highlight the serendipities that I encountered on the field, the fieldwork logistics, and my experience in gathering data and dealing with various stakeholders and interlocutors. It is hoped that this self-reflexive narrative will shed some light on the relationship between researchers and their field sites, demystify fieldwork process, and better situate fieldwork within social science methodological arsenals.

A Multistage Strategy for the Integration Ethnographic and Qualitative Methods in Anthropology and Political Science

Mark Woodward

Center for the Study of Religion and Conflict, Arizona State University

Cultural Anthropology and Political Science typically employ different methods to address similar issues. It is difficult to imagine an article relying entirely on linear regressions appearing in the pages of the American Ethnologist. It is equally difficult to image an article describing political advertisements as discursive strategies for marginalizing subaltern subjectivities appearing in the pages of the American Journal of Political Science. Since the 1980s the gap between the two disciplines has widened as they moved in nearly opposite methodological and epistemological directions. Some anthropologists moved away from rigorous data collection and analysis and towards interpretive cultural analysis theoretically formulated by David Schneider and popularized by Clifford Geertz. Many are quite content to called unscientific. Political Science moved towards ever more complex statistical methods to demonstrate that it is “genuinely” scientific. At its worst, positivist Political Science confuses correlation with causality, dismisses qualitative data collection and analyses as inherently biased subjectivism and is obsessed with “sciencism” and statistical rigor. At its worst Interpretive Anthropology becomes “anti-sciencism” denying the possibility of explanation and defining the discipline as intersubjective reflection on shared otherness based on what Geertz termed “deep hanging out” research technologies. The result is that inter-disciplinary conversation, let alone collaborative research, has become increasingly difficult. Proponents of extreme position do not, and indeed cannot, talk to each other because the lack a common intellectual language. This has impoverished both disciplines.

There is, however a middle ground between these extremes that many scholars in both fields are comfortable with. This convergent intellectual space is defined by shared concerns with empirical generalization, theoretically driven explanation and recognition of the difference between scientific method and research technologies. Philosophy of science provides a common meta-language that makes collaborative research possible.

Philosophical Considerations: Theory, Method and Research Technologies

Empirical generalization, theory driven explanation and falsification are critical components of the scientific method. There is also a critical distinction between scientific method, which is generally applicable and research technologies that are problem and discipline specific. This distinction is particularly important in the case of generalization. There are cases in which scientific method can be applied to a single case or event others in which theoretical insight precedes empirical observation. Einstein’s contributions to physics and astronomy are clear examples. In the social sciences, there are multiple strategies for generalization. Statistical analysis of large data sets is one example. It is typical of Political Science research strategies. Another, more common in ethnographic research, is that when you ask the same question many times in multiple settings
and get the same response of set of responses – you can reasonably conclude that you have arrived at a level of generalization comparable with that attainable with statistical methods.

As Popper and others have shown, theories are explanatory devices that explain, but do not emerge directly from, empirical generalizations. There are no formal discovery procedures for theories. The classic, though probably mythic, example is Newton’s apple that inspired the theory of gravity. It follows from this that theory and method are independent and that observation based one set of research technologies and lead to theoretical insights that can only be tested by the application of others. This being the case, surveys and deep hanging out can be equally valuable social science research technologies. Finally, theories can be falsified by but not proven by empirical observation. In most cases, multidisciplinary falsification tests are appropriate. As Kuhn notes, scholars tend to cling to paradigms and theories for reasons that have little to with intellectual concern. The same is true of the occupants of methodological silos. A commitment to interdisciplinary research requires us to abandon this intellectual arrogance.

To illustrate points of convergence, I rely on an interdisciplinary study of traditional and modern modes of political authority in the Javanese cities/kingdoms of Surakarta (Solo) and Yogyakarta (Yogya) that I conducted together with colleagues with disciplinary orientations in political science and social psychology. It combines methods including historical analysis, deep hanging out and surveys.

Yogya and Solo are adjacent principalities in south central Java. They share a common culture, and history. Their royal families are branches of the Mataram dynasty that diverged when the kingdom was divided between rival claimants to the throne in the mid-18th century. Since the Japanese conquest of the Netherlands Indies in 1942, they have followed divergent paths. Solo has consistently been on the wrong side of history welcoming first the Japanese invaders and in 1945 siding with the returning Dutch colonialists. Yogya resisted the Japanese and was the center of the Indonesian revolution. The result has been that Yogya remains a “kingdom within a republic” while in Solo, the dynasty is now a political anachronism.

Decades of deep hanging out, most of it in Yogya, led me to the hypothesis that political history might have led to divergent views of not only the dynasty but also on nationalism and national identity. Survey research conducted in 2013 provided statistical evidence supporting this position. It also indicated that regional identity is stronger in Yogya than in Solo.

The methodological point here is that multi-method research combining those typical in the two disciplines is not only possible, but that it can also lead to findings that would not be possible by either set of methods standing alone.
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**PERFORMATIVE ACTS IN INDONESIA’S ELECTORAL DEMOCRACY**
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This paper addresses an empirical puzzle in Indonesia’s democracy. On the one hand, the public have repeatedly shown that they have a low level of trust in key democratic institutions. On the other hand, Indonesian electorates have a high level of optimism in electoral democracy, and the turnout level in elections remains robust. How should we explain this paradox? This paper argues that the regular displays of democratic rituals help to shape the identity of Indonesian electorates as members of a democratic society. The repeated displays of democratic rituals maintain the electorates’ excitement and belonging in Indonesia’s electoral democracy. The paper uses ethnographic observation on the 2019 Indonesia presidential debate public screenings (*nonton bareng/nobar*) to understand the paradox in Indonesia’s electoral democracy. The author finds that the ethnographic method can help political scientists to answer questions that are difficult to answer when one relies only on traditional political science’s quantitative and qualitative methods. Based on the findings from ethnographic observations, one can formulate more sensitive questions that can be further interrogated through both qualitative and quantitative methods that are familiar to political scientist. In doing so, this paper contributes to the development of the interdisciplinary approach in understanding political phenomena that are difficult to answer by using traditional approaches in political science.
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Political anthropologists’ attention to the state has been informed by the ideas that impersonal, calculative, and rational techniques are the primary way for the state in ruling its subjects (Foucault 2004, Scott 1998). Recent literatures on the state’s technologies of rule, however, have disrupted this understanding by decentering calculative practices (i.e., surveillance and statistics) in their ethnographic investigations to the state’s ruling practices. This disruption takes form in