

1-27-2019

Media Ethnography: Demands Alternative

Bishal Kumar Bhandari Mr
Kathmandu University, brobishal@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr>

 Part of the Arts and Humanities Commons, Education Commons, Life Sciences Commons, Quantitative, Qualitative, Comparative, and Historical Methodologies Commons, and the Social Statistics Commons

Recommended APA Citation

Bhandari, B. K. (2019). Media Ethnography: Demands Alternative. *The Qualitative Report*, 24(1), 193-203. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2019.3014>

This How To Article is brought to you for free and open access by the The Qualitative Report at NSUWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Qualitative Report by an authorized administrator of NSUWorks. For more information, please contact nsuworks@nova.edu.



Qualitative Research Graduate Certificate
Indulge in Culture
Exclusively Online • 18 Credits
LEARN MORE

NSU
NOVA SOUTHEASTERN
UNIVERSITY

NOVA SOUTHEASTERN

Media Ethnography: Demands Alternative

Abstract

The heart and soul of ethnography lies in anthropological study within specific caste, ethnicity, and gender. In mass media research, the anthropological ethnography dominates through some of the aspects that focuses on geographical locations and ethnicity which is not relevant in the age of media and technology. The mass media has gained its own gravity, uniqueness, and distinctiveness at present as it fulfills the need and interest of individuals/society. As such fieldwork, participants, and positioning a debate within the realm of “anthropological ethnography” is not sufficient to understand the subjectivities of mass media. In such a context, this article analyzes and presents field, fieldwork strategies, participants’ and researchers’ roles that demands wideness in mass media research.

Keywords

Media Ethnography, Fieldwork, Insider and Outsider Dilemma

Creative Commons License



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-Share Alike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).

Media Ethnography: Demands Alternative

Bishal Kumar Bhandari

Kathmandu University Hattiban, Lalitpur District, Nepal

The heart and soul of ethnography lies in anthropological study within specific caste, ethnicity, and gender. In mass media research, the anthropological ethnography dominates through some of the aspects that focuses on geographical locations and ethnicity which is not relevant in the age of media and technology. The mass media has gained its own gravity, uniqueness, and distinctiveness at present as it fulfills the need and interest of individuals/society. As such fieldwork, participants, and positioning a debate within the realm of “anthropological ethnography” is not sufficient to understand the subjectivities of mass media. In such a context, this article analyzes and presents field, fieldwork strategies, participants’ and researchers’ roles that demands wideness in mass media research. Keywords: Media Ethnography, Fieldwork, Insider and Outsider Dilemma

Introducing the Need for Ethnography in Mass Media

Ethnography in mass media is gaining popularity among media scholars with the rapid emergence of mass media and technologies. The debate and discussion on its meaning and use, as well as the critique has elevated both media and ethnography especially in cultural studies.

Mass media ethnography focuses on the study of mass media tools such as radio, television, newspaper, internet mediated media, public or personal communication, and its influence in everyday life. In this article, mass media, media, and means of communication are used interchangeably. Mass media holds an influence for change in a society in both positive and negative ways; studying this influence is a most important domain within media and ethnography. Studying the influence of mass media is imperative as its basic function is to empower, educate, and socialize the society by providing news and information. The people also depend upon the information to make decisions and formulate opinions. In this way, mass media has emerged as a significant force in transmitting standard culture (new culture), particularly a culture borrowed by different means of communication.

The new culture is defined as changes in everyday life, which is different than those practices of past. For instance, in Nepal, low cost technologies imported from China such as radio named *Kichibo*¹ and television named *Xingbao*², are affordable and accessible. This is why, the culture of using radio was popular in between 2000-2010. After 2010, the use of the mobile is increasing internet use and social media.

Sociologists refer to this new culture as mediated culture as media becomes the primary tool to reflect and create new culture (Adum, Kenechukwu, & Abuah, 2015). Multinational products flow through means of communication forming new kinds of practices in a society. Therefore, media not only explores the information, advertisement, debate, and discussion presented, it also explores the new culture and commodity practices (Adum, Kenechukwu, & Abuah, 2015).

Thus, there is urgency in developing a new ethnography of mass media because of the extensive reach and access of mass media and technologies. Coman (2005) states that the 21st

1Kichibo: radio set made in China

2Xingbao: television set made in China

century is dynamic and widened because of the expansion of mass media. There is influence in every domain of society (family and individual levels). At present, information, communication, and technology (ICT) have brought sea changes in societies and in the perceptions of cultures, customs, rituals, and behaviors of individuals.

Mass media is a popular instrument for people in their everyday life. They use mass media as per their own choice or need, which is available and accessible to them. It should be remembered that media disseminates and interprets different innovations, knowledges, and news. Such information enables people to express their opinions, aspirations, feelings and sentiments, their fear and insecurities, as well as the potential resources for development (Wilmore, 2008). Hence, I see mass media as a central element in the socio-cultural, economic, and psychological lives of people. The mass media plays the role of mediator in the promotion of new products as well as in changes in an individual's attitudes and feelings (Baran & Davis, 2006), influencing the practices of societies. In the mid-19th century, there was a situated culture, but now we speak of mediated culture (Ughaerumba & Lawrence-Hatrt, 2016, p. 127).

After the expansion of different means of communication such as radio, television, newspaper, digital paper (online newspapers), social media, and mobile phones, communities and individuals are bombarded constantly with the messages that promote new practices, beliefs, and understandings. So, the role and influence of mass media is not limited to information, education, and socialization. The media have power to dominate the society. This is why the means of communication become important dimensions/discourses in mass media ethnography.

Coman (2005) states that media discourse is divided into two branches. The first branch is focused on media structure, function, process, impact, and audiences in the research field. The second is the applied branch in the university and academia in which researchers focus on communicating the information and insights through media in acceptable ways (Coman, 2005). In media ethnography, there are concerns about the messages that are spread so quickly through different means of communication. These influences are important facets of study. Previously, in anthropological research, the media was only a tool for information collection in ethnography. Now, the media becomes a separate discourse and influential tools in societies. Anthropological ethnography reveals human relations across locations and ethnicities (Gathigi, 2009; Malinowski, 1992), whereas the mass media (and) ethnography reveal the influences of modern mass media and the influence in the society.

As mentioned above, the changes in society and academia have opened the space to acknowledge ethnography from a new perspective. In the changed context, mass media ethnography from a classical anthropology vantage needs to be deconstructed to understand heterogeneous masses (audiences) and influence of media. Media originating in urban areas can influence the people who live in rural settings through designed messages. These messages spread from some fixed place and can influence the people who live in far away, unseen places of heterogeneous settings. So, the ethnography of mass media demands a new avenue.

Thussu (2000) and Petrova (2005) argue that media enable others to reflect on those voices that are not usually heard. As such, the purpose of this article is to analyze the constraints of older forms of anthropological ethnography (Baran & Davis, 2006) and to provide an alternative for this changed context. I mainly focus on the "field," "fieldwork strategies," "participants," and "positioning dilemmas" to broaden the old forms ethnography.

Changes in Traditional Ethnographic Methods: Overview and Critique

In this article, the anthropological notion of ethnography is termed traditional ethnography. I want to clear the edge and make a distinction between mass media ethnography and anthropological ethnography.

The traditional notion is defined as classical ethnography in the literature. Traditional ethnography is also known as realist ethnography (Malinowski, 1992) and has been shown to basically follow colonial tradition (Uddin, 2015). Changes have occurred over time; interpretative, critical or reflective, and postmodern ethnography are illustrations of the twist and turns in traditional ethnography (Yamphu, 2016). Although these twists and turns retained inclinations in line with the anthropological notion, there was a tiny space for mass media (and) ethnography when the use of communication was understood as a means to collect information/data from the field.

Moreover, the traditional/classical ethnography typically involved a researcher who entered a new field very different from his/her own culture to observe other people's particular ethno group/people and events to take notes, engaging as an outsider (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). Upon returning home, the ethnographer would share newly gathered knowledge and descriptions (Gathigi, 2009).

With the introduction of the interpretative, critical, reflective, and postmodern dimensions, ethnography was enlarged, but this extension did not cross the colonial periphery. Earlier in the 1980s, the Western World held the power and position to describe the colonies in their words (Yamphu, 2016) and the Western World scholars used ethnography for that purpose.

The traditional notion of ethnography has depended upon colonial legitimization. For instance, Bronislaw Malinowski was engaged in Trobriand Island, Papua New Guinea, and studied distinct cultural patterns. He viewed the society as a human body from a functionalist perspective (Malinowski, 1992), which still dominated ethnographic discourse. After the emergence of different discourses in social sciences, this traditional notion has been challenged especially in terms of engagement and knowledge transfer (Hammersley, 2017). In the multicultural, multiracial, and technological society, ethnography demands wide cosmos.

It is said that in a colonial ethnographic tradition, there was much focus on traditional anthropological notions. For example, mass media was framed under media anthropology, though it did not acknowledge the influence of media and changes in the society (Coman, 2005). Then time, place, and context were recognized as important facets in media ethnography. For instance, Erickson (2011) contested the research conducted by Redfield (1930) and Lewis (1951), in which there were differences in understanding and interpretation of reality though the research was conducted in the same field of everyday life in Mexico City. Redfield reported that the society was harmonious, internally consistent, and that people were happy. Lewis presented a miserable situation filled with tension, continual anger, jealousy and anxiety (Erickson, 2011). This indicates that earlier practice of the anthropological ethnographic tradition gave spaces to investigate alternative way and method.

Ingold (2014) and Uddin (2015) criticized traditional ethnography as colonial, as it stamps precise understanding universally, which still has domination in the field of ethnography. While searching the relevant literature of ethnography, I found that the landscapes of group identity—the ethno-spaces—around the world are no longer familiar due to influence and effect of means of communication. The “ethnos spaces and culture are no longer tightly territorialized, spatially bounded, historically unselfconscious, or culturally homogenous” (Appadurai, 1996, p. 48). It is because of mobility and migration, and mediated culture, which is explored through means of communication.

The influence of interpretivist and constructivist approaches gave room for critical and conflict approaches in social sciences. The critical approach includes post-modern, feminist, race, queer, and Third world perspectives. Around 1980, the inclusion of other discourses such as media, gay, female, non-White, and non-European or North-American issues were popular in ethnographic discourses and this is when the American Anthropological Association added the term, media anthropology (Allen, 1994, p. 2) and traditional ethnography was challenged

from different lens and viewpoints, but this helped new forms of ethnography to be created and developed. Different forms of ethnography now include

Auto ethnography, casual ethnography, citizen ethnography, cognitive ethnography, collaborative ethnography, constitutive ethnography, critical ethnography, digital ethnography, duo ethnography, educational ethnography, ethnomethodological ethnography, feminist ethnography, focused ethnography, functionalist ethnography, global ethnography, hypermedia ethnography, insider ethnography, institutional ethnography, interactionist ethnography, interpretive ethnography, linguistic ethnography, literary ethnography, longitudinal ethnography, Marxist ethnography, micro-ethnography, militant ethnography, multi-scale ethnography, multi-sited ethnography, narrative ethnography, performance ethnography, postmodern ethnography, practical ethnography, public ethnography, race ethnography, rapid ethnography, rural ethnography, slow ethnography, team ethnography, urban ethnography, virtual ethnography, visual ethnography. (Hammersley, 2017, p. 5)

Even though there has been a significant increase in the development of different forms of ethnography, many of these forms of ethnography developed within the frame of mercenary/colonial ethnography (Rohde, 2007) and rooted in a specific territory, frame of time, and particular participants (Murphy, 2003; Uddin, 2015). Hence, I feel, there is need to extend the development of ethnography further to address the influence of different means of communication in the society.

Mass media is influential at interconnecting all arenas of societies. In this changed context, I contend that the idea of a small ethnic locality as a research field is difficult in mass media research (Coman, 2005; Hammersley, 2017). For example, the rapid expansion of means of communication has brought differences in education systems, spreading of English as a common language across the globe, popularity of internet and mobile phone usage, all of which are forming standard culture (Liechty, 2010; Petrova, 2005). I experience that nowadays, there is popularity of the English New Year, Valentine's Day, fast food and coffee culture, and department stores, just some examples of emerging culture in Nepal.

At present, in the changing socio-cultural circumstances and changing media landscape, mass media and ethnography have become latent facets. To respond to the media influence in the society and changed cultural situation, the mass media and ethnography are merging into an alternative with a fresh outlook.

Encountering Ethnography with a New Idea

When I was a full-time employee as a News Desk Editor for a private television station in the capital city of Nepal, Kathmandu, 6 years ago (2011/2012), I used to report the news. Those news reports were related to politics, development, economics, and policy changes. At that time, being at the news desk every day, my preference was to pick unique and sensational news for the audiences so that they could form their criticism or support regarding the content.

As Liechty (2010) stated, mass media consumers are "audience" or "people" whose understandings and thoughts that are being influenced day by day by mass media. Liechty (2010) elaborated that there were differences in taste, choices, and the symbolic values of messages and thus, different effects on individuals. Sometimes, the media content producer's intention and the media audience's perception would differ in different contexts and settings. I also encountered similar experiences, while I was working as a Desk Editor. I used to think that whatever news and meanings that arrived from my news desk would be taken up by the

audience in the same way. My idea replicates the trickle-down flow of communication (Narula, 2004). I used to think that news and information could convince audience very easily. The media sell product, services, and ideologies convincing their audience. This is why, media is known as a dominant factor. Although, if we see it from the audience perspective, I found that the audience perceives message differently. The audience are rational and selective.

As a researcher, now, I agree with Mendoza (2010), who states that mass media content (e.g., information, messages, symbols, value, relationship, brand names, labels) are the objects which sometime lead audiences to consider things to be more real than they are. Here, the connotation of more real indicates individual knowing is not always similar and people may or may not get the message due to diverse and plural socio-cultural settings and the historical background of the society. For instance, various means of communication for Nepali society are regarded as useful tools to connect their family and friends. But the means of communication for business (i.e., selling a product to earn money) is different from that of politicians or power seekers (i.e., something that helps to obtain power).

This is the reason that mass media is a prime component of society. It can influence the perception of the society; sometimes media news could aid in changing policy and socio-cultural circumstances. Coman (2005) stated that this era is regarded as a media dominated era, in which different forms of mass media become influential factors in an audience's interpretations. While analyzing mass media, there is need to analyze the power influence because the power always aims to persuade the people to obtain their un/intended benefit (Petrova, 2005).

The mass media originating in the West has become the power center. They broadcast the news to meet the thrust of their respective countries with an intention of holding/capturing the power and also to promote the standard culture of the West, products, and values on those less-dominant cultures (Coudry, Liningstone, & Markham, 2007; Liechty, 2010). This is the political role of mass media (Liechty, 2010; Petrova, 2005). On the other hand, mass media sometimes explores preset agendas, which were already known to people. For instance, the West often portrays the suffering and misery of the developing world (Melkote & Steeves, 2001). This is a common trend of mass media. This shows that mass media is an instrument used to exercise power in the society. It is used by governments, businesses, and political parties who benefit by disseminating their policies, products, and ideological agendas respectively (Shneiderman & Turin, 2004; Wolford, 2007, p. 19). The businesses use mass media to inform people about products for mass selling of their products, whereas the politicians use the mass media to disseminate their political agendas and ideologies for mass support.

Another arena of mass media is society and culture. Mark Liechty (2010), whose ethnographic research was based in Nepal supported me to analyze the notion of ethnography in a broader way. He elucidated that the media plays an influential role in changing beliefs, norms, values, knowledge, behavior, dress, language, and lifestyles. Furthermore, this may differ according to age, gender, context, and interest. For instance, consider a Nepali family as they sit together to watch a single TV set in a common room. There are differences in perceiving or understanding the messages being broadcast because of interests, age differences, and their social environment. The political news does not always hold youngsters' interest and cartoons do not always grab the interest of the elders. If there are differences in understanding a message within a single-family, then the differences in different settings of society can only increase.

More specifically, each and every event, circumstance, happening, sorrow and woe, happy and joyful moments of ethnographic participants are captured in their cultural settings, though they may differ from person to person. The power influence of mass media and the differences in people's perceptions might be going beyond the notion of anthropological

ethnography. I termed it as traditional ethnography because of the focus on few participants, community, ethnicity, and castes and believe that is too narrow in terms of mass media. As stated by Ingold (2014) in mass media research, the notion of field and fieldwork occupy a wide range beyond a particular territory.

For instance, if the ethnographer puts his/her interest in conducting research on radio, the tentative issues would be the needs and expectations of the listeners. If the needs and expectations are studied in ethnography of media, the researcher must focus on the radio's content such as news, programs, advertisements, being broad and open from the specificity of ethnicity and locality. As such, the radio study could focus on understanding of information and influence of radio commercials. This indicates that the motto of mass media and ethnography is to understand the influence of messages. In the past, while conducting ethnography, the specific field, the specific location and culture was the known domain of ethnography. However, this is challenged by the development and expansion of mass media and its influence. The mass media could influence all forms and structure of society massively.

This is why, the mass media and ethnography is extended. The reasons for the need for extending the field of ethnography are (a) massive shifts towards studying influences of media from an ethno-tradition, (b) the field is regarded as those places where there is access to media, (c) the culture is extended to media culture (the media culture is referred to as using communication in everyday life), and (d) the users of media are regarded as participants.

In this massively changing context, media ethnography needs an alternative drive. For the alternative journey, in the following sections, I present some of the new ideas regarding ethnographic field work in mass media, participants, and positioning dilemmas.

Fieldwork in Mass Media Ethnography

With regard to the word, fieldwork, field refers to the universe which is selected by a researcher and work refers to the tasks to be undertaken in the defined universe. In other words, fieldwork is defined as the researcher's engagement in a particular universe for the purpose of information collection.

Here, I argued that the fieldwork notion is blurred or becomes an optional notion in mass media ethnography. It is because the message from mass media reaches different places at a time, regardless of territory and ethnic locality. For instance, the News of Radio Nepal is broadcasted through all territory of Nepal. All the caste/ethnic group listen to similar news broadcast by radio. As such, the notion of field needs to be broadened in this changed time. It is stated that the main purpose of the fieldwork is to enhance the quality of observation and reflection of research (Ingold, 2014), specially focusing on mass media. The fieldwork of mass media enables a researcher to note the information, time and place as well as the effect or influence of mass media in the society.

Fieldwork in mass media is important because within the mass media there are several forms of means of communication that may or may not demand a particular field. The mass media tools such as television, radio, and newspaper are common. Nowadays, the internet is used to explore those messages produced by newspaper, radio, and television. The media houses have digital newspapers, which is becoming more influential. The audience can hear, see, and read information virtually on the screen. So, the media ethnography has broadened its length and breadth from the prospect of media.

At present, the growing use of social media offer a wide arena to conduct ethnographic research. The social media enable people to share their feelings, ongoing events of their locality and necessary information. For example, the messages shared by the sister or daughter-in-law in Facebook from Kathmandu, can be easily accessed by the migrant workers in Gulf countries within a click. Delimiting in single territory to conduct ethnography would not be worthwhile.

This means, there are several forms of means of communication, and the researcher could choose the universe as per the availability of means of communication without being limited to a territorial boundary.

For instance, the ethnographic study of social media and virtual media each hold a different universe. Virtual ethnography could be conducted in a particular place within a house, where there is need of virtual screen and content. Therefore, in studying the influences of the means of various types of communications, the radio, television, newspaper, social media, mobile phone, or advertisements, could be the field.

Fieldwork holds various meanings and interpretations among the researchers (Alasuutari, 1999). In recent years, the anthropologists themselves have been debating and discussing the meaning of field and fieldwork (Alasuutari, 1999). Alasuutari states that anthropologists focus on marginalized and isolated societal aspects especially ethnic communities and their territory. However, as discussed above, I feel that after the invention of different means of communication, the territorial notion is blurred. It is because the mass media disseminates similar messages to all ethnic or non-ethnic communities, with similar kinds of influence and effects (Narula, 2008).

More to this, “fieldworkers are constantly pulled by conflicts between representing some indigenous world and its meaning” (Emerson, Fretz, & Snaw, 1995, p. 48). Jackson (1990) and Blommaert (2006) state that ethnography is all about doing the work in field and presenting the world from people’s perspectives, basically symbolizing the notion of shifts in the idea of field. I believe that the fieldwork is all about exploring multiple cultures and multiple truths within society (Emerson et al., 1995), regardless of culture, space, and ethnicity. The mass media researcher has a flexible field and participants while engaging in the field (Ingold, 2014), which contributes to the decolonization of the conventional genres of ethnographic fieldwork.

The ethnography of media has also several branches including advertisement effects, news effects, reporter life and their practices. An example is the Westerns Multinational Companies who are promoting their product and lifestyle in Eastern Regions. I observe the advertisements of KFC or Apple, Nike or Raymond, Coca-Cola or Pepsi in South Asian media constantly. These are not only products but culture that is being spread through advertisements. This indicates the advertisement has huge influence in spreading culture and lifestyles.

In this changed time, the media’s heterogeneity in terms of types and settings are important characteristics while conducting fieldwork. I argue that instead of delimitation of field, the particular genres of media could be a space for delimitation. The different means of communication, their availability and their influence among different cultural settings are important components while conducting fieldwork in mass media ethnography. The notion of fishing in one place (Ingold, 2014) and tribal uniqueness (Murphy, 2011) become blurred due to the domination of mass media.

Earlier the field and fieldwork notions were defined as study of a group of people for extended periods, more than 6 months, to interpret a unique way of life, and the beliefs and values. These notions are deconstructed in the media dominated societies, where field is defined as the space to study users of means of communication and/or the unique way of using means of communication means in the society that is not limited to a single location.

Mass Media Consumers: The Participants in Mass Media Ethnography

In this section, I discuss the implications for inviting and selecting people to participate in mass media ethnography. Mass media participants are consumers of various means of communication; they read newspapers, listen to radio and watch television, or use internet mediated communication application such as WeChat, Viber, Facebook, and Twitter The

media consumers use media to get information; to participate in different activities and events; to enlist social support; and offer their opinions, criticisms, or support on current issues.

A mass media ethnographer examines the audience/participants by exploring the messages and resultant changes in beliefs, attitude, and feelings. In media ethnography, the voice of people is explored engaging with them. Thus (2000) and Petrova (2005) have argued that the representation of voices, in other words, the representation of the voiceless, are important issues in mass media ethnography. This is crucial in media ethnography, in which the voices of the voiceless, those who are suffering from social ills and whose voices are not mainstreamed have a space and outlet for their voices. Take for instance, the community FM radio station that explores the news related to domestic violence, local entrepreneurship, or news related to peoples demands and government officials' responses. The FM radio station directly connects the government, people, and concerned stakeholders from one platform (FM stations).

In the same way, the social media is becoming crucial these days. In Nepal, Facebook and Twitter are gradually increasing in Nepali society. The organic apple produced in the high altitude of Nepal is being shared through Facebook. In Kathmandu, the carrier companies disseminate the message regarding open booking. They share the phone number and contact place, presenting the pictures and video. Soon after that, the customer books the necessary amount as per their need. Even the sale of buffalo or goat, or the vegetables or mangos from farms are posted on Facebook. This simply indicates the increased use of social media. Therefore, since the experiences of people in using media are important in ethnography, the selection of participants become more crucial. In choosing media users, their social-cultural circumstances become an important domain in considering mass media participants.

As discussed, mass media surpasses a regional or geographic context, and therefore, there is need to develop new ways of recruiting and selecting participants. For example, the ethnographic participants can be selected based on news programs of television or radio because the different radio and television channels produce unique program to attract their audiences. These days, the preferences of program and news content varies among participants/audiences (Sonia, 2004). The participants build opinions by listening to particular issues and debates on mass media. This is the reason that the influence of media needs to be understood in relation to the experiences of audiences (Saldaña, 2015, p. 101). As such, the mass media ethnographer needs to focus on their participants, clustering the different media based on programs of mass media. This process enables researcher to find appropriate participants as well as the effects of mass media in the society.

Positioning of Self in Alternative Ethnography

The insider/outsider positioning is also defined as emic/etic notions in ethnography as they impact the research process, presentation of ethnographic information, arguments, findings, and implications. These positioning facets are critical in the process of reflexively analyzing and understanding the data and issues more deeply.

The emic perspective emanates from the position of an insider. Naaeke, Kurylo, Grabowski, Linton, and Radford (2012) state that the particular culture and cultural context is explored in a more rational way if the researcher is from his/her own culture and context. However, this kind of knowing is not that significant in the changed context of mass mediated culture where the notion of culture is dynamic and changeable due to influence of mass media. However, the insider or outsider debate could differ due to gender differences and class differences.

For instance, the researcher who is from a higher class would encounter an event or circumstance differently in comparison to a middle class or rural family. Rural people are

usually characterized as poor, dependent, and uneducated while using different means of communication. Thus researchers may interpret the rural people as powerless and urban people as powerful. But the researcher who belonged to a rural village of Nepal, can interpret the phenomenon differently. The researcher may trace the particular rural network of communication, seeing communication in their circle based on attachments across people.

For the researcher, the emic and etic perspective could be defined differently in mass media ethnography. Yamphu (2016) argued that the positioning debate does not carry any meaning in modern ethnographic practices since there is no relevance of the positioning of the researcher. It is because the mass media is accessible to researcher and their participants easily. In one or another way the researcher himself is insider and/or outsider as s/he is user of mass media, in her/his everyday life (Adams, 2012). As such, I urge that the media and ethnography must go beyond the debate of insider and/or outsider, on the importance of people's voices and their context. Different to insider and outsider, sometime the status of people, gender notion, accessibility and availability of mass media could be important notions in terms of the insider/outsider debate.

Final Remarks

Mass media ethnography is emerging as an important approach. The mass media ethnography goes beyond traditional ethnography in that it is reorganized and redeveloped from a broader sense that enables the investigator to understand mass media (means of communication) and society in diverse ways. It articulates broader insights in some of the notions of ethnography such as fieldwork, participants, and insider/outsider positioning. This has also further opened the door to study mass media supremacy, weaponization of media, power and media, globalization and media, and social media ethnography at deeper levels. Further, it also demands new ways of collecting, analyzing, and interpreting information (data) as per the spirit of mass media ethnography.

References

- Adams, K. M. (2012). Ethnographic methods. In L. Dwyer, A. Gill, & N. Seetaram (Eds.), *Handbook of research method in tourism: Quantitative and qualitative approach* (pp. 339-351). London, England: Edward Elgar.
- Adum, A. N., Kenechukwu, S., & Abuah, F. (2015). Media technology and cultural expansionism in developing countries. *Communication Panorama African and Global Perspectives*, 1(1), 1-13.
- Alasuutari, P. (1999). Introduction: Three phases of reception studies. In P. Alasuutari (Ed.), *Rethinking the media audience* (pp. 1-21). London, UK: Sage.
- Allen, S. (1994). What is media anthropology? A personal view and suggested structure. In S. Allen (Ed.), *Media anthropology: Informing the global citizens* (pp. 15-33). Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey Publication.
- Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at large*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Baran, S. J., & Davis, D. K. (2006). *Mass communication theory*. Boston, MA: Wadsworth.
- Blommaert, J. (2006). *Ethnographic fieldwork: A beginner's guide*. London, UK: Institute of Education, University of London.
- Couldry, N., Liningstone, S., & Markham, T. (2007). *Media consumption and public engagement: Beyond the presumption of attention*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Coman, M. (2005). *Media anthropology: An overview*. Budapest, Hungary: European Association of Social Anthropologists (EASA).

- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 1-20). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Emerson, R. M., Fretz, R. I., & Snow, L. L. (1995). *Writing ethnographic field notes*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Erickson F. (2011). A history of qualitative inquiry in social and educational research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 43-61). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gathigi, G. W. (2009). *Radio listening habits among rural audiences: An ethnographic study of Kieni West Division in Central Kenya* (Doctoral dissertation). Scripps College of Communication of Ohio University, Central Kenya.
- Hammersley, M. (2017). What is ethnography? Can it survive? Should it? *Ethnography and Education*, 13(1), 1-17. doi:10.1080/17457823.2017.1298458
- Ingold, T. (2014). That's enough about ethnography! *Journal of Ethnography Theory*, 4(1), 383-395.
- Jackson, J. E. (1990). I am a fieldnote: Fieldnotes as a symbol of professional identity. In R. Sanjek (Ed.), *Fieldnotes: The making of anthropology* (pp. 3-33). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Lewis, O. (1951). *Life in a Mexican village: Tepoztlan restudied*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Liechty, M. (2010). *Out here in Kathmandu: Modernity on the global periphery*. Kathmandu, Nepal: Martin Chautari.
- Malinowski, B. (1922). *Argonauts of the Western Pacific: An account of native enterprise and adventure of Archipelagoes of Melanesian New Guinea*. London, UK: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Melkote, S. R., & Steeves, H. L. (2001). *Communication for development in third world, theory and practice for empowerment*. New Delhi, India: Sage.
- Mendoza, D. Y. (2010). Commodity, sign, and spectacle: Retracing Baudrillard's hyper reality. *Kritike*, 4(2), 45-59.
- Murphy, P. (2003). International communication, ethnography, and the challenge of globalization. *Communication Theory*, 13(3), 304-323.
- Murphy, P. D. (2011). Locating media ethnography. In V. Nightingale (Ed.), *The handbook of media audiences* (pp. 380-410). Blackwell, United Kingdom: Blackwell.
- Redfield, R. (1930). *Tepoztlan: A Mexican village, a study of folk life*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Naaeke, A., Kurylo, A., Grabowski, M., Linton, D., & Radford, M. L. (2012). Proceedings of the *New York State Communication Association*. Insider and outsider perspective in ethnographic. 1-9. Retrieved from <https://docs.rwu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1017&context=nyscaproceedings>
- Narula, U. (2004). *Development communication theory and practice*. New Delhi, India: Haranand.
- Narula, U. (2008). *Mass communication theory and practice*. New Delhi, India: Har-Anand.
- Petrova, M. (2005). Inequality and media capture. *Journal of Public Economics*, 111(5), 183-212.
- Rohde, D. (2007, October 5). Army enlists anthropology in war zones. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2007/10/05/world/asia/05afghan.html?_r=1&ex=1192161600&en=93026094c4e7f20d&ei=5070&emc=eta1&oref=slogin
- Saldaña, J. (2015). *Thinking qualitatively: Methods of mind*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Shneiderman, S., & Turin, M. (2004). The path to Jana Sarkar in Dolakha district: Towards

- ethnography of Maoist movement. In M. Hutt (Ed.), *Himalayan 'people's war'* (pp. 79-111). London, UK: C. Hurst.
- Sonia, L. (2004). The challenge of changing audience: Or, what is the audience researcher to do in the age of the internet? *European Journal of Communication*, 19(1), 1-12.
- Thussu, D. K. (2000). *International communication continuity and change*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Uddin, N. (2015). Decolonizing ethnography in the field: An anthropological account. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 14(6), 445-467.
- Ughaerumba, C., & Lawrence-Hart, G. (2016). The media and intercultural communication process. In N. Iheanacho (Ed.), *Intercultural communication and public policy* (pp. 127-162). Port Harcourt, Nigeria: M & J Grand Orbit Communication.
- Wilmore, M. (2008). *Developing alternative media traditions in Nepal*. Kathmandu, Nepal: Martin Chautari.
- Wolford, W. (2007). Introduction: Politics under the ethnographic microscope. In L. Joseph, M. Mahler, & J. Auyero (Eds.), *New perspectives in political ethnography* (pp. 1-13). New York, NY: Springer.
- Yamphu, I. (2016, February 18). *Small "c" contextual positioning in insider ethnographic field: Deconstruction worthless debate of insider or outsider or both*. Unpublished manuscript.

Author Note

Bishal Kumar Bhandari is currently a Ph.D. Fellow in School of Education, Kathmandu University (KUSOED). He did his post-graduation in Sociology from Nepal. He is an experienced communication expert and has worked in media for more than 15 years. Further, he has been engaged as a researcher in the anti-corruption, education and development sectors. Correspondence regarding this article can be addressed directly to: bishalkumarbhandari@gmail.com.

Copyright 2019: Bishal Kumar Bhandari and Nova Southeastern University.

Article Citation

Bhandari, B. K. (2019). Media ethnography: Demands alternative. *The Qualitative Report*, 24(1), 193-203. Retrieved from <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol24/iss1/15>
