complexity, not simply as a vehicle for content. As in CONVERSATION ANALYSIS, transcripts may be difficult for the uninitiated. Pauses, disfluencies, and other aspects of talk are typically included, but what cannot be represented in a transcript (unlike a videotape) is the unspoken. What happens to gesture, gaze, and other displays that are enacted and embodied?

Performative Analysis

Extending the interactional approach, interest goes beyond the spoken word, and, as the stage metaphor implies, storytelling is seen as performance by a "self" with a past who involves, persuades, and (perhaps) moves an audience through language and gesture, "doing" rather than telling alone. Variation exists in the performative approach, ranging from dramaturgic to narrative as praxis—a form of social action. Consequently, narrative researchers may analyze different features: actors allowed on stage in an oral narrative (e.g., characters and their positionings in a story, including narrator/protagonist); settings (the conditions of performance and setting of the story performed); the enactment of dialogue between characters (reported speech); and audience response (the listener[s] who interprets the drama as it unfolds, and the interpreter in later reading[s]). Performative analysis is emergent in narrative studies, although the dramaturgic view originated with Goffman, and researchers are experimenting with it in studies of identities— vested presentations of "self" (Riessman, 2003).

Kristin Langellier and Eric Peterson (2003) provide a compelling theory and many empirical examples, ranging from detailed analysis of family (group) storytelling to an illness narrative told by a breast cancer survivor. They analyze the positioning of storyteller, audience, and characters in each performance; storytelling is a communicative practice that is embodied, situated, material, discursive, and open to legitimation and critique.

The performative view is appropriate for studies of communication practices and for detailed studies of identity construction—how narrators want to be known and precisely how they involve the audience in "doing" their identities. The approach invites study of how audiences are implicated in the art of narrative performance. As Wolfgang Iser and reader-response theorists suggest, readers are the ultimate interpreters, perhaps reading a narrative differently from either teller or investigator. Integrating the visual (through filming and photography) with the spoken narrative represents an innovative contemporary turn (Radley & Taylor, 2003).

CONCLUSION

Analysis of narrative is no longer the province of literary study alone; it has penetrated all of the human sciences and practicing professions. The various methods reviewed are suited to different kinds of projects and texts, but each provides a way to systematically study personal narratives of experience. Critics argue (legitimately, in some cases) that narrative research can reify the interior "self," pretend to offer an "authentic" voice—unalloyed subjective truth—and idealize individual agency (Atkinson & Silverman, 1997; Bury, 2001). There is a real danger of overpersonalizing the personal narrative.

Narrative approaches are not appropriate for studies of large numbers of nameless and faceless subjects. Some modes of analysis are slow and painstaking, requiring attention to subtlety: nuances of speech, the organization of a response, relations between researcher and subject, social and historical contexts—cultural narratives that make "personal" stories possible. In a recent reflexive turn, scholars in AUTOETHNOGRAPHY and other traditions are producing their own narratives, relating their biographies to their research materials (Riessman, 2002).

Narratives do not mirror the past, they refract it. Imagination and strategic interests influence how storytellers choose to connect events and make them meaningful for others. Narratives are useful in research precisely because storytellers interpret the past rather than reproduce it as it was. The "truths" of narrative accounts are not in their faithful representations of a past world but in the shifting connections they forge among past, present, and future. They offer storytellers a way to reimagine lives (as narratives do for nations, organizations, and ethnic/racial and other groups forming collective identities). Building on C.Wright Mills, narrative analysis can forge connections between personal biography and social structure—the personal and the political.

—Catherine Kohler Riessman

REFERENCES

Atkinson, P., & Silverman, D. (1997). Kundera's "immortality": The interview society and the invention of self. *Qualitative Inquiry, 3*(3), 304–325.

Bell, S. E. (1999). Narratives and lives: Women's health politics and the diagnosis of cancer for DES daughters. *Narrative Inquiry, 9*(2), 1–43.

Boje, D. M. (2001). *Narrative methods for organizational and communication research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bury, M. (2001). Illness narratives: Fact or fiction? *Sociology of Health and Illness, 23*(3), 263–285.

Cain, C. (1991). Personal stories: Identity acquisition and self-understanding in Alcoholics Anonymous. *Ethos, 19,* 210–253.

Clark, J. A., & Mishler, E. G. (1992). Attending to patients' stories: Reframing the clinical task. *Sociology of Health and Illness, 14,* 344–370.

Cortazzi, M. (2001). Narrative analysis in ethnography. In P. Atkinson, A. Coffey, S. Delamont, J. Lofland, & L. Lofland (Eds.), *Handbook of ethnography.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gee, J. P. (1991). A linguistic approach to narrative. *Journal of Narrative and Life History, 1,* 15–39.

Hinchman, L. P., & Hinchman, S. K. (Eds.). (1997). *Memory, identity, community: The idea of narrative in the human sciences.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Labov, W. (1982). Speech actions and reactions in personal narrative. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Analyzing discourse: Text and talk.* Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Langellier, K. M. (2001). Personal narrative. In M. Jolly (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of life writing: Autobiographical and biographical forms* (Vol. 2). London: Fitzroy Dearborn.

Langellier, K. M., & Peterson, E. E. (2003). *Performing narrative: The communicative practice of storytelling.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Mishler, E. G. (1995). Models of narrative analysis: A typology. *Journal of Narrative and Life History, 5*(2), 87–123.

Radley, A., & Taylor, D. (2003). Remembering one's stay in hospital: A study in recovery, photography and forgetting. *Health: An Interdisciplinary Journal for the Social Study of Health, Illness and Medicine, 7*(2), 129–159.

Riessman, C. K. (2002). Doing justice: Positioning the interpreter in narrative work. In W. Patterson (Ed.), *Strategic narrative: New perspectives on the power of personal and cultural storytelling* (pp. 195–216). Lanham, MA: Lexington Books.

Riessman, C. K. (2003). Performing identities in illness narrative: Masculinity and multiple sclerosis. *Qualitative Research,* 3(1), 5–33.

Williams, G. (1984). The genesis of chronic illness: Narrative re-construction. *Sociology of Health & Illness, 6*(2), 175–200.

NARRATIVE INTERVIEWING

How does narrative interviewing differ from the classic in-depth interview? The first term suggests the generation of detailed "stories" of experience, not generalized descriptions. But narratives come in many forms, ranging from tightly bounded ones that recount specific past events (with clear beginnings, middles, and ends) to narratives that traverse temporal and geographical space—biographical accounts that refer to entire lives or careers.

The idea of narrative interviewing represents a major shift in perspective in the human sciences about the research interview itself. The question-and-answer (stimulus/response) model gives way to viewing the interview as a discursive accomplishment. Participants engage in an evolving conversation; narrator and listener/questioner, collaboratively, produce and make meaning of events and experiences that the narrator reports (Mishler, 1986). The "facilitating" interviewer and the vessel-like "respondent" are replaced by two active participants who jointly produce meaning (Gubrium & Holstein, 2002). Narrative interviewing has more in common with contemporary ETHNOGRAPHY than with mainstream social science interviewing practice that relies on discrete OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS and/or CLOSED-ENDED QUESTIONS.

ENCOURAGING NARRATION

When the interview is viewed as a conversation—a discourse between speakers—rules of everyday conversation apply: turn taking; relevancy; and entrance and exit talk to transition into, and return from, a story world. One story can lead to another; as narrator and questioner/listener negotiate spaces for these extended turns, it helps to explore associations and meanings that might connect several stories. If we want to learn about experience in all its complexity, details count: specific incidents, not general evaluations of experience. Narrative accounts require longer turns at talk than are typical in "natural" conversation, certainly in mainstream research practice.

Opening up the research interview to extended narration by a research participant requires investigators to give up some control. Although we have particular experiential paths we want to cover, narrative interviewing means following participants down their trails. Genuine discoveries about a phenomenon can come from power sharing in interviews.

Narratives can emerge at the most unexpected times, even in answer to fixed-response (yes/no) questions (Riessman, 2002). But certain kinds of open-ended questions are more likely than others to provide narrative opportunities. Compare "When did X happen?" which requests a discrete piece of

information, with "Tell me what happened . . . and then what happened?" which asks for an extended account of some past time. Some investigators, after introductions, invite a participant to tell their story—how an illness began, for example. But experience always exceeds its description and narrativization; events may be fleetingly summarized and given little significance. Only with further questioning can participants recall the details, turning points, and other shifts in cognition, emotion, and action. In my own research on disruptions in the expected life course, such as divorce, I have posed the question: "Can you remember a particular time when . . .?" I might probe further: "What happened that makes you remember that particular moment in your marriage?" Cortazzi and colleagues (Cortazzi, Jin, Wall, & Cavendish, 2001), studying the education of health professionals, asked: "Have you had a breakthrough in your learning recently?" "Oh yes" typically followed, and then a long narrative with an outpouring of emotion and metaphor about a breakthrough—"a clap of thunder," as one student said.

In general, less structure in interview schedules gives greater control to research participants—interviewee and interviewer alike—to jointly construct narratives using available cultural forms. Not all parents tell stories to children on a routine basis, and not all cultures are orally based (in some groups, of course, stories are the primary way to communicate about the past). Storytelling as a way of knowing and telling is differentially invoked by participants in research interviews. Not all narratives are "stories" in the strict (sociolinguistic) sense of the term.

Collecting and comparing different forms of telling about the past can be fruitful. A graduate student in my class, Janice Goodman, studied a group of Sudanese boys that had traversed many countries before the boys were finally accepted into the United States as "legitimate" refugees. Their narrative accounts differed from one another in significant ways, but all contained particular events in the narrative sequence—for example, crossing a river filled with crocodiles in which many boys perished. The absence of emotion and evaluation in the narratives contrasts with accounts of other refugee groups, reflecting perhaps the young age of my student's participants, their relationship to her, and cultural and psychological factors.

Sometimes, it is next to impossible for a participant to narrate experience in spoken language alone. Wendy Luttrell (2003), working as an ethnographer in a classroom for pregnant teens, most of whom were African American, expected "stories" from each girl about key events: learning of her pregnancy, telling her mother and boyfriend, making the decision to keep the baby, and other moments. She confronted silence instead, only to discover a world of narrative as she encouraged the girls' artistic productions and role-plays. When she asked them to discuss their artwork, they performed narratives about the key moments for each other—group storytelling. It is a limitation for investigators to rely only on the texts we have constructed from individual interviews, our "holy transcripts." Innovations among contemporary scholars include combining observation, sustained relationships and conversations over time with participants, even visual data with narrative interviewing (e.g., videotaping of participants' environments, photographs they take, and their responses to photographs of others).

In sum, narrative interviewing is not a set of techniques, nor is it necessarily natural. If used creatively in some research situations, it offers a way for us to forge dialogic relationships and greater communicative equality in social research.

—Catherine Kohler Riessman

REFERENCES

Cortazzi, M., Jin, L., Wall, D., & Cavendish, S. (2001). Sharing learning through narrative communication. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders, 36,* 252–257.

Gubrium, J. F., & Holstein, J. A. (2002). From the individual interview to the interview society. In J. F. Gubrium & J. A. Holdstein (Eds.), *Handbook of interview research: Context and method.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Luttrell, W. (2003). *Pregnant bodies, fertile minds: Gender, race, and the schooling of pregnant teens.* New York: Routledge.

Mishler, E. G. (1986). *Research interviewing: Context and narrative.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Riessman, C. K. (2002). Positioning gender identity in narratives of infertility: South Indian women's lives in context. In M. C. Inhorn & F. van Balen (Eds.), *Infertility around the globe: New thinking on childlessness, gender, and reproductive technologies.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

NATIVE RESEARCH

The predominance of POSITIVISM in EPISTEMOLOGY and science has long emphasized the necessity for researchers to conduct their work with OBJECTIVITY and methodologies through which concerns about VALIDITY, RELIABILITY, and generalizability are obviated. The phrase "GOING NATIVE" is often attributed to Bronislaw Malinowski based upon his extensive experience studying the Trobriand Islanders of New Guinea (Malinowski, 1922). In his reflections upon the relationship between the anthropologist and "subjects" in the field, Malinowski suggested that, contrary to the tradition of distancing oneself from objects of study research, one should instead "grasp the native's point of view, his relations to life, to realize *his* vision of *his* world" (p. 290). That is, scientists in a foreign milieu should go native, engaging in the research endeavor in a more interactive and reflexive manner with those peoples and cultures they study.

Over the seven decades since Malinowski first suggested the notion of going native, researchers across disciplines have focused upon the ways they might gain access to or study those populations and/or topics that are dissimilar to the researcher by gender, race, class, nationality, or other characteristics. Over the past 10 years, however, the field of anthropology has been primarily responsible for coining the nomenclature of the "native," "indigenous," or "insider" researcher (Hayano, 1979; Kanuha, 2000; Malinowski, 1922; Narayan, 1993; Ohnuki-Tierney, 1984; Reed-Danahay, 1997) in which ethnographers study social or identity groups of which they are members and/or social problem areas about which they have direct and often personal experience. Examples of native research would be female researchers studying breast cancer, ethnographers with HIV/AIDS conducting focus groups with HIV-positive clients, or Hiroshima-born scientists surveying Japanese survivors of the atomic bomb.

The benefits of researchers conducting studies by/about themselves include access to previously unstudied or hard-to-reach populations, the nature and depth of "insider" knowledge that accentuates the possibilities and levels of analytical interpretation, and a complex understanding of methods and data that can be born only of LIVED EXPERIENCE in a specific cultural context. However, native research also includes challenges. Balancing the multiple identities of being at once a PARTICIPANT OBSERVER *and* researcher requires unique skills and understandings to distance emotionally and intellectually from data in order to enhance analyses without predisposition. This is particularly difficult when the native researcher's primary social identities often mirror those he or she is studying. In addition, an essential criterion for the native researcher is to have not only some prior knowledge of the population, but also the ability to be accepted as a member of one's own group (an insider) even while conducting oneself as a researcher (an outsider).

The conundrums of native research require sensitivity to those native researchers who bring both "insider" perspectives and "outsider" methods for studying them.

—Valli Kalei Kanuha

REFERENCES

Hayano, D. (1979). Auto-ethnography: Paradigms, problems and prospects. *Human Organization, 38*(1), 99–104.

Kanuha, V. (2000). "Being" native vs. "going native": The challenge of doing research as an insider. *Social Work, 45*(5), 439–447.

Malinowski, B. (1922). *Argonauts of the Western Pacific.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Narayan, K. (1993). How native is the "native" anthropologist? *American Anthropologist, 95,* 671–686.

Ohnuki-Tierney, E. (1984). "Native" anthropologists. *American Ethnologist, 11,* 584–586.

Reed-Danahay, D. E. (Ed.). (1997). *Auto/ethnography: Rewriting the self and the social.* Oxford, UK: Berg.

NATURAL EXPERIMENT

The natural or naturalistic experiment is "natural" in the sense that it makes investigative use of real-life, naturally occurring happenings as they unfold, without the imposition of any CONTROL or manipulation on the part of the researcher(s), and usually without any preconceived notions on what the research outcomes will be. In the social sciences, empirical inquiries of this kind make use of natural settings such as playgrounds, schools, workplaces, neighborhoods, communities, and people's homes. With their naturally occurring events, these contexts provide scope for social scientists to unobtrusively gather and then analyze experimental data making use of QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH and/or QUALITATIVE RESEARCH methods (e.g., IN-DEPTH INTERVIEWS, CASE STUDIES, OBSERVATIONS, QUESTIONNAIRES, ATTITUDE SCALES, ratings, test scores). Experiments of this kind study the effect of natural phenomena on the response/DEPENDENT VARIABLE.