The Examination of Autoethnography as the Initial Step towards More Objective, Comprehensive, and Fairer Anthropology and Folkloristics

Ryo Yamasaki

Introduction

In 2015, a charity organisation was formed by a group of Scottish Travellers, an ethnic minority in Scotland. They call themselves the "Heart of the Travellers" and are commonly referred to as HOTT. Their main objective is to introduce Travellers and their cultures to the sedentary population *through their own voices;* this principle is reflected in their statement in their *Who We Are Leaflet* (3) on their website:[1] "It is prudent to promote our own culture through our own interpretations; which will augment the work done by academics." To this end, they have published a quarterly magazine, which is a collection of essays, stories, poems, and paintings by Travellers, since August 2015, as well as producing a film, *Sense of Identity*, which captured Travellers discussing their own cultures and premiered in June 2017.[2] The first issue of the magazine contains their statement that this is a new platform of their self-representation: "We are now a team of Travellers whose aim is to bring our culture into mainstream. A rich ancient history that has for too long been hidden and ignored. Through HOTT the Scottish people will now have a chance to see who we really are and what we truly stand for. We will not be involved in any form of negativity" (*The Heart of the Travellers Magazine* 2). Taking this quote and the one in the leaflet into account, Scottish Travellers are attempting to formulate and improve their social image on their own while adjusting and supplementing the Traveller image constructed by outsiders such as folklorists.

These activities of HOTT can be understood in the context of "native anthropology and folkloristics" (henceforth used without inverted commas). It is defined as "the attempt by 'natives' to represent their people, usually their own language, from native points of view" (Kuwayama, *Native Anthropology* 1). In fact, Scottish Travellers have long been researched, described, and represented by such outsiders as folklorists.[3] And all the activities of HOTT have been carried out in order for Travellers themselves to participate in the formation of their own social image. Such active production of the counter-narratives by Scottish Travellers symbolises the dawn of native folkloristics in Scotland's folklore studies. Similar instances can be found worldwide, and anthropologists and folklorists are expected to include "native anthropology" and "native folkloristics" in their disciplines in order to make their enterprises more objective,

comprehensible, and fairer.

The present study provides an overview of the history of the discussion about native anthropology and folkloristics, and it suggests what needs to be done initially in order to achieve this goal. It first looks at a discussion about native anthropology or indigenous anthropology in cultural anthropology. It argues that anthropologists have been painfully aware of the significance and necessity of native anthropology but they are still struggling to find a way to realise it. The study then turns to folkloristics and criticises that researchers have not made considerable progress in this field, either, largely due to folklorists' misconception that they are insiders. Lastly, this study proposes that the initial step towards native anthropology and native folkloristics should be a close examination of autoethnographic texts such as autobiographies produced by those who have been treated as "informants" or "contributors."

I. Discussion of "Native Anthropology"

It should be fair to say that, amongst various disciplines that deal with vernacular cultures, it was cultural anthropology that first brought up problems of the balance between researchers and research subjects and started to seek solutions to them. To this day, it has been a common practice for anthropologists (i.e. outsiders in most cases) to go into the "field," write ethnographies of the group or individual concerned, and publish the outcome, mostly for other anthropologists. After the second world war, however, this practice came under criticism for its subjectivity and power balance. To solve these issues, anthropologists proposed what is called "native anthropology" or "indigenous anthropology," which is based on ethnographic practices by those who have been considered traditionally as research subjects.

The advocation of native anthropology can be observed as early as the 1970s, and it was popularised in the mid-1980s. In 1970, Jones advocated native anthropology based on his fieldwork experiences abroad and his own community in the United States; after discussing how insiders could provide different points of view, he concluded that the theorisation of native anthropology was "not only justified but necessary" (Jones 258). In 1978, a symposium was held at Burg Watenstein, Austria, sponsored by the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research. At this symposium, they proposed the term "indigenous anthropology" as a working concept, defining it as "the practice of anthropology in one's native country, society, and/or ethnic group" (Fahim and Helmer xi). The discussion here was later published as *Indigenous Anthropology in Non-Western Countries* in 1982 and remains as one of the first major attempts to theorise and formulate native anthropology. Four years later, *Writing Culture*, a canon of post-colonial anthropology, was published, and it diffused the notion of native anthropology throughout the discipline. The anthropologists have felt the need for native anthropology for two main purposes; they believe that native anthropology

makes their discipline (1) more objective and (2) fairer.

1. TO BE MORE OBJECTIVE AND THOROUGH

Native anthropology is expected to supplement researchers' inherently subjective and partial observations and interpretations, thereby heightening the overall objectivity of the discipline. Ethnography written by anthropologists had long been believed to be scientific, hence comprehensive and objective, but *Writing Culture* proclaims that ethnography is more like literary works than an objective reflection of reality. Clifford, one of the editors of *Writing Culture*, stresses this view in the introduction entitled "Partial Truths"; he states that, "There is no longer any place of overview (mountaintop) from which to map human ways of life, no Archimedian point from which to represent the world" (Clifford 22). He insists that ethnography is a form of writing based on researchers' incomplete observations, and he criticises that anthropologists have scarcely ever doubted the partiality of their ethnographic writing. In order to compensate for their inevitably subjective and imperfect observations, anthropologists expect insiders (or their "research subjects") to conduct research themselves because they should be able to "offer new angles of vision and depths of understanding" (Clifford 9).[4)]

2. TO BE MORE POLITICALLY CORRECT

Not only can native anthropology contribute to anthropology in terms of objectivity, but it can also make the discipline fairer. Anthropologists have worked with their research subjects, but the two parties do not always stand on equal footing. To be exact, natives have long been excluded from discussions amongst anthropologists, nor have they been given a chance to refute what anthropologists say or write. In his analysis of pronouns and verb tenses in ethnographies, Fabian points out that natives are always referred to in the third person such as he, she, or they in ethnographies, and he argues that "*pronouns and verb forms in the third person mark an Other outside the dialogue*. He (or she or it) is not spoken to but posited (predicated) as that which contrasts with the personness of the participants in the dialogue" (Fabian 85; emphasis in original). Such reference in the third person implies that natives are placed outside the dialogue between writers and readers of ethnographies, and this suggests that anthropologists do not generally assume natives as primary readers of their ethnographies.

Kuwayama is one of the major anthropologists who have been tackling these power inequalities between anthropologists and natives, and he criticises this one-sidedness of the anthropological enterprise by using an analogy of portrait painters and their subjects in his work, *Native Anthropology*.

> [H]ow would we feel if we were portrayed by more than one artist and found that their works were very different from each other and from our self-image as well? And what

> should we do if the artists adamantly asserted that their works were authentic? Nothing would be more humiliating than being forced to accept such a representation merely because one did not possess enough power to resist the artists' claim. (Kuwayama, *Native Anthropology* 40)

He also points out that this structure is problematic especially because the subjects do not have the power to object to their portrait: "When the describer and the described . . . meet on an equal basis, . . . the latter is able to object. When, however, there is a great difference of power in their relationship, as between the West and the colonized non-West, people who have been described are put at the mercy of the describer" (Kuwayama, *Native Anthropology* 44). Using this similitude of the authoritative painters and the meek and mild subjects, Kuwayama successfully throws the fundamental and structural defects of anthropology into relief. And in order to solve this problem, it is essential for natives to have opportunities to represent themselves and, if necessary, object to images created by anthropologists. In brief, native anthropology is the production of self-portraits by those who have been portrayed by others. And it is expected to make anthropology more objective and impartial.

Although anthropologists have longed for the establishment of native anthropology, a major breakthrough has not been made. Some anthropologists believe that anthropology has changed dramatically since it entered its post-colonial phase. In 1986, Clifford proudly stressed anthropology's dramatic shift towards a more politically correct discipline; he stated, "a series of historical pressure have begun to reposition anthropology with respect to its 'objects' of study. Anthropology no longer speaks with automatic authority for others defined as unable to speak for themselves ('primitive,' 'pre-literate,' 'without history')" (Clifford 9–10). Marcus (429) echoed Clifford and wrote in 2012 that anthropology was no longer in the exclusive possession of academics. In the same year, however, Hendry and Fitznor (2) criticised anthropologists for not working hard enough to actually resolve the deep-rooted power inequalities, while being aware of how problematic it was. In fact, despite the fact that this topic has been discussed over the years, anthropologists are struggling to find a way to incorporate natives into their enterprise.[5] Jones, one of the earliest advocates of native anthropology, once wrote, "there are native anthropologists, but there is no native anthropology" (Jones 257). His criticism still applies to today's anthropology although the situation is slowly improving.

II. "Native Folkloristics?"

The discussion of "native folkloristics" is even less developed despite the fact that folklore studies share much in common with cultural anthropology and that folklorists are expected

to formulate native folkloristics likewise. In both anthropology and folkloristics, researchers, who are authoritative figures, go out and research those who live at the periphery (from their perspectives) and their cultures that appeal to them as vernacular. The only differences are (1) their motivations and (2) research subjects in relation to fieldworkers. Cultural anthropology has developed by exploiting the colonialism of the West; therefore, it focused primarily on non-West.[6) By contrast, the major driving force behind early folklore studies was romantic nationalism in the Occident; hence, folklorists went out to the countryside of their own countries to research the cultures of "peasants." As in anthropology, folklorists have been confronted with such issues as the inherent subjectivity in fieldworkers' accounts and enduring power inequalities between researchers and research subjects. Nevertheless, it appears that native folkloristics has not attracted academic attention from folklorists, and we have hardly ever heard of the phrase "native folkloristics."

1. REFLEXIVE ETHNOGRAPHY

Of course, folklorists have attempted to pull out of the conventional approach to ethnography by developing the reflexivity theory, to begin with, particularly since the 1980s. Reflexivity refers to an awareness that "the results of research are artefacts of the researcher's presence and inevitable influence on the research process" (Davies 3). One of the most well-known and influential folklorists concerning this topic is Barre Toelkin. In his article, "From Entertainment to Realization in Navajo Fieldwork," Toelkin appeals to all folklorists to reconsider and re-evaluate fieldwork practice as an "interhuman dynamic event with its own meanings, texts, and contextual peculiarities. Otherwise, we run the risk . . . of believing ourselves to be the objective beneficiaries of other peoples' traditions which we are free to submit to our analysis. It is folly" ("From Entertainment to Realization" 16). In his well-known essay, "The Yellowman Tapes, 1966–1997," he repeats this point and stresses the falsehood of the objectivity myth more clearly by arguing that "utter objectivity is seldom possible, even in the best of circumstances" ("The Yellowman Tapes" 384). He consistently and thoroughly admits that he is an imperfect and subjective human being, not an immaculate machine; this humble attitude of his made a great impact on contemporary folklorists.

2. RECIPROCAL ETHNOGRAPHY

As folklorists became aware of reflexivity, they also began to consider reciprocity in the folklore enterprise. Reciprocity in this context means mutual benefits of folklore research between researchers and their contributors; folklorists today are expected to seek a way "to give back to his associates, to serve their purpose, follow their agendas, and support their aims, without compromising his or her research" (Russell, "Working *with* Tradition" 25). It was Lawless that advocated "reciprocal ethnography" as a noble approach to writing ethnographies more fairly. She worked with Sister Anna, a female preacher and her contributor, and wrote

a book about her. Sister Anna read her work and sent a letter to Lawless, in which she voiced a strenuous objection to the researcher's analyses and interpretations, hence the title of Lawless' article, "'I Was Afraid Someone like You... an Outsider... Would Misunderstand.'" After having the confrontation with her contributor, Lawless realised that it was essential to present both fieldworkers' interpretations and those of contributors. She states that, "it is critically important that I allow her to respond to my interpretations with her own, and that I insist on the credibility of my interpretations even when they are different from hers. The point is that both should be presented, and that the dialogue between us should be part of the whole picture. No one gets 'the last word'" (Lawless 312–13). Lawless' "reciprocal ethnography" is one of the potential ways to overturn the conventional approach to writing ethnographies that is solely based on folklorists' observations and interpretations.

It appears to be only a matter of time before folklorists begin a discussion about native folkloristics. They now understand the innate subjectivity in their ethnographies and are well aware of the enduring power inequalities between researchers and their subjects. Therefore, modern-day folkloristics is in need of native folklorists, who can supplement the discipline with different perspectives, and native folkloristics is an ultimate form of contributor-centred approach. Nonetheless, this concept has not been hotly debated among folklorists until recently. In fact, in the case of folklore research in the UK, it was in 2002 when a "native" conducted ethnographic fieldwork for the first time.[7)]

3. FOLKLORISTS' MISBELIEF

There should be multiple elements that prevent native folkloristics from formulating, but one of the main factors is a problem unique to folklore studies, which can be called "folklorists' misbelief," that is folklorists have been inclined to regard themselves as "insiders" ever since the earliest stage of the discipline. As touched on earlier, the major driving force behind early folklore studies was romantic nationalism in Western Europe in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. The majority of the proto and early folklorists such as James Macpherson, Johann Gottfried Herder, the Brothers Grimm, and Elias Lönnrot, to name a few, had a nationalistic motivation behind their folklore-related activities; they sought *Volksgeist* in *Volkskunde*, exemplified by folksong and folktale found in rural areas of their countries. Thus, it was the most fundamental precondition in early folklore research that folklorists and their research subjects shared the same national identity.

An example that embodies folklorists' misbelief can be observed in the introduction of *Popular Tales of the West Highlands*, a pioneering work of modern Scottish folkloristics by John Francis Campbell of Islay (1821–1885). As he arrives on one of the isles in the Hebrides in search of local stories, he comes across a local fisherman and approaches him to see if he knows any Gaelic story. This fisherman guesses that the stranger is from the Lowlands or England and greets him in English in a distant manner. To this, Campbell replies "Tha n'

latha briagh" in Gaelic.

> [A]s he [Campbell] speaks, the whole face and manner of his companion change as if by magic; doubt and hesitation, suspicion and curiosity, become simple wonder; *his eyes and his heart open wide at the sound of his native tongue*, and he exclaims, "You have Gaelic! You will take my excuse by your leave, but what part of the Gaeldom are you from?" And then having found out all that is to be discovered, the ice being broken, and confidence established, it oozes out gradually that the fisherman knows a story, and after much persuasion he tells it, while he rows the gentleman who can talk Gaelic across a Highland loch. (Campbell 14; emphasis added)

This is an episode to show the local islander *and* readers that Campbell is an insider; he proves it to the fisherman by speaking Gaelic and to readers by showing the enthusiastic welcome he receives just by speaking the local language. The point is that Gaelic is Campbell's native tongue. Unlike classic anthropologists, he does not have to spend an extended period of time in the community, nor does he have to carefully study and learn local customs and traditions in order to earn the islanders' trust; it is enough for Campbell to respond a greeting in Gaelic, his native language, and he successfully collects a story from the mouth of his "informant" as a consequence. Campbell cites this dramatic anecdote to declare to his readers that he is undoubtedly an "insider."

As Campbell conducted fieldwork on his native land, the vast majority of early folklorists in Europe worked in their home countries, but did it automatically mean they were "insiders" in the communities? They may have been considered as insiders in the sense that they shared the same national identities with their contributors. However, most of them did not actually live in their neighbourhood, let alone belong to the same social class; generally speaking, folklore collectors were intellectuals and elites, and they travelled from major cities to the countryside to collect folklore materials they were searching for. As discussed earlier, the traditional framework of folklore studies and anthropology are almost identical; authoritative figures such as academics studied those who lived on the social and geographical peripheries. The difference was that, while anthropologists found exotic peoples and customs abroad, folklorists sought similar exoticism in remote areas of their own countries. Nevertheless, both early and contemporary folklorists have had the inclination to consider themselves as insiders, merely because they share the same nationality with their contributors. This "folklorists' misbelief" is one of the elements that have thwarted the discussion of native folkloristics.

Unlike folklorists, anthropologists began to realise that they were not insiders, even when they conducted fieldwork in their native communities. When anthropologists commenced

"fieldwork at home" after the Second World War, they would initially regard themselves as insiders and try to keep a distance from their field in order to retain objectivity as fieldworkers. During the 1970s and 80s, they hotly debated the advantages and disadvantages of being an insider and outsider, most of which were self-explanatory in retrospect. Over time, however, anthropologists realised that it was virtually impossible to be "true" insiders. For instance, Mach (41) wrote in 1994 that, "in many cases, 'anthropology at home' does not necessarily mean working with people to whom an anthropologist actually belongs. . . . [A]ny given social system is so complex that researchers choosing a community within their own state, are very likely to encounter many of the problems which their more 'traditional' colleagues find in a 'foreign' or 'tribal' society." The discussion of native folkloristics would be much more active if this realisation of anthropologists were shared with folklorists.

III. Autoethnography

Both anthropologists and folklorists have been seeking to establish native-oriented theories to make the researcher-oriented disciplines more objective and politically correct. However, before creating a dialogic space between academics and natives, or while trying to do so, researchers need to closely and respectfully examine already existing self-representation (i.e. self-portraits) by natives and their criticism of academics' descriptions of them (i.e. comments on their portraits painted by outsiders) because it is irresponsible and disrespectful to natives to begin a dialogue without reading or listening to what they have already stated. Such statements of natives often appear as autobiographies, and those texts can be categorised as autoethnography or autoethnographic texts as they are ethnographic texts written by natives themselves.

Autoethnography is defined as "an approach to research and writing that seeks to describe and systematically analyze (graphy) personal experience (auto) in order to understand cultural experience (ethno)" (Ellis et al., par. 1). Ellis et al. go on to say that "This approach challenges canonical ways of doing research and representing others . . . and treats research as a political, socially-just and socially-conscious act" (par. 1). There are a number of different subcategories in autoethnography, including self-referential ethnographies of scholars, but what the present study concerns are indigenous or native ethnographies, that is ethnographies written by those who are formally regarded as "research subjects." According to Pratt, it is "a text in which people undertake to describe themselves in ways that engage with representations others have made of them" (Pratt 35). Ellis et al. similarly argue that these forms of autoethnographic writing "develop from colonized or economically subordinated people, and are used to address and disrupt power in research, particularly a (outside) researcher's right and authority to study (exotic) others" (Ellis et al., par. 16). It is clear that these definitions are heavily influenced by post-colonial, reflexive anthropology, exemplified by *Writing Culture*.

1. WHY AUTOETHNOGRAPHY?

Reading indigenous or native ethnographies should be the initial step towards understanding native anthropology and folkloristics because, first and foremost, they are written voluntarily by natives themselves. Such autoethnographies enable natives to represent themselves with their own words. By so doing, they can negotiate with already permeated stereotypes and improve their subordinate social status. The correlation between a lack of self-representation of a particular ethnic group and their low social status has been pointed out in studies of such nomadic groups as Roma and Scottish/Irish Travellers. For instance, in her article on Irish Travellers' autobiographies, Lanters indicates that, "The perceived exotic and threatening nature of Travellers may in part be the result of the near absence of Traveller self-representations in any of the written or broadcast media" (Lanters 25). Sabiescu points out the identical issue in the representation of Roma in the South-East of Romania; "One significant aspect of this position of marginality resides in the lack of agency in processes of social and cultural representation. Indigenous people have been 'spoken on behalf of'" (Sabiescu 68). She concludes her article by suggesting that, "Engaging with and counter-acting discriminatory labels in the vein of autoethnographic textual production can be considered attempts at clearing the scene for allowing the people previously stigmatized to emerge as human beings with their own values and aims" (Sabiescu 85). This aim of autoethnographies sympathises with the principle of native anthropology and folkloristics.

Indigenous or native ethnographies are essential materials for native anthropology and folkloristics also because they are published without being filtered by academics. There are autobiographical texts transcribed and edited by researchers. In the case of Sottish Travellers, for example, much of Duncan Williamson's writing was transcribed and edited by his wife, Linda. Similarly, *A Book of Sandy Stewart* is an interview of a Traveller, Sandy Stewart, transcribed and edited by Roger Leitch, an ethnologist who worked for the School of Scottish Studies at the University of Edinburgh. Elizabeth Stewart's life story underwent the same process and was edited by an ethnomusicologist, Alison McMorland. Lanters points out three major problems inherent in this type of (pseudo) autoethnography. First, natives' voices are selected and presented by researchers and, therefore, it is academics that ultimately dominate and control their narrative (Lanters 30). In other words, these texts fall within the framework of conventional ethnographic practice after all. Second, researchers do not necessarily possess neutral images of their research subject and, thus, they can unconsciously stress "exotic" aspects found in natives. And third, academics can include information that natives would not share with the general public because it could damage their already fragile social image.[8)] To sum up, natives have no choice but to entrust what to tell and how to tell it to mediators in those ethnographic works. Thus, it is crucial to distinguish such writing interfered by academics from actual autoethnographies, although the demarcation line is not always clear-cut.[9)]

2. UNATTRACTIVENESS OF AUTOETHNOGRAPHY

Despite the fact that autoethnographies are requisite materials for native-oriented anthropology and folkloristics, they have not attracted serious attention from academics, largely due to their ambiguous status as writing. Autoethnographies have qualities of both ethnographies and autobiographies. Thus, they appear to be halfway or odd by both standards. When seen as ethnographies, they give the impression of being "insufficiently rigorous, theoretical, and analytical, and too aesthetic, emotional, and therapeutic" (Ellis et al., par. 37). When examined as autobiographies, on the other hand, they are evaluated as "insufficiently aesthetic and literary and not artful enough" (Ellis et al., par. 38). This reminds us of how autobiographies used to be treated in literary criticism; they were deemed as bizarre and idiosyncratic as art and history. Tsuneyama (174) argues that autobiographies are too objective and not creative enough as a work of art, while they are too subjective as history; this ambiguous status and difficulty in categorisation delayed the development of autobiography studies in the field of literary studies. Arts that extend over more than one category are predestined to be criticised and stigmatised as imperfect and deficient by standards of respective categories until critics develop criteria to evaluate and appreciate them per se. Autoethnography is one of those art forms for certain.

Autoethnography has been overlooked by anthropologists and folklorists also because there is a tendency for researchers in those fields to value orality. As a consequence, they are apt to leave something written down to literary scholars and not to choose literary works as research subjects. This attitude is backed up by Niles' writing on Scottish Travellers' oral tradition.

> For researchers in oral narrative, the chief importance of the travelling people of Scotland is not their way of life but their songs, stories, and other lore. To repeat a point, however, these two things go together. No body of lore can exist apart from its social environment. It can be recorded and fixed on the page, *but when textualized in this way it has only a museum existence that is a pale shadow of its true self.* (Niles 165; emphasis added)

Clearly, Niles is writing about transcriptions of field recordings when he talks about a "museum existence." And it is understandable because present-day folklorists are painfully aware that antiquarians and early folklorists up until the nineteenth century focused almost only on such textualised "museum existence." However, such autoethnographies by Travellers are a different kind of existence; they are artistic productions concerning Travellers written by Travellers themselves, usually without an intermediary, hence, reflecting tradition bearers' emic worldview more directly. Undoubtedly, autoethnographies such as Travellers' autobiographies constitute a unique ethnographic and literary genre and deserve special attention.

3. SOME CHARACTERISTICS AND CAUTIONARY POINTS

Although the present study has underlined the significance of autoethnography, it should be noted that such texts are not flawless, either. First and foremost, autoethnographies are as partial and subjective as ethnographies by academics are. Autoethnographers are no celestial beings and, hence, it is virtually impossible even for such insiders to observe and analyse their research subjects (i.e. their own social groups) objectively or comprehensively alone. Because they belong to those whom they study socially and psychologically, they may show a stronger tendency to perceive and describe their customs and traditions positively as Jones (258) points out: "[T]he native anthropologists should be one who looks at social phenomena from a point of view different from that of the traditional anthropologist. I feel that this point of view should be admittedly biased, in favor of the insider's own social group."

However, it is natural and permissible for autoethnographers' writing to be biased or one-sided to a certain extent. And this does not mean anthropologists and folklorists should abandon their attempt to make their disciplines more objective and fairer. As discussed earlier, ethnographies written by academics and autoethnographies produced by natives are both partial and subjective but written from different points of view. To put it another way, they are subjective in different senses. By comparing and combining these two types of texts, it is possible for us to represent a more objective "intersubjective reality" (Kuwayama, *Native Anthropology and Folklore* 59–60). If this goal is achieved in future, anthropology and folkloristics can attain a higher level of objectivity and can cover wider subjects and phenomena.

Besides being aware of their subjectivity, readers of autoethnographies must keep in mind that such texts are produced as retorts, rejoinders, and counters to mainstream narratives, which are created or at least affected by ethnographies written by outsiders. In this sense, autoethnography is innately different from ethnography by academics, as Pratt rightly indicates:

> [I]f ethnographic texts are those in which European metropolitan subjects represent to themselves their others (usually their conquered others), autoethnographic texts are representations that the so-defined others construct *in response to* or in dialogue with those texts. Autoethnographic texts are not, then, what are usually thought of as autochthonous forms of expression or self-representation . . . . (Pratt 35; emphasis in original)

In other words, the relation between ethnography and autoethnography corresponds to that of action and reaction in physics. Natives would not have had to write autoethnographies, at least in such a positive manner, if scholars had not written ethnographies and shaped their social images in the absence of natives.

Because autoethnographies are counters to mainstream discourse, natives often attempt to convey who they believe they are *not*, as well as who they think they are. Sabiescu, who

examined counter-narratives by Roma in the South-East Romania, concludes that, "negation and positive affirmation were used in succession: people felt compelled to say what they were *not* and refuse stereotypical attributes, while affirming the distinctive community features" (Sabiescu 73; emphasis in original). It is particularly significant for researchers to pay attention to natives' denials and rebuttals because such repudiation throws how mainstream narratives represent them into relief. It should be noted that, as discussed above, autoethnographies are intrinsically subjective, and so are their refutations to mainstream narratives. Thus, scholars do not have to accept natives' claims unconditionally. However, by examining natives' rebuttals in their writing, researchers can comprehend where their discontent lies and why they have to write autoethnographies. In other words, their negation is a vital clue to understanding autoethnographic text production.

Conclusion: *Their* Text is the Thing

The present study has argued that the initial step towards more objective and fairer anthropology and folkloristics, or research into vernacular cultures in general, should be a careful and detailed examination of indigenous ethnographies written by those who have been deemed as "research subjects." Anthropologists have been making strenuous efforts to establish "native anthropology," and folklorists today are expected to tackle the same issue, too. Needless to say, it is essential to create a dialogic space where scholars and natives can exchange their opinions on equal footing as Kuwayama suggests in his *Native Anthropology and Folklore* (67). However, if natives have already raised their voices and shown their discontent with their public images through various media, the first thing that scholars should do is to listen to their negation and understand why natives are producing autoethnographies. Returning to the analogy of the portrait painters and their subjects, the painters have to study their subjects' self-portraits thoroughly before they initiate conversation or discussion about the portraits and self-portraits on the discussion table. It is disrespectful to try to begin a dialogue without looking through what natives have already stated, although this process does not appear to be exciting for anthropologists and folklorists because these autoethnographies are texts (in a literal sense) not oral materials.

Anthropologists and folklorists are skilful fieldworkers, observers, and listeners but, to achieve this goal, researchers have to become good readers, too. It should be reminded that folklorists were once great *readers*; early folklore studies had depended almost solely on philological approaches, exemplified by the iconic historic-geographic method, before the discipline began paying attention to contexts such as performances and audiences. And it has developed while swaying and balancing between text and context. For instance, when the performance theory was in the limelight amongst folklorists, Wilgus wrote a provocative article, "The Text is the Thing," in 1973 and warned the fellow folklorists of the danger of

the slavish devotion to the performance-centred approach (Wilgus 252). On the other hand, Russell insisted that folklorists needed to pay even more attention to context in his article, "The Singer's the Thing," published in 2003 (278). However, the "text" that they have discussed and dealt with is usually oral traditions and does not include autoethnographies written by their research subjects. In order to understand native folkloristics and native anthropology, *their* text is the thing and, thus, scholars are expected to become good readers again, but this time with different interests and awareness.

At first, however, researchers do not have to be harsh critics when reading autoethnographies. In particular, they must not blindly criticise intrinsic subjectivity or one-sidedness found in autoethnographic texts; what they need to do is to calmly watch and see natives' textual production and allow them to represent themselves with their own words because "time is needed for those groups that have been socially stigmatized to truly take agency over processes of self-representation and make the leap from autoethnographic productions to genuine affirmations of identity in a dialogue with other social groups" (Sabiescu 86). Whilst natives accumulate their textual "self-portraits," researchers are expected to closely analyse such materials with respect and attempt to grasp what natives are trying to tell to the outside world as Toelkin suggests:

> What I do believe is that our cultural indebtedness to Native people can be partly addressed by paying serious attention to the kinds of expressions that are *appropriate* for us to see, hear, and respond to. This kind of serious attention and propriety requires respect, not adulation; it requires us to share, not intrude and plunder; it requires us to listen for Native voices, not trumpet our own assumptions. (Toelkin, *The Anguish of Snails* 5-6; emphasis in original)

A dialogue must be commenced after anthropologists and folklorists complete this time-consuming but vitally important task.

Notes

1) Currently, the link to the Heart of the Travellers website has been expired, but they are still active on facebook.
2) Their latest achievement is the publication of *Wee Bessie*, a children's picture book based on *Yellow on the Broom*, the first Traveller autobiography written by Betsy Whyte in 1979. The author of *Wee Bessie* is Whyte's great-grandson, David G. Pullar, the current chair of HOTT.
3) It was folklorists at the School of Scottish Studies at the University of Edinburgh that initiated research into Scottish Travellers. The central figure was Hamish Henderson (1919–2002), who "discovered" Traveller singers and storytellers in the early 1950s, exemplified by Jeannie Robertson (1908–1975) and the Stewarts of Blair.
4) Other anthropologists have also encouraged insiders' entry into anthropology as researchers and fieldworkers. (See Jones 252, Ohnuki-Tierney 585, and Nukunya 24).
5) One of the few exceptions is the Center for Ainu and Indigenous Studies at Hokkaido University,

Japan, established in April 2007. Here, the steering committee has researchers from the Ainu community. See Kuwayama, "Ainu" for more detail.

6) It was after the Second World War that anthropologists finally began fieldwork in their home countries. This is what Marcus and Fischer (111) called the "repatriation of anthropology." It raised awareness of reflexivity amongst anthropologists as they now had to conduct fieldwork as insiders.

7) The Elphinstone Institute at the University of Aberdeen ran a Heritage Lottery funded project, "Oral and Cultural Traditions of Scottish Travellers," between 2002 and 2005. In this project, Stanley Robertson, a tradition bearer from the Travelling communities, was employed as a key worker, and he was entrusted to conduct fieldwork and ethnographic interviews amongst his own ethnic group. For more details on this project, see Russell, "Researching Culture from the Inside."

8) Tsuneyama points out similar issues found in autobiographies of ethnic minorities transcribed, edited, and published by whites in the United States. She argues that the entire system of writing, publishing, and circulating autobiographies is under control of whites. Therefore, it is inevitable that the system has an influence on what ethnic minorities can tell in their writing. Such autobiographies are bound to result in a space where authors can only narrate and shape ethnic minority images that are ideal and favourable for whites (Tsuneyama 171–72).

9) There is always a chance that other factors intrude into natives' writing and publishing processes, even when there are no academics involved. For example, a Scottish Traveller writer, Jess Smith, confesses that her works were meddled by her publisher, Mercat Press, to a large degree. The publisher demanded Smith that she should rewrite her first draft of *Jessie's Journey*, her first work, because it was written in broad Scots and the Traveller cant, which could be incomprehensible even to Scots (Shaw 86). On the other hand, another Traveller writer, Stanley Robertson, published the majority of his works from a publisher called Balnain Books. This was run by a friend of his, Simon Fraser, and this enabled Robertson to write and publish his works with less restrictions.

Works Cited

Campbell, John Francis. *Popular Tales of the West Highlands*, vol. 1. 1860. Global Grey, 2019, www.globalgreyebooks.com/ebooks1/j-f-campbell/popular-tales-of-the-west-highlands/popular-tales-of-the-west-highlands-vols-1-4.pdf. Accessed 10 Mar. 2022.

Clifford, James, and George E. Marcus, editors. *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley, U of California P, 1986.

Davies, Charlotte Aull. *Reflexive Ethnography: A Guide to Researching Selves and Others*. London, Routledge, 1999.

Ellis, Carolyn, Tony E. Adams, and Arthur P. Bochner. "Autoethnography: An Overview." Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung, vol. 12, no. 1, 2011, https://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1589/3095. Accessed 17 June 2021.

Fabian, Johannes. *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object*. 1983. New York, Columbia UP, 2014.

Fahim, Hussein, and Katherine Helmer. "Themes and Counterthemes: The Berg Waterstein Symposium." *Indigenous Anthropology in Non-Western Countries: Proceedings of a Burg Wartenstein Symposium*, edited by Hussein Fahim. Durham, Carolina Academic P, 1982, pp. xi–xxxiii.

Heart of the Travellers. *Heart of the Travellers Magazine*, no. 1, vol. 1, www.heartofthetravellers.scot/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/Vol-1-Ed-1.pdf. Accessed 3 June 2020.

---. *Who We Are Leaflet*, www.heartofthetravellers.scot/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/Who-we-are-leaflet-updated-Dec.-17.pdf. Accessed 9 Feb. 2020.

Hendry, Joy, and Laara Fitznor, editors. *Anthropologists, Indigenous Scholars and the Research Endeavour: Seeking Bridges Towards Mutual Respect*. New York, Routledge, 2012.

Jones, Delmos J. "Toward Native Anthropology." *Human Organization*, vol. 29, no. 4, 1970, pp. 251–259.

Kuwayama, Takami. *Native Anthropology: The Japanese Challenge to Western Academic Hegemony*. Melbourne, Trans Pacific, 2004.

---. "The Ainu in the Ethnographic Triad: From the Described to the Describer." *Anthropologists, Indigenous*

Scholars and the Research Endeavour: Seeking Bridges Towards Mutual Respect, edited by Joy Hendry and Laara Fitznor, New York, Routledge, 2012, pp. 44–54.

---. 『ネイティヴの人類学と民俗学:知の世界システムと日本』*[Native Anthropology and Folklore: The World System of Knowledge and Japan]*. Tokyo, Kobundo, 2008.

Lawless, Elaine. "'I Was Afraid Someone Like You… An Outsider… Would Misunderstand': Negotiating Interpretive Differences Between Ethnographers and Subjects." *Journal of American Folklore*, vol. 105, no. 417, 1992, pp. 302–314.

Lanters, José. ""We Are a Different People": Life Writing, Representation, and the Travellers." *New Hibernia Review / Iris Éireannach Nua*, vol. 9, no. 2, 2005, pp. 25–41.

Mach, Zdzislaw. "Anthropology at Home' in a Migrant Community: Some Considerations." *Etnofoor*, vol. 7, no. 1, 1994, pp. 41–52.

Marcus, George E. "The Legacies of 'Writing Culture' and the Near Future of the Ethnographic Form: A Sketch." *Cultural Anthropology*, vol. 27, no. 3, 2012, pp. 427–445.

Marcus, George E. and Michael M. J. Fischer. *Anthropology as Cultural Critique: An Experimental Moment in the Human Sciences*. Chicago, U of Chicago P, 1986.

Niles, John D. *Homo Narrans: The Poetics and Anthropology of Oral Literature*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1999.

Pratt, Mary Louise. "Arts of the Contact Zone." *Profession*, 1999, pp. 33–40.

Russell, Ian. "Researching Culture from the Inside: A New Approach to the Study of the Oral Traditions of Scottish Travellers." *Traditional Music and Research in the Baltic Area: New Approaches in Ethnomusicology*, edited by R. Astrauskas. Vilnius, Lithuanian Academy of Music and Theatre, 2005, pp. 145–55.

---. "The Singer's the Thing: The Individual and Group Identity in a Pennine Singing Tradition." *Folk Music Journal*, vol. 8, no. 3, 2003, pp. 266–81.

---. "Working *with* Tradition: Towards a Partnership Model of Fieldwork." *Folklore*, vol. 117, 2006, pp. 15–32.

Sabiescu, Amelia. "Mainstream Narratives and Counter-Narratives in the Representation of *the Other*: The Case of the Romani Ethnic Minority." *At the Intersection of Indigenous and Traditional Knowledge and Technology Design*, edited by Nicola Bedwell and Heike Winschiers-Theophilus. Santa Rosa, Informing Science, 2015, pp. 67–88.

Shaw, Martin. *Narrating Gypsies, Telling Travellers: A Study of the Relational Self in Four Life Stories*. 2006. Umeå University, PhD dissertation.

Toelkin, Barrie. "From Entertainment to Realization in Navajo Fieldwork." *The World Observed: Reflections on the Fieldwork Process*, edited by Bruce Jackson and Edward D. Ives. Urbana, U of Illinois P, 1996, pp. 1–17.

---. *The Anguish of Snails: Native American Folklore in the West*. Logan, Utah State UP, 2003.

---. "The Yellowman Tapes, 1966–1997." *The Journal of American Folklore*, vol. 111, no. 442, 1998, 381–91.

Tsuneyama, Nahoko. 「アメリカ自伝研究の方法論」["Contemporary Perspectives on American Autobiography"]. *The Geibun-Kenkyu: Journal of Arts and Letters*, vol. 69, 1995, pp. 158–75.

Wilgus, D. K. "The Text Is the Thing." *The Journal of American Folklore*, vol. 86, no. 341, 1973, pp. 241-52.

（本学大学院博士後期課程）

The Examination of Autoethnography as the Initial Step towards More Objective, Comprehensive, and Fairer Anthropology and Folkloristics

by

Ryo Yamasaki

In cultural anthropology, there has been growing interest in native-oriented research practice, often referred to as "native anthropology" or "indigenous anthropology." This trend derives from post-war anthropologists' endeavour to rebuild their enterprise as a more objective, comprehensive, and politically correct discipline. To this end, anthropologists have attempted to create a dialogic space where academics and natives can exchange information and ideas on equal footing. In folklore studies, too, researchers are confronted with the same problem because the discipline has an almost identical structure in terms of the relationship between scholars and research subjects. However, both anthropologists and folklorists have not made a major breakthrough.

In the first and second chapters, the present study provides an overview of the history of the discussion about native anthropology and folkloristics, respectively. In the third chapter, the paper argues that, before creating the dialogic space between academics and natives, or while trying to do so, researchers need to closely and respectfully examine already existing self-representation by natives as well as their criticism of academics' descriptions of them because it is irresponsible and disrespectful to natives to begin a dialogue without reading or listening to what they have already stated. And such "self-portraits" of natives are often found in their autoethnographies, which are ethnographic writing produced by natives themselves such as their autobiographies. Therefore, the present study concludes that the close examination of autoethnography should be the initial step towards more objective, comprehensive, and fairer anthropology and folkloristics.