

Myong Soon-ok , Chun Byong-soon ,
N.B. Yem , N.K. Aljanova 

Al-Farabi Kazakh National University,
Kazakhstan, Almaty, e-mail: okmyong@gmail.com

DEVELOPMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGICAL METHODOLOGY IN RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN 'SELF AND OTHER'

The study examines the shift of perspective on research target and evolution of anthropological theory and methodology since the Enlightenment to the modern times. Anthropologists have contributed to the study of others, with the aim of colonial rule in undeveloped and undifferentiated societies since the time of enlightenment. They have made the mistake of tailoring other cultures from a western perspective. As an alternative for that problem, they have attempted to develop anthropological methodologies such as cultural relativism and insider perspectives. However, in advanced research methods, there is a dilemma of inequality in the relationship between researchers and research targets. In the process of research, the interaction between the researcher and the target influences the research result, and therefore, a device was devised to explore the self, the researcher as a participant of research while studying and writing. As a research method, historical and literature data were examined to reveal the debates that have been turning points from the Enlightenment to the present in the evolution of anthropological methodologies and theories.

Key words: anthropological methodology, anthropological theory, fieldwork, 'self and other', research methods.

Мионг Сун Ок, Чан Бенг Сун, Н.Б. Ем, Н.К. Альджанова

Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті,
Қазақстан, Алматы қ., e-mail: okmyong@gmail.com

«Өзі және басқалар» қарым-қатынасындағы антропологиялық әдіснаманы дамыту

Зерттеу тақырыбында дүниетанымның өзгеруі және ағартушылықтан қазіргі уақытқа дейінгі антропологиялық теория мен әдістеменің дамуы қарастырылады. Антропологтар ағартушылық кезеңнен бастап дамымаған және бөлінбеген қоғамдарда отаршылдық билікті мақсат етіп, басқаларды зерттеуге өз үлестерін қосты. Олар басқа мәдениеттерді Батыс тұрғысынан бейімдеу арқылы қателік жіберді. Бұл мәселеге балама ретінде олар мәдени релятивизм және инсайдерлік наным сияқты антропологиялық әдіснамаларды жасауға тырысты. Алайда, зерттеудің алдыңғы қатарлы әдістерінде зерттеушілер мен зерттеу субъектілері арасындағы қатынастардағы теңсіздік дилеммасы кездеседі. Зерттеу процесінде зерттеуші мен субъектінің өзара әрекеті зерттеу нәтижесіне әсер етеді, сондықтан зерттеу мен сипаттамада зерттеудің қатысушысы ретінде зерттеушінің жеке басын зерттеуге арналған құрылғы жасалды. Зерттеу әдісі ретінде тарихи және әдеби деректер антропологиялық әдіснамалар мен теорияларды дамытуда ағартушылықтан бастап қазіргі уақытқа дейінгі мәселелерді талқылау үшін анықталды.

Түйін сөздер: антропологиялық әдіснама, антропологиялық теория, далалық жұмыс, «мен және басқалар», зерттеу әдістері.

Мионг Сун Ок, Чан Бенг Сун, Н.Б. Ем, Н.К. Альджанова

Казахский национальный университет имени аль-Фараби,
Казахстан, г. Алматы, e-mail: okmyong@gmail.com

Развитие антропологической методологии в отношениях «Я и другой»

В исследовании рассматривается изменение взгляда на субъект исследования и развитие антропологической теории и методологии с эпохи Просвещения до наших дней. Антропологи внесли свой вклад в изучение других с целью колониального правления в неразвитых и

недифференцированных обществах со времен просвещения. Они совершили ошибку, приспособивая другие культуры с западной точки зрения. В качестве альтернативы для этой проблемы они попытались разработать антропологические методологии, такие как культурный релятивизм и инсайдерские взгляды. Однако в передовых методах исследования существует дилемма неравенства во взаимоотношениях между исследователями и субъектами исследований. В процессе исследования взаимодействие между исследователем и субъектом влияет на результат исследования, и поэтому было разработано устройство для исследования личности, исследователя как участника исследования при изучении и описании. В качестве метода исследования выступают исторические и литературные данные, которые были рассмотрены с целью выявления дискуссий в период переломного момента от Просвещения до настоящего времени в развитии антропологических методологий и теорий.

Ключевые слова: антропологическая методология, антропологическая теория, полевая работа, «Я и другой», методы исследований.

Introduction

Generally, people do efforts to understand other's value, institution, and culture when meeting with unfamiliar persons in other societies where they are not belonged to. While doing so, most people have a high tendency of judging unfamiliar out-group persons with bases of belonged in- group's value, culture, and institution [Lee, 1999]. An alert of the mistake that misunderstands out-group persons with in-group criteria has been suggested continuously in the anthropology history as an hot issue.

There has long been criticism that anthropology has served as a maid of imperialism as a means to effectively rule enlightenment colonies. In reflection, anthropologists have made self-renewal efforts in research attitudes and methods. In order to minimize research errors and ensure objectivity in research, researchers have developed rules for learning local languages and cultures and communicating in equal relations with subjects.

However, the problem of influencing research due to the inequality between researchers and study targets in the course of research has emerged as an important task in anthropology. The authors examine the process of change in anthropological methodology by examining the anthropological footprints that anthropologists have devised to solve these problems and errors.

Theoretical and methodological background of cultural anthropology

According to anthropologist Kang Shin-pyo, anthropology is the study of humankind [KSCA, 2008]. As there are various research areas related to human beings, anthropologists have tried to study humans from various viewpoints, and have developed scientific interpretations and expanded their eyesight in theories and methods.

Anthropology as a discipline in the modern sense is nothing more than 100 years old. In the 19th century, Western intellectuals saw Western science and progress as the final stages of human civilization and recognized the culture of non-Western Aboriginal peoples as the preliminary stages of civilization [Han, et al., 2012: 40]. They left the error that they have described non-Western people with ethnocentrism and prejudice based on the dichotomous perceptions of Westerners and non-Western people. By the way, an early anthropologist's study of undeveloped societies, although approached with prejudice and intellectual illusions, finally contributed to revealing the stages and developments of today's complexly fragmented modern society and widening study horizon of anthropology as a model of social and cultural change. If an existing study focused on cultures in other distant regions, modern anthropology shifted to the study of the society to which anthropologists belong, and developed in an attempt to view their culture objectively from a comparative point of view.

Today's anthropology is based on field research and cultural relativism in order to overcome the problem of evaluating other cultures based on their own culture through direct observation and investigation. In the 20th century, American anthropologist Franz Boas criticized the evolutionism of Western intellectuals, who took all of the West as an example of evolution, overlooked the historicity of culture and fell into self-cultural superiorism. He argued that there is no universal law of development in every civilization, and that each culture is shaped by complex variables, that is, historical and social contexts [Boas, 1928a; 1965b]. French modern anthropologist and structuralist Claude Levi-Strauss emphasized cultural relativity while insisting on a universal human deep structure [Levi-Strauss, 1955a]. In 1952, his book "Race and

History” thoroughly relativized Western culture from a cultural relativist viewpoint [Levi-Strauss, 1952b]. According to him, progress is “just like gambling by throwing dice on a table.” This pointed out that it is easy to have a static view that culture is developing in a similar direction and cumulatively, and how difficult it is to measure the direction of cultural progression [Ayabe, 2009: 92].

In the mid-twentieth century, a structural functionalism perspective emerged, with field research as the most fundamental and empirical tradition. This view comes from the logic that anthropologists have to enter the subject’s area directly and understand it for a long time in the perspective and context of local people, and it has become an essential process in anthropological research. However, a study of structural functionalist perspectives by B. Malinowski and A. Radcliffe-Brown was criticized for overlooking conflict and possibilities because of focusing on only the functional aspects of society. Levi-Strauss argued that man is not only a tool-making animal but also an animal that creates meaning, and that the semantic system, the symbol system, should be understood in human and cultural contexts [Levi-Strauss, 1955b].

In recent anthropology, as the reflective anthropology has emerged, the fundamental problem of field research has been pointed out. Particularly the structural functionalism of traditional anthropology has been criticized for its ethnocentrism, ideological, colonial, sexist, and historical history. It also raised questions about the objectivity and accuracy of fieldwork, and about the authority of the ethnographer in ethnographical approach [Crane, et al., 1992/2006: ix].

The frenzy of orientalism and postmodernism, which emerged as the antithesis of modern western values, further accelerated the reflection of anthropology. The postmodern ethnography presented a decentralized nation or culture with attention to internal conflicts and cracks. Edward Said’s criticism of Westerners’ orientalism revealed the relations of knowledge and power that had been concealed in cross-cultural studies [Said, 1978].

Clifford Geertz, who developed interpretive theory of culture, emphasized the work of «thick description» in writing ethnography. His frequently quoted phrase, “Man is an animal suspended in the web of significance he himself has spun. Culture is a web spun in such a way, so cultural analysis is not an experimental science that seeks after regularity, but an interpretational science that pursues significance” are saying the linkage between meanings and symbols. That is, symbols are the carriers to load

and deliver meanings. However, it is not that “The truth as it is” is inherent in specific symbols, but that specific people gave specific meanings to the symbols [Ayabe, 2006: 188-189].

There was an appeal to the ‘crisis of representation’ by George Marcus and Michael Fisher [Marcus, et al., 1986]. As an alternative, experimental ethnography was noted as a new describing method. That is, conversational principle emphasizing the relationship between Self (researcher) and Other (study target) as a new representing method; reflexive describing based on one’s understanding of the other; polyphony to reflect the voices of many human beings have been proposed.

As noted above, anthropology has entered a deeper era of self-reflection since the 1980s. Modern anthropology has been reflected continuously with Franz Boas, who criticized the racist prejudice based on dichotomous thinking; Levi-Strauss, who criticized the dichotomy of civilization and barbarism from the structural anthropological perspective; emerge of postmodernism, and feminism and so on.

Problems of study on the other in the traditional perspective

Indebting to developments of accumulated industries and scientific technology after the age of enlightenment, western people came to turn their eyes to outside world of western countries. They have done commercial activities by bringing in the goods that gave commercial profits from new continental, Asia, and Africa etc so as to accumulate the wealth of own country while striving to be first. Westerners required correct understandings on the new colonial regions that brought the wealth, and thus a learning called ‘Ethnography’ came into being by the necessity. Specially, the ethnographic study has been developed in England and the US. Purposes and directions in ethnographic study were not matched each other from these two countries. American anthropologists researched from directions of understanding human nature after collecting many information on the native (Indian, Aztec, Polynesia, Australia societies) as soon as possible. And the anthropologists in England that had many colonies in overseas attempted to get information on the native’s society, institution, and values etc. so as to govern the colonial natives more effective and less suppressive. However, their researches were not systemized because merchant, soldier, and explorers at that time had not any technology on the field survey study at all.

Another matter that traditional anthropologists have been accused of is the question of the view of the other. Most of the research started from the 'outside view' which is regarded as the object of sympathy and romantic inquiry about the unfamiliar people.

Limitations and alternatives from insider and outsider perspectives

In relation with viewpoints of seeing the research subjects considered important in anthropology study, there have been conflicting opinions on which viewpoints from insider or outsider would be seen more importantly or had to be used among them. William Graham Sumner indicated in his articles «Folkways» that "there occurred differences between ourselves, our group and all besides ours, their group, out-group. Members in our group are resided in peace, order, law, and politics of ours. In contrast, they have relations of war or blames on out-group or others in the pretext of dissimilar thoughts." [Sumner, 1966: 12] These assertions from Sumner have been systemized more by Hyman, and he said it 'reference group' that became an standard group in case of judging and evaluating others, and then in-group in the most societies was worked as the reference group [Lee, 1999]. D.K. Lewis systemized the insider's viewpoint in his 1973 thesis <Anthropology and Colonialism>. According to his assertions, he insisted that white anthropologists should not attempt to research on black society or North American Indian's one, and rather black anthropologists had to research black society along with Indian research by Indian ones so as to see the society justly. Conversely, M.D. Caulfield criticized the limitation of in-group viewpoints in his thesis "Participant Observation and Partisan Observation" in 1973. According to him just as large differences between a black anthropologist who are grown up at middle-class area and blacks in the slum are existed in social levels, similarly, there are many cases that white anthropologists become outsider's positions in white culture and classes. Another thing is that losing from anthropology insider's viewpoints are large as much as getting. According to Lewis it could be unfit when researches on the white middle-class is carried out by anthropologists of white middle-classes. The reason is that they will consider it daily matters on the stamp collection or doctor's bringing about pet dogs and thus need not to be mentioned. Preferably, scholars who are grown up at the 3rd world could do comparative

studies while collecting far more vivid data than the anthropologists of American middle-class [Keesing, 1985].

Two viewpoints that brought criticisms have merits and demerits at the same time. Researches by outsider will have difficulties in approaching to complicated matters in the society easily because researchers are not members of the society, and thus it could be unfit to its study owing to excessive simplicity and distortion along with being too superficial. The criticism of being in discord mutually at the most parts of Western anthropologists' studies having been made from outsider's positions is believed as being able to be overcome by insider's viewpoints. However, Keesing indicated the limitation of insider viewpoints, stating that a scholar who can write about African tribes well, but he has considerable difficulties in describing the department where he is teaching now. The reason is that he knows about the university too much.

In the two viewpoints of controversy, unequal relations between researchers and study subjects are inherent. That is, others have been defined according to viewpoints of western people, not from 'as it is.' This means making others besides me be other persons thoroughly. This distorted viewpoint in the early anthropology produced norms called cultural relativism, and 'superficial research' and 'insufficient in-depth study' were highlighted as overcoming problems from the methodological dimension of field survey. Cultural relativism and field survey that could be said as core elements in modern anthropology have been started from troubles on how to understand the meeting with others along with others itself.

Interaction between ethnographer and research subject

True understanding is not the one-sided thing, and 'limitation of true understanding and its dilemma' was because of hanging on unilateral understanding all together. Schizophrenic phenomenon in which various identities are collided each other has been appeared because the identity as 'researcher, understanding person' by having negative position on the actuality was not thrown away. There occur problems for readers by writing research results of this kind of recognition. Anthropologists compose a lot of knowledge gotten from field surveys systematically, and then organize it so as to be fit to consistent subjects. Through this method, anthropologists make others' cultures having been understood in person into easily understandable

types for readers. However, as stated previously, anthropological studies is related to understand between self and others, not understand on others from self, and the understanding by the researcher becomes one-sided type as soon as suggesting like 'research subjects are such existences.' As the study results are recorded by alone, not sharing with research subjects, and thus it is impossible to record the interactivity of mutual understandings because of writing by oneself. Thoughts that researcher can grasp interactive understanding fully by oneself, and then describe it is nothing more than making the research objects be others again.

It is an alternative in this dilemmatic situation to divulge oneself without hiding 'self' of the researcher in the process of anthropological study. Existing anthropologic studies have rendered productive criticisms on the researches to be powerless after making the viewpoints of the anthropologist be 'absolute' by recording the research accomplishment as others' cultures.

Efforts of saving 'self' having been existed in the research process let readers be able to see the understanding between self and others through 'self.' These efforts make the anthropologist's viewpoint having been absolute be relative, and research process and its accomplishment unoccupied exclusively, and thus productive criticism and developmental discussions become possible. The self of the anthropologist is the self being transformed and newly formed through interaction with others instead of buried one to the self. The

departure from this kind of self has a merit of being able to implicate more things in spite of demerit such like description of subjective self.

Conclusion

Daily figure of anthropologist's study work of nowadays is the field survey that experiences lives of on-scene people directly after going there for the research. Field survey is a selected method so as to reach in-depth understandings on the on-scene people's culture and themselves through meeting anthropologists with research objects. That is, it is a devised research method in the anthropology as an alternative for getting out from mistakes called otherness along with difficulties in understanding insider's life and culture from outsider's positions. This has been devised as a way of getting recognized on the facts of insider's life and culture that cannot be found from outsider's positions while entering into the insider's culture and then living together. These methods have been requisite rites of passage to be reached to 'in-depth understanding' that is aimed from current anthropology studies.

Anthropology has been doing reaps worrying about how to set up relations between the author and readers along with interaction's understanding between the outsider and insider over discussions of researches from insider's viewpoint or outsider's one. In post-modern, postcolonial times, anthropology as an academic field examines and reflects on the endless self-identity and trajectory.

Литература

- Ayabe, T. ed. 문화인류학의 20가지 이론 (20 theories of cultural anthropology) (2006). trans. M. Yoo. – Seoul: Ilchogak, 2009.
- Boas, Franz. Anthropology and Modern Life (1928 6). Transaction Publishers, 2003.
- Boas, Franz. The Mind of Primitive Man. Revised edition. New York: Free Press. 1965 a.
- Crane, J.G., Angrosino, M.V. 문화인류학 현지조사방법 (Field Projects in Anthropology: A Student Handbook) (1992). trans. K. Han, S. Kim. – Seoul: Ilchogak, 2006.
- Han, Sang-Bok, Lee, Mun-Woong, Kim, Kwang-Ok. 문화인류학 (Cultural Anthropology). Seoul National University, 2012.
- Keesing, Roger M., 현대문화인류학 (Contemporary Cultural Anthropology). trans. Chun Kyeong-soo. Seoul: Hyun-Am Publishing Co., 1985.
- Korean Society for Cultural Anthropology (KSCA) ed. 문화인류학 반세기 Cultural Anthropology Half a Century. Seoul: Sohwa, 2008.
- Lee, Chong-il. 질적연구방법의 역사 (Qualitative Study Approaches' History)// Bulletin of Primary Education in Daegu University, 17(2), 1999.
- Levi-Strauss, Claude. Race and History. UNESCO, 1952 a.
- Levi-Strauss, Claude. Tristes Tropiques (1955). Trans. Park O.J. Seoul: Jung-ang Sinseo, 1995 6.
- Marcus, George E. and Fisher, Michael M. J. 인류학과 문화비평 (Anthropology as cultural critique: An Experimental Moment in Human Sciences). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986.
- Said, W. Edward. Orientalism. New York: Pantheon, 1978.
- Sumner, William Graham. Folkway. New York: Ginn & Company, 1966.

References

- Ayabe, T. ed. (2006). *Munhwainlyuhag-ui 20gaji ilon (20 theories of cultural anthropology)*. Trans. M. Yoo. – Seoul: Ilchogak, 2009.
- Boas, Franz. (1928 a). *Anthropology and Modern Life*. Transaction Publishers, 2003.
- Boas, Franz. (1965 b). *The Mind of Primitive Man*. Revised edition. New York: Free Press.
- Crane, J.G., Angrosino, M.V. (1992). *Munhwainlyuhag hyeonjijosabangbeob (Field Projects in Anthropology: A Student Handbook)*. Trans. K. Han, S. Kim. – Seoul: Ilchogak, 2006.
- Han, Sang-Bok, Lee, Mun-Woong, Kim, Kwang-Ok. (2012). *Cultural Anthropology*. Seoul National University.
- Keesing, Roger M. (1976). *Hyeondaemunhwainlyuhag (Contemporary Cultural Anthropology)*. trans. Chun Kyeong-soo. Seoul: Hyun-Am Publishing Co., 1985.
- Korean Society for Cultural Anthropology ed. (2008). *Cultural Anthropology Half a Century*. Seoul: Sohwa.
- Lee, Chong-il. (1999). “Jiljeog-yeongubangbeob-ui yeogsa (Qualitative Study Approaches’ History)”. *Bulletin of Primary Education in Daegu University*, 17(2), 1999.
- Levi-Strauss, Claude. (1952 a). *Race and History*. Unesco.
- Levi-Strauss, Claude. (1955 b). *Tristes Tropiques*. Trans. Park O.J. Seoul: Jung-ang Sinseo, 1995.
- Marcus, George E. and Fisher, Michael M. J. (1986). *Inlyuhaggwa munhwabipyong (Anthropology as cultural critique: An Experimental Moment in Human Sciences)*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Said, W. Edward. (1978). *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon.
- Sumner, William Graham. (1966). *Folkway*. New York: Ginn & Company.