyrot, M. & Burns, S.L. (2001) 'Sociologists on Trial: Theoretical Competition and Juror Reasoning', *American Sociologist*, 32(4): 42-69

Pomerantz, A. & Zemel, A. (2003) 'Perspectives in Interviewers' Queries', pp. 215-231 in Berg, H.V.D., Wetherell, M. & Houtkoop-Steenstra, H. (eds.) *Analyzing Interviews on Racial Issues*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Rapley, T.J. (2001) 'The Art(fullness) of Open-Ended Interviewing: Some Considerations on Analysing Interviews', *Qualitative Research*, 1(3): 303-23

Rose, E.L. (1960) 'The English Record of a Natural Sociology', *American Sociological Review*, 25(2): 193-208

Rose, E.L. (1992) *The Werald*, Boulder, CL: The Waiting Room Press

Roulston, K. (2006) 'Close Encounters of The 'CA' Kind: A Review of Literature Analysing Talk in Research Interviews', *Qualitative Research*, 6(4): 515-534

Roulston, K. (2011) 'Interview 'Problems' as Topics for Analysis', *Applied Linguistics*, 32(1): 77-94

Roulston, K., DeMarrais, K. & Lewis, J.B. (2003) 'Learning to Interview in the Social Sciences', *Qualitative Inquiry*, 9(4): 643-668

Sacks, H. (1963) 'Sociological Description', *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, 8: 1-16

Sacks, H. (1992) *Lectures on Conversation*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Sacks, H. (1999) 'Max Weber's *Ancient Judaism*', *Theory, Culture & Society*, 16(1): 31-39

Schaeffer, N.C. (1991) 'Conversation with a Purpose – or Conversation? Interaction in the Standardized Survey', pp. 367-91 in Biemer, P.P, Groves, R.M., Lyberg, L.E., Mathiowetz, N.A. & Sudman, S. (eds.) *Measurement Errors in Surveys*, New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons

Schaeffer, N.C. & Maynard, D.W. (2005) 'From Paradigm to Prototype and Back Again: Interactive Aspects of 'Cognitive Processing' in Standardized Survey Interviews', pp. 114-133 in Molder, H.T & Potter, J. (eds.) *Conversation and Cognition*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Schaeffer, N.C. & Presser, S. (2003) 'The Science of Asking Questions', *Annual Review of Sociology*, 29: 65–88

Schegloff, E.A. (1988) 'Description in the Social Sciences I: Talk-in-Interaction', *IPRA Papers in Pragmatics*, 2: 1-24

Schegloff, E.A. (1999) 'On Sacks on Weber on Ancient Judaism: Introductory Notes and Interpretive Resources', *Theory, Culture & Society*, 16(1): 1-29

Sharrock, W.W. (1974) 'On Owning Knowledge', pp. 45-53 in Turner, R. (ed.) *Ethnomethodology*, Harmondsworth: Penguin

Sharrock, W.W. & Anderson, R.J. (1982) 'On the Demise of the Native: Some Observations on and a Proposal for Ethnography', *Human Studies*, 5(1): 119- 135

Sharrock, W.W. (2000) 'The Fundamentals of Ethnomethodology', pp. 249-259 in Smart, B. & Ritzer, G. (ed.) *Handbook of Sociological Theory*, London: Sage

Sormani, P. & Benninghof, M. (2008) 'Metaphorical Moves: 'Scientific Expertise' in Research Policy Studies', pp. 257-270 in Carver, T. & Pikalo, J. (eds.) *Political Language and Metaphor: Interpreting* and *Changing the World*, Abingdon: Routledge

Stax, H-P (2004) 'Paths to Precision: Probing Turn Format and Turn-Taking Problems in Standardized Interviews', *Discourse Studies*, 6(1): 77-94

Stoddart, K. (1986) 'The Presentation of Everyday Life: Some Textual Strategies for Adequate Ethnography', *Urban Life,* 15(1): 103-121

Suchman, L. & Jordan, B. (1990) 'Interactional Troubles in Face-to-Face Survey Interviews', *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 85(409): 232–241.

Turner, R. (ed.) (1974) *Ethnomethodology*, Harmondsworth: Penguin

Tutt, D. & Hindmarsh, J. (2011) 'Reenactments at Work: Demonstrating Conduct in Data Sessions', *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 44(3): 211-236

Watson, D.R. (2009) *Analysing Practical and Professional Texts: A Naturalistic Approach*, Farnham, Sussex: Ashgate

Wieder, D.L. (1974) *Language and Social Reality: The Case of Telling the Convict Code*, The Hague: Mouton

Weider, D.L. (1977) 'Ethnomethodology and Ethnosociology', *Mid-American Review of Sociology*, 2: 1-18

Wieder, D.L. (1980) 'Behavioristic Operationalism and the Lifeworld: Chimpanzees and Chimpanzee Researchers in Face-to-Face Interaction', *Sociological Inquiry*, 50(3/4): 75-103

Witzel, A. & Mey, G. (2004) ''I am NOT Opposed to Quantification or Formalization or Modelling, But Do Not Want to Pursue Quantitative Methods That Are Not Commensurate With the Research Phenomena Addressed": Aaron Cicourel in Conversation with Andreas Witzel and Günter Mey', *Forum: Qualitative Social Research/Sozialforschung*, 5(3): Article 41

Zimmerman, D.H. & Pollner, M. (1971) 'The Everyday World as a Phenomenon', pp. 80-103 in Douglas, J.D. (ed.) *Understanding Everyday Life: Towards a Reconstruction of Sociological Knowledge*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul

Zimmerman, D.H., & Wieder, D.L. (1977) ''You can't help but get stoned": Notes on the Social Organization of Marijuana Smoking', *Social Problems*, 25(2): 198-207

Anthropology

Barth, F. (2002) 'An Anthropology of Knowledge', *Current Anthropology*, 43(1): 1-18

Borofsky, R. (1997) 'Cook, Lono, Obeyesekere, and Sahlins', *Current Anthropology*, 38(2): 255-282

Borofsky, R. (2005) *Yanomami: The Fierce Controversy and What We Can Learn from It*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press

Boyer, D. (2005) 'Visiting Knowledge in Anthropology: An Introduction', *Ethnos*, 70(2): 141-148

Briggs, C.L. (1986) *Learning How to Ask: A Sociolinguistic Appraisal of the Role of the Interview in Social Science Research*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Briggs, C.L. (1993) 'Metadiscursive Practices and Scholarly Authority in Folkloristics', *The Journal of American Folklore*, 106(422): 387-434

Briggs, C.L. (2003) 'Interviewing, Power/Knowledge, and Social Inequality', pp. 243-254 in J.F. Gubrium & J.A. Holstein (eds.) *Postmodern Interviewing*, London: Sage

Briggs, C.L. (2007) 'The Gallup Poll, Democracy, and the Vox Populi: Ideologies of Interviewing and the Communicability of Modern Life', *Text & Talk*, 27(5-6): 681-704

Briggs, CL. & Bauman, R. (1992) 'Genre, Intertextuality and Social Power', *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 2(2): 131-72

Briggs, C.L. (2007) 'Anthropology, Interviewing, and Communicability in Contemporary Society', *Current Anthropology*, 48(4): 551-580

Bourdieu, P. (1977) *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Bourdieu, P. (1990) *The Logic of Practice*, Cambridge: Polity Press

Clifford, J. (1983) 'On Ethnographic Authority', *Representations*, 1(2): 118-146

Clifford, J. & Marcus, G.E. (eds.) (1986) *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*, Berkeley: University of California Press

Cobb, H., Harris, O.J.T., Jones, C. & Richardson, P. (2012) *Reconsidering Archaeological Fieldwork: Exploring On-Site Relationships Between Theory and Practice*, London: Springer

Cox, R. (2008) 'Wandering without Purpose: Auditory Journeys through History and Memory in Nagasaki', *Journeys, The International Journal of Travel & Travel Writing*, 9(2): 76-96

Cox, R. (2010) 'The Sound of Freedom: US Military Aircraft Noise in Okinawa, Japan', *Anthropology News*, 51(9): 13-14

Dauber, K. (1995) 'Bureaucratizing the Ethnographer's Magic', *Current Anthropology*, 36(1): 75-95

Edgeworth, M. (ed.) (2006) *Ethnographies of Archaeological Practice: Cultural Encounters, Material Transformations*, Lanham, MD: Rowman Altamira

Erlmann, V. (ed.) (2004) *Hearing Cultures: Essays on Sound, Listening and Modernity*, Oxford: Berg

Falzon, M.-A. (2009) *Multi-sited Ethnography: Theory, Praxis and Locality in Contemporary Research*, Farnham: Ashgate

Faubion, J.D. & Marcus, G.E. (2009) *Fieldwork is Not what it Used to Be: Learning Anthropology's Method in a Time of Transition*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press

Forte, M.C. (2011) 'The Human Terrain System and Anthropology: A Review of Ongoing Public Debates', *American Anthropologist*, 113(1): 149-153

Freeman, D., Orans, M. & Côté, J.E. (2000) 'Sex and Hoax in Samoa', *Current Anthropology*, 41(4): 609-622

Geertz, C. (1973) *The Interpretation of Cultures*, New York, NY: Basic Books

Grasseni, C. (ed.) (2007) *Skilled Visions: Between Apprenticeship and Standards*, New York, NY: Berghahn Books

Gupta, A. & Ferguson, J. (eds.) (1997) *Anthropological Locations: Boundaries and Grounds of a Field Science*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Halstead, N., Hirsch, E. & Okely, J. (2008) *Knowing How to Know: Fieldwork and the Ethnographic Present*, Oxford: Berghahn Books

Hamilakis, Y. (2011) 'Archaeological Ethnography: A Multitemporal Meeting Ground for Archaeology and Anthropology', *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 40: 399-414

Hamilakis, Y. & Anagnostopoulos, A. (2009) 'What is Archaeological Ethnography?', *Public Archaeology*, 8(2/3): 65-87

Heider, K.G. (1988) 'The Rashomon Effect: When Ethnographers Disagree', *American Anthropologist*, 90(1): 73-81

Heider, K.G. (1989) 'Reply to Freeman and Rhoades', *American Anthropologist*, 91(2): 450

Herzfeld, M. (1983) 'Looking Both Ways: The Ethnographer in the Text', *Semiotica*, 46(2/4): 151-166

Freeman, D. (1989) 'Comment on Heider's "The Rashomon Effect"', *American Anthropologist*, 91(1): 169-171

Irons, J.W. (2009) *A Moment in Archaeology, A Reflexive Examination of the Culture of Meaning-Making in Archaeological Fieldwork*, Unpublished Thesis, Indianapolis, IN: Butler University

Kratz, C.A. (2010) 'In and Out of Focus', *American Ethnologist*, 37(4): 805-826

Löfgren, O. (1990) 'The Danger of Knowing What You Are Looking For: On Routinizing Research', *Ethnologia Scandinavica*, 20: 3-18

Löfgren, O. (2013) 'Routinising Research: Academic Skills in Analogue and Digital Worlds', *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, DOI: 10.1080/13645579.2014.854022

Macdonald, J. (2000) 'The Tikopia and "What Raymond Said"', pp. 107-123 in Jaarsma, S.R. & Rohatynskyj, M.A. (eds.) *Ethnographic Artifacts: Challenges to a Reflexive Anthropology*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Marcus, G.E. (1980) 'The Ethnographic Subject as Ethnographer: A Neglected Dimension of Anthropological Research', *The Rice University Studies*, 66(1): 55-68

Marcus, G.E. (1995) 'Ethnography in/of the World System: The Emergence of Multi-Sited Ethnography', *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 24: 95-117

Marcus, G.E. & Cushman, D. (1982) 'Ethnographies as Texts', *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 11: 25-69

Marcus, G.E. & Fischer, M.M.J. (1986) *Anthropology as Cultural Critique: An Experimental Moment in the Human Sciences*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press

Marcus, G.E. & Okeley, J. (2007) 'How Short Can Fieldwork Be?', *Social Anthropology/Anthropologie Sociale*, 15(3): 353-367

Mills, D. (2008) *Difficult Folk? A Political History of Social Anthropology*, Oxford: Berghahn Books

Mills, D. (2011) 'Have We Ever Taught Anthropology? A Hidden History of Disciplinary Pedagogy', *Teaching Anthropology*, 1(1): 12-20

Mills, D. & Ratcliffe, R. (2013) 'After Method? Ethnography in the Knowledge Economy', *Qualitative Research*, 12(2): 147-164

Miner, H. (1956) 'Body Ritual among the Nacirema', *American Anthropologist*, 58(3): 503-507

Morton, C. (2004) 'The Anthropologist as Photographer: Reading the Monograph and Reading the Archive', *Visual Anthropology*, 18(4): 389-405

Morton, C. (ed.) (2009) *Photography, Anthropology and History: Expanding the Frame*, Farnham: Ashgate

Okely, J. (2013) *Anthropological Practice: Fieldwork and the Ethnographic Method*, London: Bloomsbury

Orans, M. (1996) *Not Even Wrong: Margaret Mead, Derek Freeman, and the Samoans*, Novato, CA: Chandler & Sharp

Rabinow, P. (1977) *Reflections on Fieldwork in Morocco*, London: University of California Press

Rabinow, P. (1996) *Essays on the Anthropology of Reason*, Princeton: Princeton University Press

Rabinow, P. & Stavrianakis, A. (2013) *Demands of the Day: On the Logic of Anthropological Inquiry*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press

Rhoades, J.D. (1989) 'The "Rashomon Effect" Reconsidered', *American Anthropologist*, 91(1): 171

Rosaldo, R. (1987) 'Where Objectivity Lies: The Rhetoric of Anthropology', pp. 87-110 in Nelson, J., Megill, A. & McCloskey, D. (eds.) *The Rhetoric of the Human Sciences*, Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press

Rosaldo, R. (1989) *Culture and Truth: The Remaking of Social Analysis*, Boston, MA: Beacon Press

Ryzewski, K. (2012) 'Multiply Situated Strategies? Multi-Sited Ethnography and Archaeology', *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory*, 19(2): 241-268

Sahlins, M. (2013a) 'The National Academy of Sciences: Goodbye to all that', *Anthropology Today*, 29(2): 1-2

Sahlins, M. (2013b) 'Human Science', *London Review of Books*, 35(9): 29

Samuels, K. (2011) 'Field Work: Constructing Archaeological and Ethnographic Intersections', *Cambridge Archaeological Journal*, 21(1): 152-156

Sangren, P.S. (2007) 'Anthropology of Anthropology? Further Reflections on Reflexivity', *Anthropology Today*, 23(4): 13-16

Schaffer, S. (1994) 'From Physics to Anthropology: And Back Again', *Prickly Pear Pamphlet Number 3*, London: Prickly Pear Press

Strathern, M. (ed.) (2000) *Audit Cultures: Anthropological Studies in Accountability, Ethics and the Academy*, London: Routledge

Watson, M.C. (2012) 'Staged Discovery and the Politics of Maya Hieroglyphic Things', *American Anthropologist*, 114(2): 282-296

Williams, M.D. (2002) *The Ethnography of an Anthropology Department (1959-1979): An Academic Village*. New York, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press

Williams, S. (1993) 'Abjection and Anthropological Praxis', *Anthropological Quarterly*, 66(2): 67-75

Williams, S. (1997) 'Ethnographic Fetishism or Cyborg Anthropology? Human Scientists, Rebellious Rats, and their Mazes at El Delirio and in the Land of the Long White Cloud', pp. 165-191 in Downey, G.L. & Dumit, J. (eds.) *Cyborgs & Citadels: Anthropological Interventions in Emerging Sciences and Technologies*, Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press

Wolbert, B. (2000) 'The Anthropologist as Photographer: The Visual Construction of Ethnographic Authority', *Visual Anthropology*, 13(4): 321-343

Mixed Methods

Bergman, M. (2008) *Advances in Mixed Methods Research: Theories and Applications*, London: Sage

Brannen, J. (2009) 'Prologue: Mixed Methods for Novice Researchers: Reflections and Themes', *International Journal of Multiple Research Approaches*, 3(1): 8-12

Bryman, A. (1988) *Quantity and Quality in Social Research*, London: Unwin Hyman.

Bryman, A. (2006) 'Paradigm Peace and the Implications for Quality', *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 9(2): 111-126

Bryman, A. (2007) 'Barriers to Integrating Quantitative and Qualitative Research', *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1(1): 8-22

Creswell, J.W. (2009) 'Editorial: Mapping the Field of Mixed Methods Research', *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 3(2): 95-108

Creswell, J.W. & Garrett, A.L. (2008) 'The "Movement" of Mixed Methods Research and the Role of Educators', *South African Journal of Education*, 28: 321-333

Freshwater, D. (2007) 'Reading Mixed Methods Research: Contexts for Criticism', *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1(2): 134-146

Greene, J.C., Caracelli, V.J., & Graham, W.F. (1989) 'Toward a Conceptual Framework for Mixed-Method Evaluation Designs', *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 11: 255-274

Hammersley, M. (1996) 'The Relationship between Qualitative and Quantitative Research: Paradigm Loyalty versus Methodological Eclecticism', pp. 159-174 in

Richardson, J.T.E. (ed.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research Methods for Psychology and the Social Sciences*, Leicester: BPS Books

Hart, L.C., Smith, S.Z., Swars, S.L & Smith, M.E. (2009) 'An Examination of Research Methods in Mathematics Education (1995-2005)', *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 3(1): 26-41

Johnson, R.B., Onwuegbuzie, A.J. & Turner, L.A. (2007) 'Toward a Definition of Mixed Methods Research', *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1(2): 112-133

Mason, J. (2011) 'Facet Methodology: The Case for an Inventive Research Orientation', *Methodological Innovations Online*, 6(3): 75-92

May, V. & Burke, H. (2010) 'Practical Considerations for Leading and Working on a Mixed Methods Project', *Realities Toolkit 11*, Morgan Centre, University of Manchester

Molina-Azorín, J. (2009) 'Understanding how Mixed Methods Research is undertaken within a Specific Research Community: The Case of Business Studies', *International Journal of Multiple Research Approaches*, 3(1): 47-57

Niglas, K. (2009) 'How the Novice Researcher Can Make Sense of Mixed Methods Designs', *International Journal of Multiple Research Approaches*, 3(1): 34-46

O'Cathain, A., Murphy, E. & Nicholl, J. (2007) 'Integration and Publications as Indicators of "Yield" From Mixed Methods Studies', *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1(2): 147-163

O'Cathain, A., Murphy, E. & Nicholl, J. (2008) 'The Quality of Mixed Methods Studies in Health Services Research', *Journal of Health Service Research Policy*, 13: 92-98

Plano Clark, V.L. (2010) 'The Adoption and Practice of Mixed Methods: U.S. Trends in Federally Funded Health-Related Research', *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16(6): 428-440

Pluye, P., Grad, R.M., Levine, A. & Nicolau, B. (2009) 'Understanding Divergence of Quantitative and Qualitative Data (or Results) in Mixed Methods Studies', *International Journal of Multiple Research Approaches*, 3(1): 58-72

Sandelowski, M. (2001) 'Real Qualitative Researchers Do Not Count: The Use of Numbers in Qualitative Research', *Research in Nursing & Health*, 24(3): 230-240

Sandelowski, M. (2003) 'Tables or Tableaux? The Challenges of Writing and Reading Mixed Methods Studies', pp. 321-350 in Tashakkori, A. & Teddlie, C. (eds.) *Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social and Behavioral Research*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Sandelowski, M. & Barroso, J. (2002) 'Reading Qualitative Studies', *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 1(1): Article 5

Sandelowski, M., Barroso, J. & Voils, C.I. (2007) 'Using Qualitative Metasummary to Synthesize Qualitative and Quantitative Descriptive Findings', *Research in Nursing & Health*, 30(1): 99–111

Sandelowski, M., Voils, C.I. & Barroso, J. (2006) 'Defining and Designing Mixed Research Synthesis Studies', Research in the Schools 13(1): 29-40

Sandelowski, M., Voils, C.I., Barroso, J. & Lee, E-J. (2008) '"Distorted Into Clarity": A Methodological Case Study Illustrating the Paradox of Systematic Review', *Research in Nursing & Health*, 31(5): 454-465

Sandelowski, M., Voils, C.I. & Knafl, G. (2009) 'On Quantitizing', *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 3(3): 208-222

Sandelowski, M., Voils, C.I., Leeman, J. & Crandell, J.L. (2012) 'Mapping the Mixed Methods-Mixed Research Synthesis Terrain', *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 6(4): 317-331

Tashakkori, A. & Teddlie, C. (2010) 'Putting the Human Back in "Human Research Methodology": The Researcher in Mixed Methods Research', *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 4(4): 271-277

Teddlie, C. & Tashakkori, A. (2006) 'A General Typology of Research Designs Featuring Mixed Methods', *Research in the Schools*, 13(1): 12-28