ANNUAL REVIEWS

*Annual Review of Sociology*

# Ethnography, Data Transparency, and the Information Age

Alexandra K. Murphy,[1] Colin Jerolmack,[2] and DeAnna Smith[1]

[1]Department of Sociology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109, USA; email: murphyal@umich.edu

[2]Department of Sociology, New York University, New York, NY 10012, USA

Annu. Rev. Sociol. 2021. 47:41–61

First published as a Review in Advance on April 6, 2021

The *Annual Review of Sociology* is online at soc.annualreviews.org

https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-090320-124805



## Keywords

ethnography, methodology, technology, transparency, replication, reanalysis, data sharing

## Abstract

The conventions ethnographers follow to gather, write about, and store their data are increasingly out of sync with contemporary research expectations and social life. Despite technological advancements that allow ethnographers to observe their subjects digitally and record interactions, few follow subjects online and many still reconstruct quotes from memory. Amid calls for data transparency, ethnographers continue to conceal subjects' identities and keep fieldnotes private. But things are changing. We review debates, dilemmas, and innovations in ethnography that have arisen over the past two decades in response to new technologies and calls for transparency. We focus on emerging conversations around how ethnographers record, collect, anonymize, verify, and share data. Considering the replication crisis in the social sciences, we ask how ethnographers can enable others to reanalyze their findings. We address ethical implications and offer suggestions for how ethnographers can develop standards for transparency that are consistent with their commitment to their subjects and interpretive scholarship.

## INTRODUCTION

Ethnographers are facing a reckoning over the long-standing conventions they follow to gather, write about, and store their data. In part, this reckoning has been brought on by massive changes in technology that have dramatically remade social life and transformed the tools ethnographers have at their disposal to conduct their research. The ubiquity of smartphones, the internet, and social media has introduced new challenges to how ethnographers have traditionally maintained the anonymity of their participants. Moreover, although people are increasingly documenting their lives and forging community online, many ethnographers continue to center their analyses on place-based, face-to-face interaction. Additionally, ethnographers have been reticent to turn on their own phone cameras or recorders: Most still reconstruct scenes and quotes from jottings after exiting the field.

Perhaps to a greater extent, however, this reckoning has been brought on by growing calls from those outside and within the academy for greater data transparency among ethnographers. Journalists, lawyers, and others who have different practices around maintaining confidentiality of sources, fact-checking, and the preservation of data (e.g., Forman 2014, Lubet 2018) have increasingly demanded to know exactly how ethnographers carry out their work—and why. Demands for transparency from outside the social sciences seem to occur when ethnographies reach a wide public audience (e.g., Venkatesh 2008, Goffman 2014, Desmond 2017). In this arena, journalistic standards of disclosing names of people and places, fact-checking, and data sharing prevail, so ethnographic conventions (e.g., deidentifying people and places and shielding or destroying fieldnotes) arouse suspicion that the researcher may have something to hide (Kaminer 2012, Singal 2015). Within the social sciences, demands for data transparency are coming, in part, from a broad movement to promote open science through the sharing of data, code, and publications (Nosek et al. 2015, Natl. Acad. Sci. Eng. Med. 2018). Calls for transparency are also the result of a replication crisis in the social sciences, which has prompted quantitative researchers to scrutinize everything from model selection to the definition of statistical significance (Freese & Peterson 2017, Benjamin et al. 2018, Young 2018) and rehash perennial debates about the replicability or representativeness of ethnographic research (e.g., Cohen 2015, Sharkey 2015).

Given the growing recognition that the advancement of social science hinges upon scholars being more transparent, funders like the National Science Foundation are increasingly requiring grantees to make their data publicly available in repositories (Tornow et al. 2020). More and more journals are making data sharing a requirement for publication (Herndon & O'Reilly 2016, Crosas et al. 2018). And both the American Sociological Association and the American Anthropological Association, whose members include many ethnographers, have embraced the idea that data sharing should be a "regular practice" (Am. Anthropol. Assoc. 2004; Am. Sociol. Assoc. 2018, p. 16). In this context, ethnographers who insist that standards of replication and verification cannot and should not apply to their work (Tsai et al. 2016), and that ethics prevents them from sharing their data or disclosing the names of the people and places they study, are being greeted with greater skepticism.

This is not the first time that ethnographers have faced a reckoning. When postmodernism and postcolonial theory swept across the social sciences, the myth that ethnographers were "flies on the wall" who produced objective accounts of the communities they studied was exploded (Clifford & Marcus 1986, Mascia-Lees et al. 1989). Ethnographers were also forced to grapple with the exploitative nature of their enterprise (e.g., Bourgois 1996, Duneier 1999), which often involved privileged white people studying marginalized people of color. As Timmermans (2019, p. 265) points out, this reflexive turn created "vigorous exchanges" among ethnographers "aiming to define good ethnography, including the use of ethnographic evidence." One result of these exchanges was that a new standard emerged whereby ethnographers were expected to account for their positionality in the field (Abu-Lughod 2008, Van Maanen 2011). Although there is variation in how ethnographers practice reflexivity, a common approach is to include a methodological appendix where the author explains how they entered the field, built relations, interpreted findings, and accounted for their own subjectivity (e.g., Lacy 2007, Rios 2011, Calarco 2018, Clerge 2019).

This first reckoning is far from over. As Small (2015, p. 352) observes, contemporary ethnographies of "poor urban people," many of which are written by privileged, white "outsiders," routinely incite "accusations of stereotyping, misrepresentation, sensationalism, and even cashing in on the problems of the poor." Meanwhile, ethnographers who are "insiders" of historically marginalized groups have voiced concern about having their own research delegitimized as unscientific "me-search" (Hoang 2015, pp. 20–21) while the work of their white counterparts is celebrated. Relatedly, some ethnographers critique the androcentric epistemological foundations of the method, which create little space for acknowledging issues like sexual harassment and assault in the field (e.g., Hanson & Richards 2019).

The continued reverberations of this first reckoning have fed into what might be called the second reckoning. Public debates regarding ethnographies of historically marginalized communities—brought on by journalists, activists, and scholars of color, among others—have called attention to how ethnography is practiced as a scientific method (e.g., Sharpe 2014, Budd 2016, Lewis-Kraus 2016, Autry 2020). In these discussions, long-standing critiques at the heart of the first reckoning regarding research ethics, power, and representation intersect with a newer set of criticisms aimed at time-honored ethnographic practices regarding subjects' confidentiality and strategies of data verification (Reyes 2019). This is especially the case as the drift of social life onto online platforms makes it harder for ethnographers to insulate their subjects and research settings from their audiences.

Although changes in technology are not necessarily related to growing demands for data transparency, in the current moment these two trends are conspiring to challenge long-standing ethnographic conventions. In the wake of this second reckoning, it is not yet clear what—if any—new standards around the gathering, writing, and sharing of data will arise. In this article, we review how—and to what extent—ethnographers are rethinking conventions related to their research and writing in response to new technologies and new expectations regarding data transparency.

While ethnographers have many audiences for whom they write, one important audience is the scholarly community. Accordingly, we focus our review on conventions that bear upon the ethnographer's ability to meet this community's expectation that ethnographies contribute to cumulative social science. In quantitative research, replication and reproducibility are the gold standards for judging whether scholarship contributes to cumulative social science. But we suspect that many, if not all, ethnographers would agree with Freese & Peterson's (2017, p. 159) remark that "replication is simply the wrong language to apply to qualitative studies." After all, each ethnography is a snapshot of a vanished moment in time as captured from the distinct perspective (or bias) of the researcher. Likewise, we also suspect that many ethnographers would agree with Tsai et al. (2016) that, given the highly interpretive and personal nature of fieldnotes and the process of data analysis, reproducibility is not attainable in ethnography either. At the same time, most sociological ethnographers strive to deliver a "reasonably reliable rendering of the social world" (Duneier 2011, p. 2) that is not a product of the researcher's positionality alone. The fact that ethnography cannot be replicated or reproduced in the same way that quantitative research can does not mean that it should be immune to calls for greater transparency—quite the opposite. Transparency is crucial for meeting what we think should be the standard by which to judge whether an ethnography contributes to theory building and the accumulation of empirical knowledge about the social world: reanalysis.

Scholars engage in reanalysis whenever they marshal any and all available data to independently evaluate an ethnographer's interpretations and consider alternative explanations. Reanalysis can take the form of in-person revisits (Burawoy 2003) to the original site to study how differences across researchers or over time change a study's findings. Alternatively, reanalysis can entail a comparison of ethnographic findings to large-*n* data sets (cf. Browning et al. 2006, Brayne 2014, Small et al. 2018), other primary sources (Duneier 2006), or ostensibly similar historical or ethnographic cases to gauge theoretical generalizability or empirical representativeness. Reanalysis can also involve the interrogation of ethnographic findings through a secondary analysis of an ethnographer's fieldnotes.

We focus our review on conventions in four areas of the research and writing process that can inhibit transparency and, in turn, reanalysis: recording and collecting data, anonymizing, data verification, and data sharing. Where applicable, we show the role that technology is playing in ethnographers' rethinking of these conventions. We document the debates and dilemmas that are surfacing as a result of these responses, especially as they pertain to ethnographers' ethical obligation to their participants. Though individual ethnographers have responded to the second reckoning in different ways, in this review we ask: How might ethnographers think about a field-level response? In this vein, we offer suggestions for how the field could think about developing new standards for transparency in each of these areas that are consistent with our commitment to both our participants and interpretive scholarship. We make these suggestions humbly. These are not standards we have always followed ourselves. We also recognize that there are many reasons that ethnographers may not be able to adopt some of these standards, ranging from institutional barriers to the subject and population of study, something we discuss throughout the review.

## RECORDING AND COLLECTING DATA

Constrained by the technologies of their time, ethnographers relied almost exclusively on handwritten fieldnotes for the better part of the twentieth century. Concerned that conspicuous note-taking would compromise relationships in the field and alter participants' behavior, ethnographers routinely wrote down observations only in private spaces out of the sight of their participants, such as the bathroom (Cahill et al. 1985), or relied entirely on memory to reconstruct interactions after leaving the field (e.g., Gans 1965, Stack 1974, Anderson 1978).

Much has changed since then. Dramatic technological advances provide ethnographers with a range of tools to record data in real time in relatively unobtrusive ways. Consider, for example, the tape recorder. First mentioned in sociological literature in 1951, the use of tape recorders in the past was constrained by their bulk (Lee 2004). But these days, audio recorders are small. They are also built into smartphones, whose ubiquity allows ethnographers to record interactions in real time without bringing much attention to themselves or altering the behavior of their participants. When Duneier (1999) used a tape recorder to document the interactions of unhoused Black street vendors in Greenwich Village in New York City, he noted that after a few days the vendors stopped being aware of its presence. Desmond (2017, p. 19) had a similar experience using a digital recorder in his study of evictions, writing that landlords and tenants got used to his notepad and recorder "the same way you grow used to a friend's cigarettes as she repeatedly lights up."

Video cameras that are either handheld or built into smartphones are a second technological advancement that enables ethnographers to unobtrusively record data in real time. Reviewing the use of video cameras in ethnography, Jones & Raymond (2012, p. 113) note that "[s]ystematic study of video data over the years. . .has confirmed that people do not fundamentally alter what they are doing when they know the camera is present." This was Lee's (2016) experience using a video camera to record rap ciphers in Los Angeles, which he found enhanced the quality of his ethnographic data significantly. Lee observed that his notes lacked the specific colloquialisms, dialogue, and give-and-take that are the scaffolding of interaction. In contrast, video recordings allowed him to capture "a raw account of an unfolding interaction," including its nonverbal and spatial dimensions (Lee 2016, p. 232). Videotaping enabled new insights that would not have been possible to produce from fieldnotes alone, especially regarding the interactional norms of the rap cipher.

The use of an audio recorder for formal interviews has become standard among ethnographers, and ethnographers seem to be increasingly using their smartphones to take detailed notes in real time (e.g., Hoang 2015, Besbris 2020). Nonetheless, the use of smartphones, audio recorders, and video cameras to record situated interactions has not yet become common practice (but see Katz 2001; Bourgois 1996, 2009). The "small notepad" continues to take center stage within ethnographic texts and appendices (Benzecry 2011, Meadow 2018). Ethnographers have also continued to follow the convention of writing down jottings, "nip[ping] to the toilet" (Walford 2009, p. 124) or "dash[ing] into an empty office room" (Desmond 2009, p. 293) to record their observations in secret so as not to disrupt behavior or "plant seeds of distrust" (Emerson et al. 2011, p. 36), filling in their notes long after they leave the field. The one exception seems to be in medical sociology, where "an emerging standard is to audio or, preferably, video record patient-doctor interactions" (Timmermans 2019, p. 265).

Perhaps the reliance on old conventions for recording data should not be surprising. As Murthy (2008, p. 839) points out, ethnographers have always been resistant to adopting new data collection technologies, "mock[ing]" tape recorders in the 1950s and "scrutin[izing]" the use of photographs in the 1970s. Lee (2016, p. 229) makes a similar observation in regard to the adoption of video cameras, writing that the reluctance to use video cameras seems, in part, to come out of a sense that this is simply not "what we [ethnographers] do."

Yet being resistant to change does not seem to be a good reason to avoid tools that have the potential to produce higher-quality data. While some ethnographers claim they have developed mental tricks for reconstructing interactions with great accuracy (e.g., Sanchez-Jankowski 2016), the fallibility of human memory has been well documented (Schacter 1999). Moreover, smartphones have become such a pervasive presence in the lives of most people that expectations of privacy have changed (Turkle 2011). With so many of our research subjects using their phones to take pictures, send text messages, and even livestream everyday interactions, it seems harder to justify the convention of relying on clandestine pen-and-paper jottings by claiming that using a phone for real-time note-taking and recording would disrupt the social setting.

Of course, the value of ethnographic data cannot be reduced to the exact words that people utter, or to how a social situation captured on video unfolds. There is much an ethnographer can learn about social phenomena only by becoming fully immersed physically and emotionally in a setting alongside their subjects. Regarding his ethnography of palliative care, Roi Livne (personal communication, Oct. 23, 2020) points out that, in sitting at the bedsides of those who were dying, few words were spoken and yet deep meanings and feelings were conveyed; the atmosphere, as he understood it, was not something that could be captured on video. There is likely no substitute for traditional, long-form fieldnotes, which convey moods, interpretations, and actions that would otherwise unfold outside the narrow frame of the camera; link past and present; and allow ethnographers to hash out their hypotheses and flesh out descriptions. Rather, we suggest that using audio recorders or setting up stationary video recorders when feasible may free up ethnographers to more fully become participants in their fieldsite or focus their observations on precisely the aspects of social life that cannot be so easily captured by recording technologies (because researchers are no longer burdened with the task of either trying to write down everything being said in real time or remembering and then reconstructing dialogue), while ensuring that important dialogue is rendered as accurately as possible.

We acknowledge that the use of recording technologies may be less welcome by subjects in certain settings (e.g., Desmond 2009) and more damaging to efforts to build rapport [such as with vulnerable populations and people engaged in illegal behavior (e.g., Hoang 2015)]. The use of these devices may also be prohibited in certain institutional settings (e.g., prisons) or restricted by state or international laws. Lastly, there may be certain settings where the ethnographer does not think it appropriate to record situated interactions (e.g., the intimacy of the domestic sphere). It certainly may not be possible, or advisable, then, to use such technologies in every study. However, given that using widely available recording technologies would in many cases improve data quality, and that more of our subjects are utilizing these same technologies to publicly share intimate moments of their lives online, ethnographers should give more consideration to using them in their own work where appropriate. At the very least, ethnographers who do not use audio recording or videotaping should be more transparent around how and why they made such a decision.

Ethnographers should also, some scholars suggest, be more transparent around the sources of data they use to produce their quotes, especially given the significant differences in accuracy between data recorded verbatim versus recorded by hand in real time versus reconstructed from memory hours later. After all, meaning is often bound up in specific grammar, syntax, and word choice (Duneier 1999). One approach is that taken by Duneier (1999), who reserved the use of double quotation marks exclusively for speech that was audio recorded; speech reconstructed from his notes was not demarcated. Another approach is to use double quotation marks around utterances that were audio recorded and single quotation marks around interactions and conversations that were reconstructed from fieldnotes (Jerolmack 2013, Livne 2019). Though Goffman (2009) did not use a tape recorder at all during her fieldwork, she distinguished when she wrote down something that someone said in the moment and when she reconstructed what was said after the fact, using double quotations only for the former. It seems to us that the use of double quotation marks for only those utterances that have been recorded verbatim or, at the very least, written down in real time is a reasonable standard for ethnographers to follow. Alternatively, if ethnographers cannot or choose not to adopt this standard, they should justify that decision and make clear to readers why we should have faith in the veracity of a reconstructed quote (e.g., Tavory 2016).[1]

Aside from changing how ethnographers record data, technology is also changing the types of data that ethnographers can collect. Whereas handwritten fieldnotes used to constitute the totality of an ethnographer's data set, today ethnographic data can include text messages, social media posts, and emails between the ethnographer and her participants (Lee 2016, Khan 2019, Levine 2021). Additionally, as much of social life has moved online, real-life interactions increasingly unfold on social media platforms like TikTok, Twitter, and YouTube, where ethnographers can view, tag, and respond to them just like any other follower.

While an increasing number of people are documenting their lives online and forging community through online platforms, most ethnographers continue to center their analyses on place-based, face-to-face interaction. As Lane (2018, p. 169) writes, most ethnographers have "bracketed off" digital communication as outside the limits of ethnography. This, he argues, is "ethnographic

[1] Such efforts to be transparent around the veracity of quotes are aligned with Mose Brown & de Casanova's (2014, p. 220) call for greater transparency around how ethnographers "alter, embellish, or clean-up" their participants' language, especially when their participants speak "socially devalued dialects." As they argue, few ethnographers who study marginalized Black communities discuss how they chose to render their participants' speech, with implications for the ethics of representation (but see Bourgois 1996, Pattillo 2013, Mojola 2014).

negligence," given the sheer volume of interactions that now occur digitally (p. 170). Studying what people do online is important not only because social life is increasingly digital and thus a space worthy of study but also because interactions online structure interactions offline, and vice versa. As Lane's "digital urban ethnography" of Harlem youth demonstrates, it is impossible to understand their involvement in violence or other phenomena of sociological interest with face-to-face observations alone.

Given the centrality of the internet to people's social lives, ethnographers would be remiss in leaving the study of online interactions to communications scholars. It may be the case that more ethnographers follow their participants online or are engaged in text and email exchanges with people in the field than we realize. If so, ethnographers should be more transparent about the myriad ways they interact with and get to know their participants, for even if tweets or text messages do not appear in an ethnographer's writings, such information likely shapes their interpretations of their subjects and the field. The COVID-19 pandemic seems to have made ethnographers, out of necessity, more open to studying technologically mediated interaction (Fine & Abramson 2020, Hidalgo & Khan 2020). As the field begins to embrace digital ethnography, it will be important to distinguish whether quotes come from digital communication or from face-to-face dialogue.



## ANONYMIZING

Ethnographers are ethically obliged to ensure that their participants experience minimal harm from participating in research. To protect participants from being humiliated or punished, ethnographers routinely promise to keep participants' identities confidential. However, because assigning pseudonyms is usually not enough to ensure confidentiality, many ethnographers also mask or change what they consider to be small details about people, places, or key events (Van Cleve 2016); the date that certain events occurred (Goffman 2014); or the citations of public sources relied upon (Sherman 2009). Some even combine characteristics and experiences of participants to build composite characters (Ralph 2014) or portray a single participant as multiple characters in their texts (e.g., Venkatesh 2008, Pacewicz 2016). These techniques of anonymization remove and alter details about the people and places ethnographers study. Nonetheless, the scientific community has generally found them acceptable. Interested in the generalizable aspects of a case, readers deem such details idiosyncratic and thus insignificant.

Extensive masking, however, has not always sufficiently protected participants' anonymity (e.g., Boelen 1992, Scheper-Hughes 2000, Stein 2010). The internet has made the task of maintaining confidentiality even more difficult (Tilley & Woodthorpe 2011, Shklovski & Vertesi 2013, Reich 2015). For example, although Kulz (2017) assigned pseudonyms to the name of the school, borough, and participants in her ethnography of an English academy, Walford (2018, p. 519) "was able to identify the name of the school simply by selecting just three words from the blurb and putting them into Google!" Additionally, as ethnographers increasingly interact with their participants in online spaces, they are being tagged in photos, tweeted at, and having their Facebook walls commented on by their participants—all of which is visible to, at a minimum, everyone in the ethnographer's and participant's social networks. Sometimes participants take to social media, blogs, or even Amazon ratings to identify themselves and other participants in very public ways (Walford 2018). As Bosk & De Vries (2004, p. 254) write, "We can do nothing. . .to stop a figure in an ethnographic narrative from identifying himself or herself, or to prevent an institution from coming forward and saying, 'We are 'made-up-ville.'"

Jerolmack & Murphy [2019 (2017)] argue that anonymization also involves significant social scientific trade-offs. For one, anonymizing can deprive the scholarly community of the "sociologically significant information" necessary to independently explore alternative explanations (p. 803).

Decisions around what and how to anonymize are inherently theoretical decisions (Nespor 2000). What the ethnographer might consider to be an "inconsequential" (Khan 2011, p. 203) identifier, like gender or age, may actually be quite significant to certain readers (e.g., Bosk 2008). Anonymization can also hinder the scholarly community's ability to determine what to "generalize a[n] [ethnographic] case to" [Jerolmack & Murphy 2019 (2017), p. 811]. This is especially true for ethnographies of places and organizations. For instance, through anonymization, "a particular school in a particular town or neighborhood studied at a particular historical moment can be treated as if it were a placeless, timeless, representative instance of school" (Nespor 2000, p. 551; see also Small 2009a). As a result, it is nearly impossible to know what kinds of schools or communities might be directly comparable to the one in question. As Murphy & Jerolmack (2016) point out, this also makes it difficult for scholars who might have contradictory findings to understand exactly why their findings differ. Perhaps most problematic is that anonymization makes it difficult to conduct ethnographic, archival, virtual, and quantitative reanalysis of ethnographic sites. Jerolmack (2021) found that Milofsky's (2008) earlier ethnography of the same town he was studying—Williamsport, Pennsylvania—was of limited use to him in understanding how fracking had changed the town over time. Milofsky had hidden or altered so many details of civic leaders, nonprofits, and other organizations that Jerolmack was often unable to compare his findings of these same people and organizations with Milofsky's.

Given the scientific trade-offs that result from anonymization and the increasing difficulties of ensuring confidentiality, Jerolmack & Murphy [2019 (2017)] conclude that disclosure, not anonymization, should be the default convention within ethnography. While recognizing that "there are many instances in which disclosure is not possible" (p. 802), they argue that by starting from a place of presumed disclosure, ethnographers would be compelled to confront how decisions around anonymization are inherently theoretical and to make transparent how they navigated the ethical and scientific trade-offs of anonymization.

In response, some ethnographers have endorsed the idea of disclosure as default. Timmermans (2019, p. 265) writes that "as a blanket methodological habit, layered anonymization has impoverished ethnographic research" (see also Lubet 2018). But others have pushed back against disclosure. Some scholars argue that, despite the many cases where confidentiality has been broken, anonymization is important because it provides participants with plausible deniability (Bosk 2008, Pacewicz 2016, Reyes 2018). Others argue that anonymity is necessary to gain access to certain fieldsites and establish trust (Reyes 2018). [We note that there are sociologists who have been able to access all kinds of sites without promising anonymity—including organizations and corporations (e.g., Zaloom 2006, Marwell 2007, Ho 2009, Brayne 2020).] Concerns have also been raised about whether disclosure as default would "exacerbate the exploitation of poor and perhaps minority and other underrepresented" participants who might be more willing to be named than "those who have higher education and money" because they may not understand the "unintended consequences that come with being named in academic research" (Reyes 2018, p. 211). Finally, ethnographers continue to express concern that disclosure would harm their participants because it would tie them to potentially sensitive or embarrassing information (e.g., Seim 2020). [We note that even when participants' identities are anonymized, there is evidence that some participants still experience harm when they feel like the ethnographer has stripped them of their full humanity in the service of social analysis (e.g., Scheper-Hughes 2000, Lareau 2011, Rhoads 2020).]

Perhaps the strongest pushback against the idea of disclosure as default has come from ethnographers who study people engaged in crime and violence among vulnerable populations. Contreras (2019), who has studied Dominican drug robbers in the South Bronx and Mexican Maravilla gangs in East Los Angeles, writes that for those studying dangerous contexts, participants might be tortured, killed, or arrested by the police if their identities or specific locations are disclosed. He also states that the researcher himself may be threatened by his participants. Stuart (2020, p. 210) echoes this sentiment in his ethnography of drill rappers and gang members on the South Side of Chicago, writing that "I am not being hyperbolic when I say that maintaining confidentiality is a matter of life and death for many of the people involved in this research." Nonetheless, Contreras (2019) acknowledges the importance of biographical and spatial information to others' ability to reanalyze his findings and suggests strategies for revealing sociologically important aspects of subjects' biographies and the setting while protecting them from disclosure. In contrast, given how central social media platforms were to his study, Stuart (2020, p. 211) argues that the "democratization of digital production creates the need for even heavier masking" to protect "gang-associated youth and other demonized populations." In addition to "alter[ing] personal identifiers, as well as smaller details of events" (p. 210), Stuart follows Shklovski & Vertesi's (2013) method of "un-Googling," which involves Googling social media posts he wanted to quote and making "minor changes to neutralize future searches" (p. 211). Given that scholars who study people engaged in crime and violence are, understandably, likely to disclose the least, it is important to consider the possibility that disclosure as default could contribute to putting these studies under greater scrutiny than they already receive, making them seem more suspect and less reliable. This could have negative ramifications for the populations who are given voice through this work, as well as for the scholars who produce it, many of whom are scholars of color.

Taking these arguments together, ethnographers seem to be converging on the idea that, although decisions around the degree of anonymization will have to be made on a case-by-case basis [Reyes 2018, Contreras 2019, Jerolmack & Murphy 2019 (2017)], we should take a "pragmatic approach to confidentiality" (Small 2019, p. 197) and aim to anonymize as minimally as possible. What this looks like in practice will vary given the contexts and populations people study. For some, like Stuart, "minimal" might require extensive masking. No one should expect, or even desire, that at-risk people be named or otherwise made identifiable. At the same time, ethnographers have argued forcefully that the practice of developing composite characters should be abandoned, as doing so essentially amounts to "making fiction" (Fine et al. 2018, p. 117; Small 2019). And while only some ethnographers seem convinced that using the real names of their participants provides much scientific utility, there seems to be a growing consensus that we should name the geographic places we study when possible (Nespor 2000, Lee 2016, Vargas 2016).

It is important to recognize that, even in some cases where ethnographers want to disclose the names and personal details of their participants or fieldsites and where their participants agree to share that information, institutional barriers may make doing so impossible. Though Institutional Review Boards (IRBs) "may be more open to challenge than is recognized" (Freese 2007, p. 165), what (if any) kinds of disclosure the IRBs permit will differ across studies and institutions. Legal barriers within the institutions under study may also prevent disclosure (e.g., Armstrong & Hamilton 2015, Jack 2019). Lastly, as Jerolmack & Walker (2018) discovered when they published an article in the *American Journal of Sociology* on Jerolmack's research in Williamsport, journals also have the power to stifle transparency. The journal prevented the authors from naming some of the participants and revealing how much money they made from leasing their land for gas drilling, even though Jerolmack had documentation showing that both his subjects and his university's IRB gave him permission to reveal those details (Jerolmack & Walker 2018, p. 494).

Regardless of what an ethnographer decides (or is allowed to do), in the interest of scholarly reanalysis, ethnographers should be transparent in their writing about what anonymization techniques were employed and why (Rhoads 2020). Several notable examples of this alternative form of transparency exist. Seim (2020, p. xvi) devotes a two-page author's note to explaining why he used fictitious names for the people, ambulance company, and California county he studied (see also Wingfield 2019; cf. Shedd 2015). Similarly, across three pages in the methods appendix of an interview-based study, Small (2019) delineates the social scientific trade-offs involved in the various options he had available to protect his participants' confidentiality and how he made decisions around what to change, "reveal," and "conceal" (Anspach & Mizrachi 2006, p. 716; see also Reyes 2019).

Ethnographers should also be transparent with their participants about their inability to ensure "complete or perfect anonymity" (Rhoads 2020, p. 404; see also Guenther 2009, Kaiser 2009). Promising anonymity "may give some subjects a false sense of security," and "in many instances, it may be ethically questionable for researchers to insinuate that they can guarantee confidentiality" [Jerolmack & Murphy 2019 (2017), p. 803]. Moreover, conversations about confidentiality and consent should be ongoing, as the ethnographer gains clarity around how she plans to use the data, including what outlets she plans to present the data in (Kaiser 2009, Mukungu 2017).[2]

One final issue related to anonymization is rarely acknowledged: External confidentiality is a collective responsibility. The degree to which it can be promised depends on an ethnography's readers. As Contreras (2019, p. 310) points out, the biggest threat to participants being exposed by outsiders is the "rogue unmasker"—the journalist or "anonymous academic critic" or even the keen scientist wishing to conduct a revisit—who "publicizes private identities and field sites." While the scholarly community blames ethnographers for their failure to keep the confidentiality of their participants when they are exposed, it seems that, to the extent that researchers take maintaining confidentiality seriously, they should acknowledge their own responsibility in helping protect the confidentiality of other ethnographers' participants.[3]

## DATA VERIFICATION

Ethnographers readily acknowledge that there are many reasons why participants' accounts should not be taken at face value, including "poor memory, wishful thinking, and misinterpretation of the questions" (Duneier 1999, p. 346). They also understand that incongruities in what people say and do reveal individual perceptions, member meanings, and community myths—data that generate novel insights into people's social worlds (Jerolmack & Khan 2014). For these reasons, questioning and corroborating what participants say have long been a component of ethnographic training in sociology. As Timmermans (2019, p. 265) writes, "From the 1960s on, teachers of ethnography. . .have emphasized the importance of tricks of the trade such as triangulating different sources of evidence, keeping a healthy distrust of self-serving statements, and being alert to factual discrepancies."

However, recent criticisms from journalists and scholars outside the field have questioned the extent to which ethnographers verify their participants' accounts (e.g., Lewis-Kraus 2016). Such critique has been voiced most loudly by legal scholar Steven Lubet. Inspired by allegations (Singal 2015) that Goffman (2014) made several claims in her book that seemed implausible, Lubet (2018) attempted to fact-check more than 50 urban ethnographies. In doing so, he alleges that roughly half of the randomly selected claims he audited could not be verified (Timmermans 2019). Echoing Duneier's (2007, p. 36) concern that traditional "shoe leather" ethnography is being replaced by "ethnographic interviewing," in which scholars all too often "let their subjects' attributions of cause and effect stand," Lubet accuses ethnographers of treating subjects' retellings of events as fact. He urges ethnographers to follow the lead of Desmond (2017), who, writing for the general

[2] Such discussions may reveal that, in some cases, our subjects do not want to be anonymous (e.g., Jerolmack 2013). In instances where the risk associated with being named is low, and where participants view seeing their name in print as a benefit, naming may be more ethical than masking [Jerolmack & Murphy 2019 (2017)].
[3] Professional associations may even want to consider developing norms and guidelines around this issue.

public on a popular press, hired an independent fact-checker to corroborate the details of his book *Evicted* by conducting background research; reviewing his fieldnotes, interview recordings, and public records; and (re)interviewing many of his subjects.

Ethnographers have responded to such criticisms in varied ways. One response has been to rebut the charges entirely. Lubet's own approach to fact-checking was mostly to compare ethnographers' claims with accounts that he gathered through talking (on the phone) with experts and checking official records and policies. "That's not the way it works," Timmermans (2019, p. 264) writes. To demonstrate that the ethnographer got something wrong, Timmermans says, the fact-checker would have to put in the work to make repeated firsthand observations in the setting under question. Officials and their records may not comport with what happens on the ground. As Goffman writes, "law is one thing and on-the-ground 'war on crime' as it is practiced" is another, especially in Black communities (Elbow 2015; see also Stuart 2020).

Another response has been to point out that ethnographers verify their data more thoroughly than Lubet suggests. To corroborate some of his participants' accounts, Duneier (1999, p. 345) asked multiple participants to tell him their life stories. "When the same events were told to me over and over again in the context of different individual lives, the stories were more convincing," he writes. Edin & Schaefer (2015) sought out what they call "external verification" or "environmental confirmation" for things their participants told them by "checking stories for consistency with the experience of others, seeking confirmation from members of the community, and otherwise exploring the available evidence base" (Lubet 2018, p. 128). Some ethnographers have, like Lubet, turned to third parties to verify things they have seen and heard. After hearing one of his participants tell her landlord about the welfare sanctions she had experienced, Desmond (2017) verified that such sanctions were not uncommon by inquiring with the Wisconsin Department of Children and Families. Others have verified their data by gathering alternative sources of evidence. In his ethnography of ambulance crews, Seim (2020, p. 196) collected 107,208 deidentified medical records, which he used to "triangulate some key patterns revealed in the field" pertaining to neighborhood-level differences in ambulance calls and crew–cop interactions. In their respective digital ethnographies, both Lane (2018) and Stuart (2020) cross-reference the data they gathered in person with data from social media feeds. And numerous ethnographers report taking their work back to their participants to identify any factual discrepancies that need to be changed before the writing goes to print (Duneier 1999, Grasmuck 2005, Broughton 2015).

However, some ethnographers acknowledge that, when it comes to verifying data, there is room for improvement. Twenty years before Lubet's criticisms, Duneier (1999, p. 345) critically noted that, compared with journalists, ethnographers "have not taken [fact-checking] as seriously in their own work." In responding to Lubet's book, Jerolmack complained that too many ethnographers treat interviews and observations as "equivalent sources of data" and "don't tell you whether they saw something firsthand" or not (Fine et al. 2018, p. 116). Yet even if some ethnographers see that there are issues to address in this regard, they do not necessarily agree that hiring independent fact-checkers is the answer. In part this is because most ethnographers do not have the resources to do so, but it is also because no one has yet shown the "value added" of hiring independent fact-checkers (Fine et al. 2018, p. 118). Do their findings change the course of a book, or do they pick up only insignificant inaccuracies? Ethnographers have also been reluctant to embrace alternative proposals for fact-checking, like Desmond's idea that ethnographers could swap fieldnotes and fact-check one another's claims, pointing out that this would be overly burdensome and may breach confidentiality promises (Fine et al. 2018). Nevertheless, ethnographers recognize that, as Pattillo put it, "there has to be some checks and balances" (Fine et al. 2018, p. 128).

Some ethnographers, however, reject the premise that fact-checking—at least, as commonly understood in journalism—is essential to the ethnographic enterprise. Timmermans (2019,

p. 265) and Burawoy (2019) share the view that a focus on verifying every little "factoid" ignores the broader interventions that ethnographies make—their conceptual and theoretical contributions. The scholarly utility of ethnography, they contend, exists largely in the space where ethnographers move beyond their descriptions of direct observations to make inferences, which are not easily subject to traditional fact-checking. This is not always well understood by critics outside of sociology, including Lubet (Timmermans 2019). The fetishization of journalistic fact-checking also glosses over other ways that ethnographers verify claims—for instance, by comparing them with scholarship and against theoretically derived hypotheses—and risks privileging the "truth" as constructed by records, experts, and other outsiders over our subjects' perceptions and experiences, which are commonly a central object of ethnographic inquiry (Fine et al. 2018).

It is unlikely that ethnographers will converge around a standard for verifying their data. Yet it seems that, at a bare minimum, ethnographers can follow Duneier's (1999) and Lubet's (2018) prescription to make more transparent precisely how they know what they know (e.g., from interviews versus observations) so that the scholarly community can judge for itself the grounds upon which the ethnographer is making inferences. This is relatively easy and need not entail the money and time costs associated with journalistic fact-checking. Desmond (2017), for example, indicates in his endnotes when he is describing events that he did not witness but were told to him. He also notes what data were verified, what sources were used for verification, and whether there were inconsistencies between his sources. In addition, he writes "remembered" or "recalled" when writing about events that his subjects relayed to him. This helps make transparent exactly what kind of data the ethnographer is deploying and, as Pattillo points out, helps ethnographers move away from the practice of representing what someone said "as a supposed contemporaneous and witnessed account of events" (Fine et al. 2018, p. 127).

Ethnographers can also make explicit when discrepancies exist between their own observations and the accounts of their participants (e.g., Liebow 1967), explicating what conclusions we should draw from these inconsistencies and how they chose one form of data over another in making their claims. Goffman (2014), for example, noted significant differences between her own observations of how men with warrants ran from the police and how her participants described these same incidents after the fact. Accordingly, in describing how young men run from the police, she relied on her observations alone, noting, "Accounts of chases are interesting in their own right, but are not good data for learning how men actually go about running from the police and the resulting success rates" (p. 269). This points to a larger issue: While some ethnographers have taken to minimizing stories that they cannot corroborate (Desmond 2017), others have highlighted them in their work as valuable data for showing people's perceptions of their social worlds and their place in it (Duneier 1999, Goffman 2014).

Long ago, Becker (1967, p. 247) argued that we can "satisfy the demands of our science by always making clear the limits of what we have studied, marking the boundaries beyond which our findings cannot be safely applied"—for instance, "that we have studied the prison through the eyes of the inmates and not through the eyes of the guards and other involved parties." This point is a convincing rebuttal to the Lubet-style fact-checking approach—for example, asking prison guards if what the ethnographer has written about prisoner behavior is valid—which is dismissive of our participants' perceptions and our own observations. But it may not be enough to make transparent how we arrive at our conclusions or to help readers consider the robustness of our inferences. Facticity is not always paramount in ethnography; our participants' worldview is extremely important data, regardless of whether their accounts can be verified. At the same time, facticity often matters, especially for scholars who may want to test and build on our insights. In this way, getting facts wrong presents the same kinds of issues for cumulative social science as does changing factual details for the purposes of anonymization. Thus, some kind of verification of accounts seems warranted. At the same time, we recognize that time and financial constraints may limit the extent to which some ethnographers can verify some or even most of their data. At the very least, then, providing a paper trail of one's verification efforts in parentheticals or endnotes will allow readers to assess whether or not the author has convincingly made the case with the data at hand.

## DESTROYING, PRESERVING, AND SHARING DATA

Following the publication of books and articles, it has been common practice for ethnographers to destroy their fieldnotes to protect participant confidentiality (Katz 2019). IRBs have buttressed this convention, asking some ethnographers to destroy their notes after a specified time period following the conclusion of their study (Parry 2015).

However, ethnographers are increasingly rethinking this convention. In part, this is because they recognize that destroying fieldnotes may do less than one thinks to protect confidentiality, since fieldnotes constitute only one source of an ethnographer's data. As Khan (2019, p. 259) notes, when his documents related to his research were subpoenaed after the school he studied became the subject of a criminal investigation, he had a "wealth of information" aside from his fieldnotes that were stored as "emails, analysis documents, hundreds of paper and chapter drafts and files." Some ethnographers are also rethinking the convention because they recognize the importance of preserving fieldnotes for the purposes of reanalysis. As Khan (2019, p. 259) writes in describing why he does not support the destruction of ethnographic data, "No doubt some of the arguments I make in my work are wrong. When other scholars argue that I am wrong about some claim or argument, it is important for me, and for others, to be able to reevaluate the basis on which my claims are made." The preservation of fieldnotes also enables ethnographers to conduct revisits of their fieldsites, documenting what has changed about the people or places they studied over time (Lareau 2011, Pattillo 2013). IRBs are seemingly becoming more open to allowing ethnographers to preserve their data indefinitely, especially if the negative implications of data destruction "for the scientific goals of the research are emphasized" (Freese 2007, p. 165).

Developments in technology have recently made it possible to "digitize, archive, and facilitate access to large data sets" (Chauvette et al. 2019, p. 2)—including preserving fieldnotes in online repositories like the Qualitative Data Repository at Syracuse University—so that other scholars may analyze or build upon them. Though ethnographers may be sympathetic to the idea that sharing fieldnotes and interview transcripts fosters reanalysis, many are hesitant to do so.[4] One reason is the long-standing feeling that our data are hard won and the result of personal, trusting relationships that we built over years with our subjects. Another reason revolves, again, around confidentiality. To comply with ethical guidelines, ethnographers would need to write their fieldnotes in a way that anonymizes their participants (Hoang 2015), anonymize the fieldnotes retroactively, redact the fieldnotes extensively, or some combination of the three. As Rhoads (2020, p. 411) writes, given that some ethnographic writing is "oriented towards the thick description ideal," "one can imagine line after line of raw data having to be redacted." Such extensive redactions might make data "so unserviceably thin that they would be devoid of meaningful content" and thus nearly impossible to reanalyze (Tsai et al. 2016, p. 194; see also Parry & Mauthner 2004, Carusi & Jirotka 2009). Furthermore, as intimated above, anonymization and redaction would not guarantee confidentiality (cf. Tsai et al. 2016, Walford 2018, Chauvette et al. 2019).

[4]Here, our focus on sharing data revolves around pressures to make ethnographic data publicly available in data repositories. For a review of other ways ethnographers can share data, such as writing detailed methodological appendices and including fieldnote excerpts in the text, see Reyes (2018).

Other researchers argue that risks to confidentiality are overblown. As Wutich & Bernard (2016) point out, anthropologists have been preserving their ethnographic materials in archives for decades with few problems. And as archivist Bishop (2009) notes, data managers have developed sophisticated data management policies that can mitigate such risks by granting depositors decision-making power over the uses of, and access to, the data (e.g., the Economic and Social Data Service's Qualidata archive in the United Kingdom or the restricted-use policies at the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research at the University of Michigan). Other options to protect the confidentiality of hard-to-anonymize data include imposing lengthy embargoes, permanently withholding the most sensitive portions of data, allowing the original researcher to vet potential users, and using confidentiality agreements (Bishop 2005, 2009; Freese 2007; Emmelhainz 2015). Different levels of access to sensitive data can also be granted based on the biography or purpose of the user (e.g., a researcher, a journalist, the public; see, e.g., the Timescapes Qualitative Longitudinal Study, discussed in Bishop 2009). As Wutich & Bernard (2016, p. 200) argue, "a major lesson from existing efforts to archive and share qualitative data is that the risk to research participants is not all that different from the risk in sharing quantitative data and that the risk can be managed."

Another debate around making ethnographic data publicly available concerns what this would mean for the language and process of informed consent. Putting ethnographic data into a repository would seemingly require participants to agree to have intimate details about their lives made available to unknown researchers for an indefinite period of time. What happens if a third party wants to use the data in a way the participant might not have agreed to (Parry & Mauthner 2004, Carusi & Jirotka 2009, Rhoads 2020)? As Chauvette et al. (2019) point out, once data are made publicly available, the researcher loses control over how they are used. This has raised concerns that data sharing might change who would be willing to participate in ethnographic studies, and what kind of information they would be willing to share. Some scholars worry, for example, that data sharing might limit our ability to study elites, who are more likely to take precautions to protect themselves from accidental disclosure (Tsai et al. 2016).

While these concerns are valid, as Bishop (2009) notes, there is little research on whether data archiving would actually make some participants reluctant to participate in ethnographic research. However, she cites an example of archivists with the Finnish Social Science Data Archive who, with the permission of the original researchers, went back to the participants of one study to gain reconsent for archiving. Of the 169 participants contacted, 151 agreed to have their data archived. Bishop concludes that, whereas ethnographers might assume that their participants would not want their data archived, it might actually be meaningful to them to have their stories preserved and to make greater contributions to science. Accordingly, "the duty to provide participants with appropriate visibility of their data must be weighed along with the protection of their rights" (Bishop 2009, p. 260).

Ethical issues aside, ethnographers have also argued that if the intended purpose of making data publicly available is, in part, to enable reproducibility (the ability of one researcher to achieve the same findings when analyzing the data set of another), then sharing data would not actually accomplish this goal.[5] The highly interpretive and personal nature of fieldnotes and the process of data analysis, they argue, make verification of ethnographic data through secondary analysis nearly impossible (Tsai et al. 2016). Indeed, what an ethnographer writes down in her fieldnotes is

[5]Another oft-cited purpose of sharing data publicly is that it enables other researchers to reuse this data to conduct research "when a lack of resources for data collection would otherwise prevent them from doing so" (Cent. Qual. Multi-Method Inq., p. 1).

"inevitably cryptic," bound up in how she understands her fieldsite, her relationships to her participants, her research questions, and her own identity and positionality—something a third-party analyst has little access to (Hammersley 1997; Tsai et al. 2016; Katz 2019, p. 272). Moreover, some of what goes into an ethnographer's analysis is derived not from the "hard data" that would be put into a public repository but rather from the "soft data" that comes from an ethnographer's memory and feelings (Pool 2017). Because neither the soft data nor the ethnographer's iterative engagement with the literature (Small 2009a) appears in the raw data, it is not clear that sharing fieldnotes would enable reproducibility. Some ethnographers worry that, without deep knowledge of the field site and social context in question, others who engage with a researcher's fieldnotes are prone to misunderstanding the phenomena described therein (Chauvette et al. 2019). While concerns over the extent to which the interpretive nature of ethnographic data impacts the utility of fieldnotes for reanalysis are well taken, they may simply point to the need for "analytic transparency"—access to the interpretive process through which researchers come to their conclusions—in addition to data transparency (Small 2009b, Moravcsik 2014).

Recognizing that there is utility in sharing data with others while acknowledging ethnographers' hesitancy to turn over all of their data, some ethnographers have offered ways to compromise. For example, Abramson & Dohan (2015) suggest that ethnographers can share select pieces of data while also being more transparent about how they know what they know through what they call "ethnoarrays": heat maps that visually represent the themes of and associations within ethnographic data. Ethnoarrays provide a "limited form of data sharing" in which the scholarly community has access to the specific, deidentified coded observations that underlie the ethnographer's claims (Abramson et al. 2018, p. 261). Tsai et al. (2016, p. 195) similarly propose a strategy by which ethnographers can share data fragments: "excerpted and possibly disembodied interview text" and fieldnotes that are assigned to specific codes. This could protect anonymity while enabling the research community to assess whether the quotes and fieldnote excerpts "provided in manuscripts and journal articles capture the overall content of the data" (p. 195). In addition, Tsai et al. recommend sharing transcription rules, data segmentation, coding units, the process for code development, and finalized codes. A third possibility, especially for ethnographers who do not use computer-assisted qualitative data analysis software, is called Annotation for Transparent Inquiry (ATI) (Cent. Qual. Multi-Method Inq. 2020). ATI is based on Moravcsik's (2010, p. 31) idea of "active citations," which are "rigorous, annotated (presumptively) primary source citations hyperlinked to the sources themselves." According to Moravcsik, active citations would enable readers to determine "whether the evidence cited in an article provides a prima facie case for the interpretive or theoretical claims being advanced" (p. 32).

On balance, there is much to be gained by sharing some data—especially if doing so can be accomplished without compromising participant confidentiality. And there is possibly more to lose by not doing so. At an extreme, ethnographers may risk losing access to top-tier journals and funders that demand data sharing (Tsai et al. 2016). We are not suggesting that ethnographers simply acquiesce to transparency demands and turn over thousands of pages of their intimate—and meticulously gathered—data. But we are suggesting that the time has come for ethnographers to work together to develop their own set of guidelines for data sharing that are consistent with research ethics principles and that account for issues revolving around positionality (e.g., Tsai et al. 2016). We can then petition journals—and enjoin fellow researchers—to accept the varied forms of data transparency that comport with our needs and the needs of our subjects. (We could envision, for instance, that some ethnographers might be unwilling to share data but could instead minimally mask to enable reanalysis; others may feel the need to mask heavily but could enable reanalysis by sharing deidentified portions of their data in a repository.)

In making these suggestions, we acknowledge that preparing data to be shared publicly, from determining a data management plan on the front end of a project to deidentifying data to protect confidentiality on the back end, involves a tremendous time commitment (Saunders 2014, Abramson & Dohan 2015). While data repositories can provide support for some of these tasks, such support can be cost prohibitive, especially for ethnographers without institutional resources. Advocating for institutional support will therefore be just as important in enabling ethnographers to share data as whatever guidelines we develop ourselves.

## CONCLUSION

Demands for data transparency and the realities of the Information Age have created a second reckoning in ethnography. Ethnographers have responded to this moment individually. But will ethnography as a field develop a more coherent and coordinated response? While it remains unclear, we contend that this reckoning provides ethnographers an opportunity to push our craft forward through the adoption of new standards that are aligned with evolving technologies and expectations around transparency. Doing so will be crucial for ensuring that ethnography continues to contribute to cumulative social science by enabling reanalysis. It will also be important if ethnographers wish to maintain the wide readership within and outside the academy we have come to enjoy. More practically, adopting new standards may be necessary if ethnographers hope to continue garnering funding and publishing in top-tier journals.

We have offered a series of suggestions for new standards that we believe are consistent with ethnographers' commitment to both our subjects and interpretive scholarship. We recognize that not all of the standards we suggest may be feasible, given the diversity of places and people ethnographers observe as well as the diversity of ethnographers themselves and the institutions where we work. Therefore, it will be important to ensure that the field does not embrace new standards in a way that punishes ethnographers who are less able—whether because of a lack of institutional resources or because of the particular people and settings they study—to adopt many of our aforementioned recommendations. To this end, we have provided suggestions for standards that are flexible, and many of them can be easily be adopted by all ethnographers, regardless of the particular ethnographic tradition that they practice. For example, at a minimum, ethnographers can be reflexive and transparent around the decisions we make with regard to how we record our data, what quotations mean, whether we follow our participants online, and whether and how we anonymize. We can also, at a minimum, make in-text distinctions between data that come from interviews and data from observations and be transparent around what evidence we use to verify our claims. Other measures, especially making data publicly available, will require collective action and significant institutional support.

We believe that the future of ethnography is bright. Much like how the first reckoning around positionality continues to generate constructive debates among ethnographers around ethics, evidence, and representation, this second reckoning is inspiring productive conversations around data transparency and verification. Just as that moment resulted in a new set of standards that improved the craft, we are optimistic that this moment will do the same.

## DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The authors are not aware of any affiliations, memberships, funding, or financial holdings that might be perceived as affecting the objectivity of this review.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank participants of the University of Michigan's Ethnography Workshop as well as David Pedulla, Michael Bader, Roi Livne, and an anonymous reviewer for thoughtful and constructive feedback on earlier drafts of this review.

## LITERATURE CITED

Abramson CM, Dohan D. 2015. Beyond text: using arrays to represent and analyze ethnographic data. *Sociol. Methodol.* 45(1):272–319

Abramson CM, Joslyn J, Rendle KA, Garrett S, Dohan D. 2018. The promises of computational ethnography. *Ethnography* 19(2):254–84

Abu-Lughod L. 2008. *Writing Women's Worlds: Bedouin Stories*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press

Am. Anthropol. Assoc. 2004. *Statement on Ethnography and Institutional Review Boards*. Arlington, VA: Am. Anthropol. Assoc. **http://research.fiu.edu/documents/irb/documents/ethnographyReview.pdf**

Am. Sociol. Assoc. 2018. *Code of Ethics*. Washington, DC: Am. Sociol. Assoc. **https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/asa_code_of_ethics-june2018a.pdf**

Anderson E. 1978. *A Place on the Corner*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Anspach RR, Mizrachi N. 2006. The field worker's fields: ethics, ethnography, and medical sociology. *Soc. Health Illn.* 28(6):713–31

Armstrong E, Hamilton L. 2015. *Paying for the Party*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press

Autry R. 2020. Sociology's race problem. *Aeon*, Novemb. 26. **https://aeon.co/essays/urban-ethnographers-do-harm-in-speaking-for-black-communities**

Becker H. 1967. Whose side are we on? *Soc. Probl.* 14(3):239–47

Benjamin DJ, Berger JO, Johannesson M, Nosek BA, Wagenmakers E-J, et al. 2018. Redefine statistical significance. *Nat. Hum. Behav.* 2:6–10

Benzecry C. 2011. *The Opera Fanatic: Ethnography of an Obsession*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Besbris M. 2020. *Upsold: Real Estate Agents, Prices, and Neighborhood Inequality*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Bishop L. 2005. Protecting respondents and enabling data sharing: reply to Parry and Mauthner. *Sociology* 39(2):333–36

Bishop L. 2009. Ethical sharing and reuse of qualitative data. *Aust. J. Soc. Issues* 44(3):255–72

Boelen WAM. 1992. Street corner society: Cornerville revisited. *J. Contemp. Ethnogr.* 21(1):11–51

Bosk CL. 2008. *What Would You Do? Juggling Bioethics and Ethnography*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Bosk CL, De Vries RG. 2004. Bureaucracies of mass deception: institutional review boards and the ethics of ethnographic research. *Ann. Am. Acad. Political Soc. Sci.* 595(1):249–63

Bourgois P. 1996. *In Search of Respect: Selling Crack in El Barrio*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press

Bourgois P. 2009. *Righteous Dopefiend*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press

Brayne S. 2014. Surveillance and system avoidance: criminal justice contact and institutional attachment. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 79(3):367–91

Brayne S. 2020. *Predict and Surveil*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press

Broughton C. 2015. *Boom, Bust, Exodus*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press

Browning C, Wallace D, Feinberg S, Cagney K. 2006. Neighborhood social processes, physical conditions, and disaster-related mortality: the case of the 1995 Chicago heat wave. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 71:661–78

Budd J. 2016. Sociology professor's ethics under scrutiny. *Columbia Spectator*, Novemb. 15. **https://www.columbiaspectator.com/news/2012/12/03/sociology-professors-ethics-under-scrutiny/**

Burawoy M. 2003. Revisits: an outline of a theory of reflexive ethnography. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 68(5):645–79

Burawoy M. 2019. Empiricism and its fallacies. *Contexts* 18(1):47–53

Cahill SE, Distler W, Lachowetz C, Meaney A, Tarallo R, Willard T. 1985. Meanwhile backstage: public bathrooms and the interaction order. *Urban Life* 14(1):33–58

Calarco JM. 2018. *Negotiating Opportunities: How the Middle Class Secures Advantages in School*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press

Carusi A, Jirotka M. 2009. From data archive to ethical labyrinth. *Qual. Res.* 9(3):285–98

Cent. Qual. Multi-Method Inq. 2020. *Sharing data @ Qualitative Data Repository* (*QDR*). Inf. Sheet, Cent. Qual. Multi-Method Inq., Syracuse Univ., Syracuse, NY. **https://qdr.syr.edu/drupal_data/public/Sharing_Data_at_QDR.pdf**

Chauvette A, Schick-Makaroff K, Molzahn AE. 2019. Open data in qualitative research. *Int. J. Qual. Methods* 18:1–6

Clerge O. 2019. *The New Noir: Race, Identity, Diaspora in Black Suburbia*. Oakland: Univ. Calif. Press

Clifford J, Marcus GE. 1986. *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography: A School of American Research Advanced Seminar*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press

Cohen P. 2015. On the ropes (Goffman review). *Family Inequality Blog*, May 28. **https://familyinequality.wordpress.com/2015/05/28/on-the-ropes-goffman-review/**

Contreras R. 2019. Transparency and unmasking issues in ethnographic crime research: methodological considerations. *Sociol. Forum* 34(2):293–312

Crosas M, Gautier J, Karcher S, Kirilova D, Otalora G, Schwartz A. 2018. Data policies of highly-ranked social science journals. SocArXiv, March 30. **https://doi.org/10.31235/osf.io/9h7ay**

Desmond M. 2009. *On the Fireline: Living and Dying with Wildland Firefighters*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Desmond M. 2017. *Evicted: Poverty and Profit in the American City*. New York: Crown

Duneier M. 1999. *Sidewalk*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux

Duneier M. 2006. Ethnography, the ecological fallacy, and the 1995 Chicago heat wave. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 71(4):679–88

Duneier M. 2007. On the legacy of Elliott Liebow and Carol Stack. *Focus* 25(1):33–38

Duneier M. 2011. How not to lie with ethnography. *Soc. Methods* 41(1):1–11

Edin K, Schaefer HL. 2015. *$2 a Day: Living on Almost Nothing in America*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt

Elbow S. 2015. Updated: UW sociology prof responds to critic who accused her of 'major felony' during research. *Capital Times*, June 3. **https://madison.com/ct/news/local/writers/steven_elbow/updated-uw-sociology-prof-responds-to-critic-who-accused-her-of-major-felony-during-research/article_45d5b0eb-ea57-5de4-89b1-848a3bc7daae.html**

Emerson RM, Fretz RI, Shaw LL. 2011. *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press. 2nd ed.

Emmelhainz C. 2015. Ethnographic field data 3: preserving and sharing ethnographic data. *Savage Minds Blog*, Aug. 28. **https://savageminds.org/2015/08/28/ethnographic-field-data-3-preserving-and-sharing-ethnographic-data/**

Fine GA, Abramson CM. 2020. Ethnography in the time of COVID-19: vectors and the vulnerable. *Etnogr. Ric. Qual.* 2:165–74

Fine GA, Cohen P, Jerolmack C, Khan S, Lubet S, Pattillo M. 2018. Panel discussion: Author meets critic. *Northwest. J. Law Soc. Policy* 13(3):107–37. **https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1168&context=njlsp**

Forman J Jr. 2014. The society of fugitives. *The Atlantic*, Oct. **https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2014/10/the-society-of-fugitives/379328/**

Freese J. 2007. Replication standards for quantitative social science: Why not sociology? *Sociol. Methods Res.* 36(2):153–72

Freese J, Peterson D. 2017. Replication in social science. *Annu. Rev. Sociol.* 43:147–65

Gans HJ. 1965. *The Levittowners: Ways of Life and Politics in a New Suburban Community*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press

Goffman A. 2009. On the run: wanted men in a Philadelphia ghetto. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 74(3):339–57

Goffman A. 2014. *On the Run: Fugitive Life in an American City*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Grasmuck S. 2005. *Protecting Home: Class, Race, and Masculinity in Boys' Baseball*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers Univ. Press

Guenther KM. 2009. The politics of names: rethinking the methodological and ethical significance of naming people, organizations, and places. *Qual. Res.* 9(4):411–21

Hammersley M. 1997. Qualitative data archiving. *Sociology* 31(1):131–42

Hanson R, Richards P. 2019. *Harassed: Gender, Bodies, and Ethnographic Research*. Oakland: Univ. Calif. Press

Herndon J, O'Reilly R. 2016. Data sharing policies in social sciences academic journals. In *Databrarianship*, ed. L Kellam, K Thompson, pp. 219–43. Chicago: Am. Libr. Assoc.

Hidalgo A, Khan S. 2020. Blindsight ethnography and exceptional moments. *Etnog. Ric. Qual.* 2:185–93

Ho K. 2009. *Liquidated: An Ethnography of Wall Street*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press

Hoang KK. 2015. *Dealing in Desire: Asian Ascendancy, Western Decline, and the Hidden Currencies of Global Sex Work*. Oakland: Univ. Calif. Press

Jack A. 2019. *The Privileged Poor*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press

Jerolmack C. 2013. *The Global Pigeon*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Jerolmack C. 2021. *Up to Heaven and Down to Hell: Freedom, Fracking, and Community in an American Town*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press

Jerolmack C, Khan S. 2014. Talk is cheap: ethnography and the attitudinal fallacy. *Sociol. Methods Res.* 43(2):178–209

Jerolmack C, Murphy AK. 2019 (2017). The ethical dilemmas and social scientific trade-offs of masking in ethnography. *Sociol. Methods Res.* 48(4):801–27

Jerolmack C, Walker E. 2018. Please in my backyard: quiet mobilization in support of fracking in an Appalachian community. *Am. J. Sociol.* 124(2):479–516

Jones N, Raymond G. 2012. The camera rolls: using third-party video in field research. *Ann. Am. Acad. Political Soc. Sci.* 642(1):109–23

Kaiser K. 2009. Protecting respondent confidentiality in qualitative research. *Qual. Health Res.* 19(11):1632–41

Kaminer A. 2012. Columbia's gang scholar lives on the edge. *New York Times*, Novemb. 30. **https://www.nytimes.com/2012/12/02/nyregion/sudhir-venkatesh-columbias-gang-scholar-lives-on-the-edge.html**

Katz J. 2001. *How Emotions Work*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Katz J. 2019. Armor for ethnographers. *Sociol. Forum* 34(1):264–75

Khan S. 2011. *Privilege: The Making of an Adolescent Elite at St. Paul's School*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press

Khan S. 2019. The subpoena of ethnographic data. *Sociol. Forum* 34(1):253–63

Kulz C. 2017. *Factories for Learning: Making Race, Class and Inequality in the Neoliberal Academy*. Manchester, UK: Manchester Univ. Press

Lacy KR. 2007. *Blue-Chip Black: Race, Class, and Status in the New Black Middle Class*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press

Lane J. 2018. *The Digital Street*. Oxford, UK: Oxford Univ. Press

Lareau A. 2011. *Unequal Childhoods: Class, Race, and Family Life*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press. 2nd ed.

Lee J. 2016. *Blowin' Up: Rap Dreams in South Central*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Lee RM. 2004. Recording technologies and the interview in sociology, 1920–2000. *Sociology* 38(5):869–89

Levine J. 2021. *Constructing Community*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press

Lewis-Kraus G. 2016. The trials of Alice Goffman. *New York Times*, Jan. 12. **https://www.nytimes.com/2016/01/17/magazine/the-trials-of-alice-goffman.html**

Liebow E. 1967. *Tally's Corner: A Study of Negro Streetcorner Men*. Boston: Little, Brown

Livne R. 2019. *Values at the End of Life: The Logic of Palliative Care*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press

Lubet S. 2018. *Interrogating Ethnography: Why Evidence Matters*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press

Marwell NP. 2007. *Bargaining for Brooklyn: Community Organizations in the Entrepreneurial City*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Mascia-Lees FE, Sharpe P, Cohen CB. 1989. The postmodernist turn in anthropology: cautions from a feminist perspective. *Signs J. Women Cult. Soc.* 15(1):7–33

Meadow T. 2018. *Trans Kids: Being Gendered in the Twenty-First Century*. Oakland: Univ. Calif. Press

Milofsky C. 2008. *Smallville: Institutionalizing Community in Twenty-First-Century America*. Lebanon, NH: Univ. Press N. Engl.

Mojola SA. 2014. *Love, Money, and HIV: Becoming a Modern African Woman in the Age of AIDS*. Oakland: Univ. Calif. Press

Moravcsik A. 2010. Active citation: a precondition for replicable qualitative research. *PS* 43:29–35

Moravcsik A. 2014. Transparency: the revolution in qualitative research. *PS* 47:48–53

Mose Brown T, de Casanova EM. 2014. Representing the language of the 'other': African American Vernacular English in ethnography. *Ethnography* 15(2):208–31

Mukungu K. 2017. How can you write about a person who does not exist? Rethinking pseudonymity and informed consent in life history research. *Soc. Sci.* 6(3):86

Murphy AK, Jerolmack C. 2016. Ethnographic masking in an era of data transparency. *Contexts* 15(2):14–17

Murthy D. 2008. Digital ethnography: an examination of the use of new technologies for social research. *Sociology* 42(5):837–55

Natl. Acad. Sci. Eng. Med. 2018. *Open science by design: realizing a vision for 21st century research*. Consens. Study Rep., Natl. Acad. Sci. Eng. Med., Washington, DC

Nespor J. 2000. Anonymity and place in qualitative inquiry. *Qual. Inq.* 6(4):546–69

Nosek BA, Alter G, Banks GC, Borsboom D, Bowman SD, et al. 2015. Promoting an open research culture. *Science* 348(6242):1422–25

Pacewicz J. 2016. *Partisans and Partners: The Politics of the Post-Keynesian Society*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Parry M. 2015. Conflict over sociologist's narrative puts spotlight on ethnography. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, June 12. **https://www.chronicle.com/article/conflict-over-sociologists-narrative-puts-spotlight-on-ethnography/**

Parry O, Mauthner NS. 2004. Whose data are they anyway? Practical, legal and ethical issues in archiving qualitative research data. *Sociology* 38(1):139–52

Pattillo M. 2013. *Black Picket Fences: Privilege and Peril Among the Black Middle Class*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press. 2nd ed.

Pool R. 2017. The verification of ethnographic data. *Ethnography* 18(3):281–86

Ralph L. 2014. *Renegade Dreams: Living Through Injury in Gangland Chicago*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Reich JA. 2015. Old methods and new technologies: social media and shifts in power in qualitative research. *Ethnography* 16(4):394–415

Reyes V. 2018. Three models of transparency in ethnographic research: naming places, naming people, and sharing data. *Ethnography* 19(2):204–26

Reyes V. 2019. *Global Borderlands: Fantasy, Violence, and Empire in Subic Bay, Philippines*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press

Rhoads RA. 2020. "Whales tales" on the run: anonymizing ethnographic data in an age of openness. *Cult. Stud. Crit. Methodol.* 20(5):402–13

Rios V. 2011. *Punished: Policing the Lives of Black and Latino Boys*. New York: NYU Press

Sanchez-Jankowski M. 2016. *Cracks in the Pavement*. Oakland: Univ. Calif. Press

Saunders EN. 2014. Transparency without tears: a pragmatic approach to transparent security studies research. *Secur. Stud.* 23(4):689–98

Schacter D. 1999. The seven sins of memory. *Am. Psychol.* 54(3):182–203

Scheper-Hughes N. 2000. Ire in Ireland. *Ethnography* 1(1):117–40

Seim J. 2020. *Bandage, Sort, and Hustle: Ambulance Crews on the Front Lines of Urban Suffering*. Oakland: Univ. Calif. Press

Sharkey P. 2015. Review of *On the Run: Fugitive Life in an American City*, by Alice Goffman. *Soc. Serv. Rev.* 89(2):407–46

Sharpe C. 2014. Black life, annotated. *New Inquiry*, Aug. 8. **https://thenewinquiry.com/black-life-annotated/**

Shedd C. 2015. *Unequal City*. New York: Russell Sage Found.

Sherman J. 2009. *Those Who Work, Those Who Don't: Poverty, Morality, and Family in Rural America*. Minneapolis: Univ. Minn. Press

Shklovski I, Vertesi J. 2013. "Un-Googling" publications: the ethics and problems of anonymization. In *CHI '13 Extended Abstracts on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pp. 2169–78. New York: ACM

Singal J. 2015. The internet accused Alice Goffman of faking details in her study of a black neighborhood. I went to Philadelphia to check. *The Cut*, June 18. **https://www.thecut.com/2015/06/i-fact-checked-alice-goffman-with-her-subjects.html**

Small ML. 2009a. How many cases do I need? *Ethnography* 10(1):5–38

Small ML. 2009b. *Unanticipated Gains: Origins of Network Inequality in Everyday Life*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press

Small ML. 2015. De-exoticizing ghetto poverty: on the ethics of representation in urban ethnography. *City Community* 14(4):352–58

Small ML. 2019. *Someone to Talk To*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press

Small ML, Manduca RA, Johnston WR. 2018. Ethnography, neighborhood effects, and the rising heterogeneity of poor neighborhoods across cities. *City Community* 17(3):565–89

Stack C. 1974. *All Our Kin: Strategies for Survival in a Black Community*. New York: Basic

Stein A. 2010. Sex, truths, and audiotape: anonymity and the ethics of exposure in public ethnography. *J. Contemp. Ethnogr.* 39(5):554–68

Stuart F. 2020. *Ballad of the Bullet: Gangs, Drill Music, and the Power of Online Infamy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press

Tavory I. 2016. *Summoned: Identification and Religious Life in a Jewish Neighborhood*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Tilley L, Woodthorpe K. 2011. Is it the end for anonymity as we know it? *Qual. Res.* 11(2):197–212

Timmermans S. 2019. Hypocriticism. *Contemp. Sociol.* 48(3):264–66

Tornow J, Martonosi M, Marrongelle K, Tilbury D, Easterling W, et al. 2020. *Dear colleague letter: open science for research data*. Publ. 20-068, Natl. Sci. Found., Washington, DC. **https://nsf.gov/pubs/2020/nsf20068/nsf20068.jsp**

Tsai AC, Kohrt BA, Matthews LT, Betancourt TS, Lee JK, et al. 2016. Promises and pitfalls of data sharing in qualitative research. *Soc. Sci. Med.* 169:191–98

Turkle S. 2011. *Alone Together: Why We Expect More from Technology and Less from Each Other*. New York: Basic

Van Cleve N. 2016. *Crook County: Racism and Injustice in America's Largest Criminal Court*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press

Van Maanen J. 2011. *Tales of the Field: On Writing Ethnography*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press. 2nd ed.

Vargas R. 2016. *Wounded City: Violent Turf Wars in a Chicago Barrio*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press

Venkatesh SA. 2008. *Gang Leader for a Day: A Rogue Sociologist Takes to the Streets*. New York: Penguin

Walford G. 2009. The practice of writing ethnographic fieldnotes. *Ethnogr. Educ.* 4(2):117–30

Walford G. 2018. The impossibility of anonymity in ethnographic research. *Qual. Res.* 18(5):516–25

Wingfield AH. 2019. *Flatlining: Race, Work, and Health Care in the New Economy*. Oakland: Univ. Calif. Press

Wutich A, Bernard HR. 2016. Sharing qualitative data & analysis. With whom and how widely? A response to "Promises and pitfalls of data sharing in qualitative research." *Soc. Sci. Med.* 169:199–200

Young C. 2018. Model uncertainty and the crisis in science. *Socius* 4:1–7

Zaloom C. 2006. *Out of the Pits: Traders and Technology from Chicago to London*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Annual Review
of Sociology
Volume 47, 2021

# Contents

## Prefatory Article



## Theory and Methods



## Social Processes

## Formal Organizations



## Political and Economic Sociology



## Differentiation and Stratification



## Individual and Society

**Demography**



**Policy**



**Sociology and World Regions**



**Indexes**



**Errata**

An online log of corrections to *Annual Review of Sociology* articles may be found at http://www.annualreviews.org/errata/soc