Understanding Ethnography:
An Introduction to Its Concepts, Methods, and Human Significance

Mr Devang Darji
Temporary Assistant Professor
Department of English
VNSGU - Surat

Abstract:

This paper introduces ethnography as a qualitative research method, what it means, where it came from, what its core principles are, and how it is actually practiced. It draws on ideas discussed extensively on ethnographic study, and places them alongside the writings of key thinkers in sociology and anthropology, such as Bronislaw Malinowski, Clifford Geertz, and Emile Durkheim. The goal of this paper is simple: to explain ethnography clearly and honestly, as a method that takes people seriously, their lives, their stories, and their realities.

What Is Ethnography?

Ethnography is a qualitative research method rooted in the disciplines of sociology and anthropology. Its central aim is to understand people — their behaviors, beliefs, and cultural practices — by spending extended time with them in the environments where they actually live and work. Unlike laboratory studies, surveys, or structured experiments, ethnography does not pull people out of their natural surroundings. Instead, the researcher goes to the people.

The word "ethnography" itself comes from the Greek ethnos, meaning "people" or "nation," and graphia, meaning "writing." So at its most basic level, ethnography means writing about people. But it is much more than writing. It is observing, listening, participating, questioning, and reflecting — and then, after all of that, trying to make honest sense of what you have seen and heard.

Ethnography is both a process and a product. As a process, it involves the researcher's active engagement with participants in their context: observing daily life, conducting interviews, participating in activities, and building relationships over time. As a product, it is the rich, descriptive account of human experience that comes out of that process — a document that attempts to represent not just what people do, but what it means to them. The two are inseparable. The kind of knowledge ethnography produces can only come from the kind of engagement that ethnography requires (Malinowski 14).

People sometimes assume that observation comes naturally — that just "watching" people is enough. But there is an important difference between casual seeing and ethnographic observation. Casual seeing is passive; ethnographic observation is active, attentive, and disciplined. The researcher looks carefully at the world around them, at people's interactions and routines, at objects and environments, and applies thought, empathy, and analysis to what they see. This kind of seeing takes practice and commitment.

Where Did Ethnography Come From?

The practice of writing about other cultures and peoples is not new. Long before the word "ethnography" was coined, travelers like Ibn Battuta, Marco Polo, Huien Tsang, and Al-

Beruni crossed continents and recorded what they observed about the peoples and civilizations they encountered. These proto-ethnographers, as they are sometimes called, wrote detailed accounts of foreign customs, societies, and ways of life. Their records were driven by curiosity, a desire to understand worlds unlike their own, and sometimes, the practical needs of the rulers or traders who sent them.

The term "ethnography" began to be used formally in the eighteenth century, during a period when European nations were expanding into new territories — what we now recognize as the age of colonialism. The choice of the word ethnos, which also carried connotations of "race" at that time, was not accidental. Ethnographic writing during this period was often done in service of colonial agendas: to understand — and ultimately, to control — the peoples whose lands were being occupied. Scholars who accompanied colonial expeditions wrote about local populations in the same detached, taxonomical way they wrote about plants and animals. This kind of writing was used to justify colonization, suggesting that European presence would bring "civilization" to native peoples (Geertz, The Interpretation of Cultures 23).

Two significant movements shaped ethnography into a more rigorous discipline: the Chicago School of sociology in the late 1800s, which emphasized detailed description of social life, and British Social Anthropology, which brought theoretical depth to the method. The combination of rich description and analytical theory became the hallmark of ethnographic research. Since the 1970s, new critical perspectives — postcolonialism, feminism, and subaltern studies — have pushed ethnography to examine its own biases and actively center the voices of people who have historically been marginalized.

Contemporary ethnographers are acutely aware of the troubled history of their discipline. Rather than pretending it does not exist, they work to build a form of research that is respectful, empathetic, and conscious of power. Today, ethnography is not about studying faraway, "exotic" cultures — it is just as likely to take place in a home, a school, a workplace, or a hospital.

The "Other" and the Ethics of Engagement

One of the most foundational concepts in ethnography is the idea of "the other." In research, the "other" refers to the person or community that the researcher is studying — someone who, by definition, is seen as different from the researcher. This is a dynamic concept. Who counts as "the other" changes with context. When you are in your home country, someone from a different region might feel like "the other." Travel abroad, and suddenly, anyone from your home country feels familiar, while people from elsewhere become "the other."

Ethnographers are very careful about the language they use to describe the people they study, because language shapes relationships. When researchers call people "subjects," they imply passivity — as if the people being studied are objects of inquiry with no agency or contribution of their own. When they use the term "respondents," they suggest that the only role these people play is to answer the researcher's questions. Both terms carry a subtle power imbalance that can harm the research and the people involved.

Contemporary ethnographers prefer the terms "participants" or "contributors." These words acknowledge that the people being studied are active partners in the research — not objects to be examined, but human beings whose knowledge, perspectives, and agency genuinely shape the outcome of the study. This shift in language is not merely semantic; it reflects a fundamental change in how researchers relate to the people they work with.

The risk of "othering" — of treating research participants as fundamentally less than or separate from the researcher — is real and serious. When participants are othered, the research loses its ability to generate genuine insight. It becomes a one-way extraction of information, and the knowledge produced often fails to serve or represent the people it claims to be about. The answer to this problem is not polite condescension, but genuine empathy and structural equality in the research relationship.

Empathy, Reality, and the Researcher's Posture

Empathy is not just a nice quality to have in ethnographic research — it is a methodological requirement. Empathy enables researchers to place themselves in the position of the other, to genuinely try to see the world through someone else's eyes. It is not the same as sympathy, which implies feeling sorry for someone. Empathy involves active, sustained effort to understand.

At the heart of empathy is the belief that in learning about others, we learn about ourselves. Self-reflexivity — the practice of being constantly aware of one's own assumptions, biases, and social position — is central to this. A researcher who does not examine their own worldview risks projecting their assumptions onto the people they study, and those projections can distort everything they see. Empathy and self-reflexivity go hand in hand: together, they help researchers remain open to perspectives that are different from their own.

The importance of empathy becomes vivid in a concrete example. After a devastating earthquake struck Latur, Maharashtra, in 1993, engineers were sent to help rebuild roads. Rather than spending time listening to what the townspeople actually needed, the engineers gave people a simple choice: straight roads or curved roads. The result was a set of roads that looked fine on paper but did not actually serve the community's needs. The engineers had

imposed their own framework — urban, technical, top-down — onto people whose lives and needs were far more complex. As filmmakers Anjali Monteiro and K.P. Jayasankar document in their film Punarvasan, asking a closed question like "straight or curved?" made implicit, lived knowledge disappear. The act of forcing people to articulate their needs in the researcher's language distorted the very thing the researchers were trying to understand.

This example captures something essential about ethnography: it is a method for understanding things that cannot be learned through surveys or multiple-choice questions. The life of a community, the meaning of a ritual, the purpose of a road — these are not simple, singular things. They are layers upon layers of context, history, relationship, and meaning. Ethnography takes those layers seriously.

Closely related to empathy is the question of reality — specifically, whose reality counts. Ethnographic research is built on the understanding that reality is not singular or objective. Each person, shaped by their own experiences, cultural context, and social position, inhabits a different version of reality. The sociologist Emile Durkheim captured this elegantly when he wrote that "sociality is built into structures and institutions" (qtd. in Geertz, The Interpretation of Cultures 17) — meaning that what we take for granted as "real" is actually shaped by the invisible social frameworks around us.

Consider the concept of money. It seems perfectly objective — everyone agrees it has value. But a debit card that is precious to a working adult is meaningless to a young child who has never used one. The card's value is not inherent; it is socially constructed and context-dependent. This is true of almost everything in human life. What is normal, what is moral, what is real — all of these are defined by the social and cultural context in which we live. Recognizing this is not relativism; it is the first step toward genuinely understanding other people.

Core Principles of Ethnographic Research

Several key principles distinguish ethnography from other research methods. Understanding these principles is essential to understanding what makes a study truly ethnographic.

The first principle is that ethnography is naturalistic. It takes place in the natural environment of the people being studied — not in a lab, a studio, or a controlled setting. If a researcher brings participants to an unfamiliar space and observes how they behave there, that is not ethnography. The context is not just a backdrop; it is an essential part of the data. People behave differently when they are in their own spaces, and that difference matters enormously.

The second principle is that ethnography is synchronic, meaning it is situated in the present. It studies phenomena as they are actually happening, not reconstructing the past through historical documents (though those may be consulted) or forecasting the future. Being present, in the right place at the right time, is not incidental — it is the entire point.

The third principle is that ethnography is contextual. The researcher must understand not just the surface behaviors of participants, but the broader web of meanings, relationships, histories, and social structures that give those behaviors their significance. Bronislaw Malinowski, who is often credited with establishing modern ethnographic practice through his fieldwork in the Trobriand Islands in the early twentieth century, argued that the ethnographer's central task is to gather what he called "the imponderabilia of actual life" — the small, seemingly trivial, everyday details that cannot be captured through formal questioning or official documents but that are absolutely essential to understanding how people really live (Malinowski 18).

Malinowski described his method this way: observing the village come to life in the morning, watching people cook and eat and argue and joke, noticing the arrangements of daily work — not as background noise, but as the substance of research. The imponderabilia are the lived texture of human experience, and they can only be perceived by someone who is actually there, paying close attention, over a sustained period of time.

The fourth principle is that ethnography produces thick description — a term developed and popularized by the anthropologist Clifford Geertz. Geertz borrowed the phrase from the philosopher Gilbert Ryle to describe the difference between a simple, factual account of what someone is doing (thin description) and a rich, interpretive account that reveals the layers of meaning embedded in that action (thick description). Ryle's famous example is the difference between a twitch and a wink. Both look the same from the outside — a rapid contraction of the eyelid. But a twitch is involuntary, while a wink is a deliberate communication, aimed at someone specific, meant to convey a particular message according to a shared social code. Describing the physical movement alone (thin description) tells us almost nothing. Understanding the context, the relationship, the intention, and the cultural code (thick description) tells us everything (Geertz, The Interpretation of Cultures 6).

As Professor Rowena Robinson, a sociologist at IIT Bombay, explains in the context of the course material this paper draws from, thick description is not just description — it is interpretation. It brings together the biographical, the historical, the situational, the relational, and the interactional. A rich ethnographic account does not just tell you what happened; it tells you why it matters, who was affected, what social forces were at play, and what the event

reveals about the broader culture. Robinson illustrates this using an excerpt from Dr. B.R. Ambedkar's account of visiting Daulatabad Fort in 1934 and the humiliation he and his party faced when they used a tank of water — a vivid, painful example that captures all five dimensions of thick description at once.

The fifth principle is that ethnography is interpretive and subjective. This might seem like a weakness, but it is actually a strength — provided the researcher is honest about it. Unlike natural sciences, where the goal is to produce objective, reproducible facts, ethnographic research openly acknowledges that knowledge is constructed through the lens of the researcher. As Geertz famously put it, "what we call our data are really our constructions of other people's constructions of what they and their compatriots are up to" (Geertz, The Interpretation of Cultures 9). Ethnographic knowledge is not a fixed, findable thing; it is a patchwork quilt of multiple perspectives, stitched together by the researcher's interpretation.

This is precisely why self-reflexivity is not optional in ethnographic research. Researchers must be constantly aware of how their own identity, assumptions, and social position affect what they see, how they interpret it, and how they represent it. When a researcher enters a context, the context changes. It is simply not possible to be a neutral, invisible observer. Acknowledging this — and letting that acknowledgment shape the research — is part of what makes ethnography honest.

Designing an Ethnographic Study

Ethnographic research does not begin the moment a researcher enters the field. It begins with careful groundwork: reading existing literature, defining a research question, identifying participants and contexts, and reflecting on one's own assumptions. This design phase is as important as the fieldwork itself.

The research question is the anchor of the entire study. It defines what the researcher is looking for and why. A good research question is neither too narrow (ruling out the complexity that ethnography is uniquely equipped to capture) nor too vague (leaving the researcher with no clear direction). For example, a student interested in studying a traditional art form like Tholpavakoothu — Kerala's shadow puppetry — might start with a broad question: what motivates the performers to continue their art in an era with little patronage? This question can then be refined into sub-questions about identity, economic pressures, the role of religion, and the art form's relationship with digital media.

Before entering the field, researchers conduct what is called secondary research — a review of existing literature, studies, and records related to their subject. This is not about finding what has already been answered, but about understanding the landscape. Secondary

research helps researchers avoid reinventing the wheel, identify gaps in existing knowledge, and arrive in the field better prepared to understand what they observe. Reading existing ethnographies about a culture is, as one instructive framing puts it, like reading a travel guide before a trip — it helps you know the language, understand the customs, and set realistic expectations.

Ethnography is also particularly well-suited to specific types of research questions: those about how people see their world, how relationships are formed and maintained, how social activities are organized, and how identities are constructed across contexts. When a research question requires understanding the lived experience of a person or community from the inside out, ethnography is often the right method.

Fieldwork: Access, Trust, and Immersion

The heart of ethnographic research is fieldwork — the sustained, direct engagement with participants in their own context. Fieldwork is not simply "visiting" people. It is a form of immersion: becoming, for a period of time, a part of the world you are studying.

Gaining access to that world is rarely straightforward. People are understandably cautious about letting strangers into their lives, especially strangers who want to ask questions and take notes. Participants may wonder if the researcher is a spy, an agent of the government, a journalist, or someone who could harm them in some way. These concerns are not irrational — ethnographers have sometimes caused harm, intentionally or not, by misrepresenting communities or publishing sensitive information without adequate consent.

Building trust is therefore one of the most important and most delicate tasks in ethnographic fieldwork. Researchers typically begin by spending time in the community without pressing for formal interviews — hanging around in common spaces, having casual conversations, being present without being intrusive. This process of becoming a familiar, non-threatening face takes time and cannot be rushed. As the Indian ethnographer M.N. Srinivas found during his fieldwork in a south Indian village, the person who first welcomes a researcher into a community often shapes — and can constrain — the researcher's access to other members. Being hosted by a high-caste Brahmin meant that lower-caste villagers were reluctant to approach Srinivas at all. He eventually had to work deliberately to break free of that dynamic (Srinivas 31).

Researchers often rely on key participants — sometimes called key informants — who serve as guides, interpreters, and connectors within the community. A key participant can open doors, explain cultural norms, introduce the researcher to others, and offer insider perspectives on what the researcher observes. But key participants have their own biases and limitations,

and their access within the community is never total. A male key participant may have no entree into spaces reserved for women, and vice versa. The researcher must always remember that any single person's view of a community is partial.

Immersion — the practice of becoming deeply embedded in the context of the participants — is central to ethnographic methodology. But immersion does not mean one single thing. Different studies require different degrees of immersion. Researcher Verrier Elwin, who spent years living among the Gond tribal communities of central India, is an example of what might be called complete membership — he became deeply embedded in the community's life, eventually starting literacy programs for the Gonds and becoming a recognized figure within the community. In contrast, a researcher who spends focused time with a community only during a particular festival or ritual might practice what could be called peripheral membership — present and observant, but not integrated into daily life.

Whatever the degree of immersion, the ethnographer must always hold two positions simultaneously: insider and outsider. They must be familiar enough with the context to understand what they are seeing, and yet distant enough to analyze it. This tension — between belonging and observing — is not a flaw in the method; it is its defining feature.

Ethics are woven into every aspect of fieldwork. The researcher must constantly ask: Am I building this relationship for my own benefit, or is it genuinely mutual? What do my participants gain from working with me? Am I protecting the privacy and dignity of the people who trust me? When research will be published or made public, participants' identities may need to be anonymized — especially when the community is vulnerable, such as Dalit workers or sex workers. Informed consent — ensuring that participants understand what they are agreeing to and can withdraw at any time — is a fundamental ethical requirement.

Fieldwork is also an exercise in flexibility and humility. Things rarely go according to plan. Participants cancel. Gatekeepers block access. Unexpected events reshape the entire research question. The researcher must be responsive, not rigid. In one illustrative example, a researcher visiting a traditional bakery in Goa was warmly welcomed by the owner on her first visit. When she returned the next day, the warmth had evaporated. She later discovered that she had failed to acknowledge the bakery's other workers, who had grown suspicious and warned the owner. The lesson was simple but important: access is not a single, one-time event. It is an ongoing relationship that must be continually earned and maintained.

Methods of Engagement: Observation and Interview

The primary tools of ethnographic engagement are observation, participant observation, and interviews. Each of these methods has its own character and its own demands.

Observation means watching carefully and attentively. In ethnographic practice, this is not passive watching — it is active, analytical engagement. The ethnographer observes people's daily activities, their rituals and routines, their interactions with each other and with their physical environment, the objects they use and the spaces they inhabit. All of these become data.

Participant observation takes this further. Rather than watching from the sidelines, the researcher joins in. They eat with the community, participate in their work, attend their ceremonies, and become a temporary member of the social world they are studying. Malinowski argued that this kind of participation was essential to understanding culture from the inside — that there were aspects of social life that simply could not be accessed any other way.

Interviews in ethnographic research are usually semi-structured or unstructured — meaning the researcher has broad questions in mind but lets the conversation develop naturally, following the participant's lead. This is very different from a structured survey, where every question is fixed in advance and every respondent answers the same questions in the same order. Ethnographic interviews are more like guided conversations, shaped by what the participant chooses to share and where the discussion goes.

The recording of observations — through notes, sketches, photographs, video, and audio — is not merely a documentation exercise. It is also an interpretive act. As the researcher writes down what they see, they are already beginning to analyze it. Field notes capture not just events but the researcher's thoughts about those events — questions, connections, emerging interpretations. The act of recording and the act of understanding are not sequential steps; they happen simultaneously.

Ethnographic research also involves secondary sources — existing studies, archival documents, oral histories, and other records that provide context for what the researcher observes in the field. These sources do not replace primary engagement; they enrich and frame it.

Representing Ethnographic Knowledge

What happens with everything the ethnographer has gathered — the notes, the recordings, the conversations, the memories? It must be shaped into a form that communicates the knowledge produced. This is the stage of representation, and it is itself an act of analysis.

Ethnographic knowledge can be represented in many forms: written texts, documentary films, interactive media, visual art, or even performances. Each form carries its own possibilities and limitations. A written ethnography can convey nuance and complexity in language; a film can show the viewer what words can only describe; an installation or art piece can create an embodied experience of another world.

Whatever form it takes, ethnographic representation must honor the complexity of what it is trying to convey. It must present multiple perspectives, acknowledge the researcher's own subjectivity, and avoid reducing the rich particularity of people's lives to simple generalizations. Historian Alessandro Portelli's research on the Italian workers' movement offers a striking example of this. When he interviewed workers about the death of Luigi Trastulli during a 1949 protest, many of them misremembered the year, placing his death in a different context entirely. Rather than dismissing these inaccuracies, Portelli explored what the misrememberings revealed about how workers had processed trauma and loss. The "incorrect" memories turned out to be as ethnographically valuable as accurate ones — perhaps more so (Portelli 26).

This example illustrates one of the most important insights of ethnographic research: what people believe, remember, and say — even when it diverges from documented fact — is itself meaningful data. It tells the researcher something about how people make sense of their world, how they construct meaning in the face of pain or change, and what forces shape their understanding of their own history.

Conclusion

Ethnography is a method built on a simple but radical premise: that the best way to understand people is to spend time with them, in their own worlds, on their own terms. It is radical because it asks the researcher to give up the comfortable detachment of objectivity and instead embrace the messiness, the uncertainty, and the intimacy of genuine human engagement. It asks researchers to be empathetic, self-aware, patient, and honest — not just as personal virtues, but as methodological requirements.

The core concepts of ethnography — the other, empathy, context, thick description, naturalism, self-reflexivity — are not jargon. They are tools for thinking clearly and honestly about what it means to learn from other human beings. They push researchers to ask hard questions about power, representation, and the ethics of their work. And they remind us that the knowledge produced through ethnographic research is not neutral — it is shaped by the choices of the researcher at every step.

In a world that is increasingly characterized by distance — between rich and poor, between different cultures, between policymakers and the people their policies affect — ethnography offers something genuinely valuable: the practice of paying attention. Of slowing down. Of choosing to understand rather than assume. That is not just a research method; it is a way of being human.

Works Cited

- Ambedkar, B.R. *Waiting for a Visa.* Self-published, 1935–36. Reprinted in *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar: Writings and Speeches*, vol. 12, Government of Maharashtra, 1993, pp. 661–91.
- Atkinson, Paul, et al. *Handbook of Ethnography.* SAGE Publications, 2001.
- Durkheim, Emile. *The Rules of Sociological Method.* Translated by Sarah A. Solovay and John H. Mueller, Free Press, 1964.
- Elwin, Verrier. *The Baiga.* John Murray, 1939.
- Geertz, Clifford. *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays.* Basic Books, 1973.
- ---. "Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture." *The Interpretation of Cultures,* Basic Books, 1973, pp. 3–30.
- ---. "Deep Play: Notes on the Balinese Cockfight." *The Interpretation of Cultures,* Basic Books, 1973, pp. 412–53.
- Hammersley, Martyn, and Paul Atkinson. *Ethnography: Principles in Practice.* 3rd ed., Routledge, 2007.
- Laidlaw, James. "For an Anthropology of Ethics and Freedom." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute,* vol. 8, no. 2, 2002, pp. 311–32.
- MacDougall, David, and Judith MacDougall, directors. *Lorang's Way.* Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies, 1980.
- Malinowski, Bronislaw. *Argonauts of the Western Pacific: An Account of Native Enterprise and Adventure in the Archipelagoes of Melanesian New Guinea.* George Routledge & Sons, 1922.
- Monteiro, Anjali, and K.P. Jayasankar, directors. *Punarvasan.* CAMP, 1995.
- ---. *So Heddan So Hoddan.* CAMP, 1996.
- Pink, Sarah. *Doing Visual Ethnography.* SAGE Publications, 2001.
- Portelli, Alessandro. *The Death of Luigi Trastulli and Other Stories: Form and Meaning in Oral History.* State University of New York Press, 1991.
- Robinson, Rowena. Guest lecture on culture and thick description. *Understanding Ethnography,* IIT Bombay, 2021. Course lecture transcript.

- Ryle, Gilbert. *The Concept of Mind.* Hutchinson, 1949.
- Srinivas, M.N. *The Remembered Village.* University of California Press, 1976.
- Understanding Ethnography: A Way of Engaging with the Other. Department of Design Engineering, IIT Bombay. NPTEL / SWAYAM online course, 2021. Full lecture transcript.