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Numbers in italics refer to examples taken from the Alzheimer’s Beliefs Study.

accounting/accountability, xi, 48, 56–58, 65, 76, 113, 114, 186
and cultural norms, 57
and narratives, 183
and script formulation, 181
Garfinkel and, 56
acculturation scales, 108
African American Acculturation Scale, 33, 108
Stephenson Multigroup Acculturation Scale, 109
adjacency pairs, 60, 193
first pair part – second pair part, 60
interview frame and, 173
agreement. See alignment
pairwise, 134
pairwise agreement threshold, 135
patterned alignment, 128
within-group, 136
alignment
and participant-by-participant matrix, 135
and stance profiles, 85, 130
and stance triangle, 62
graphic maps of, 135, 138, 151
in consensus analysis, 128, 129, 138
in the face-to-face interview, 64
in the sociocultural field, 128
step-by-step instructions for mapping, 152–153
Alzheimer’s Association, xv, 17, 19, 20, 104, 229, 238, 244
Alzheimer’s Beliefs Study
collection of ethnic groups, 104, 105–106
description, 17–18
design, 18, 101, 113
selected results from qualitative interviews, 197–199, 208–209, 211
selected results from quantitative survey, 157–163
Alzheimer’s disease
brief history, 18–20
clinical presentation, 20
cultural beliefs, 21
epidemiology, 20
ethnicity and, 20–22
answer key, 129, 138, 139, 143, See knowledge scores
and kappa coefficient, 146, 159
and pairwise agreement, 142
Bayesian posterior probabilities, 143
cross-cultural comparison of, 146
generation of, 143, 159
logic of, 128–129, 143
metaphorical usage, 129
Atlas.ti, 70, 72, 112, 114, 116, 117, 118, 167, 189
Austin, J.L., 47, 48, 49, 216, 238, 239
back channeling, 64, 202, 207
and attunement, 60
back-translation
critique, 88
example in qualitative research, 90
example in quantitative research, 88
Barth, F, 168, 169, 170, 187, 191, 220, 224, 239, 243, 245, 253
Baumann, G, 29, 41, 239
bias and equivalence, 39
bias, 31–32
construct equivalence, 31
integrative framework, 30–32
biculturalism. See ethnic identity bilinguals
biculturalism and, 107
competencies as translators, 96
in the Alzheimer’s Beliefs Study, 115
translation and, 91, 93
Borgatti, S, 69, 134, 135, 138, 140, 152, 240, 245
Index
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Bourdieu, P. 36, 37, 38, 128, 240, 244, 254
Distinction, 36
field, 36, 37, 39, 128
habitus, 37
reflexive sociology, 37
co-construction, 193–194
meanings in the interview, 76
of accounts in the interview, 194
of alignment, 64
of an anecdote, 76
of meaning, 48, 190, 218
role of transcriber, 113
struggle between interviewer and participant, 188
coding
by transcriber, 113
constant comparative method, 112
content coding, 72, 112, 114, 168, 171, 189
interactional transcripts, 114
language of. See language of coding
communicative competence
definition, 94
range of communicative abilities, 95
speaker’s goals, 94
community, 41
and ethnic membership, 29–30
as constructed in the interview, 191, 201
example of social science agenda in the interview, 174, 201
consensus analysis, 128, 222, See culture experts
alignments and stance profiles, 129
and factor analysis, 140
answer key, 143, See answer key assumptions, 138–139
cross-cultural comparisons, 144–146, 157–163
eigenvalues, 141, 157
knowledge scores, 141, 157, See knowledge scores
logic of, 128–129
reporting results, 146, 157
sample size, 144
step-by-step instructions, 154–155
construct equivalence, 2, 31
levels of bias and equivalence framework, 31
constructed speech (imaginary), 195, 196, 198,
See reported speech
constructed anecdote, 71, 74
constructing group comparisons
between-group variation/within-group homogeneity, 40
country-level institutions, 32–34
ethnic groups or communities, 28–30
face-to-face contexts, 25–26
nation states, 36–37
content analysis, 30, 69, 71, 90, 189
contextualization cues, 57, 60–61, 74, 75
laughing, 60, 61
prosody, 61, See prosody
conversation analysis, 47, 69
ordinary talk, 59–60
pauses, 60, See pauses
preference organization, 59
recipient design, 59
sequential organization of talk, 61–62
trouble spots, 176, 193, 205, 207
turn construction units, 59
uptake, 176
correspondence analysis, 35, 37, 38, 81, See geometric data analysis
and mapping social field, 38
description, 37–38
maps, 38
Creswell, J.W., 5, 7, 9, 10, 224, 232, 242
cross-cultural comparison (mixed methods).
See variationist approach to comparative research
as variations within a field of discourse, 223
cross-cultural comparison (qualitative)
discourse-based approach to interview data, 186–188, 211–212
discourse-based approach to interview data, 166–168
cross-cultural comparison (quantitative)
discourse-based approach to survey data, 144–146
item-based approach to survey data, 125–126
traditional hallmarks, 3
cultural beliefs
clustered within individuals, 126
in Alzheimer’s Belief’s Study, 160–163
patterns of agreement, 128
webs of beliefs, 159, 220, 221, 223
cultural group. See constructing group comparisons
as discursive construct, 42
cultural identity. See ethnic identity
cultural logics, 5, 26, 66, 188, 212
in the interview, 188
participants’ vs. researchers’, 225
cultural norms, 58
Cultural Sociology, 35
culture. See interviews as cultural events, See culture experts
and community, 29
and translation, 16, 88, 95
Index

consensus concept of, 128

definition of (Silverstein), 14

discourse, 11, 70, 72

discourse centered framework general description, 44–46
theory, method, and ontology-epistemology, 215–220
discourse domain, 82, 127
as survey topic, 138
coherent domains, 144, 153, 157, 222
noncoherent or low consensus domains, 139, 144
speakers, institutions, circumstances, 14–15, 216
discourse markers, 61–62
oh, 62
so, 61, 196, 201
well, 61, 205
you know, 62, 72, 193, 205
discursive and linguistic devices. See conversation
analysis
adjacency pairs, 60, See adjacency pairs
back channeling, 60, See back channeling
constructed speech. See constructed speech
contextualization cues, 60–61, See contextualization cues
deictic reference. See deixis
descriptions, 56, 180
discourse markers, 61–62, See discourse markers

turn-by-turn communication, 216–217

discourse analysis, 11, 70, 72

discourse centered framework general description, 44–46
theory, method, and ontology-epistemology, 215–220

extreme identity, 40
as “inner essence”, 109
as situationally relevant, 109, 169
biculturalism and multiethnic society, 107
emergent in social interaction, 168–169
inhabitable categories of identity, 177, 179
macросocial categories or spaces, 177, 179, 195, 218, 224
performed in an interview, 177–179, 197–198
recruitment to role, 177, 179, See recruitment to role
self-ascription, 29, 104
societal or governmental categories, 105
ethnography, 27, 28, 39, 43, 110, 215
ethnomethodology, 56, 188, See Garfinkel

factor analysis, 139, 157, See consensus analysis
field. See sociocultural field, See Bourdieu
fillers, 60, 72, 74, 79, 192
Foucault, M. 15, 216, 244
frame analysis
as mapping tool, 176, 190
interactive and interpretive frames, 172
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frame analysis (cont.)
interview frame, 172–173, 191, 203, 203
mutual relations frame, 174–175

Garfinkel, H. 56, 188, 216, 244
genre, 13
geometric data analysis, 38, See correspondence analysis
graphic layout maps, 135
agreement thresholds, 136
graphic layout algorithm, 151
hypothetical alignments between participants, 138
representation of expertise, 137–138
step-by-step instructions for, 152–153
subgroups within, 136
virtual network, 135, 138
grounded theory, 5, 69
habitus, 37, 39, 43, See Bourdieu
Health and Quality of Life Outcomes, 28
indexicality, xi, 48, 50–56, 65, 76, 170, 190, 205, See recruitment to role
and translation, 92–93
layers or orders of, 178
nonreferential indexicals, 54, 177–179
partitioning social space, 55
presupposing and entailing, 54
pronouns and deixis, 53
integrating data
purposes, 8
terminology, 10–11
integrative frameworks
bias and equivalence, 30–32
discourse centered, 44–46, See discourse centered framework
ethnography, 27–28, 215
pragmatism, 34–35, 215
reflexive sociology, 37–39, 215
theoretical, methodological, and philosophical-ontological, 42–43, 215
interaction
in the face-to-face standardized interview, 78
in the social science interview, 66
paper-and-pencil/computerized interview, 80
social habits of, 80
interactional sociolinguistics, 47
intercultural variability, 42
interculturality in the interview, 187–188, 221, 224
and ‘thick description’, 188
culture of social science, 187, 199
national, regional, ethnic, 186–187, 198
interview analysis (interactional)
discursive analysis, 176–186, See discursive and linguistic devices
frame analysis. See frame analysis
participant awareness of interview agenda, 173–174
role revelation during the interview, 174–175, 202
selection of subcorpus, 171–172
interview society, 67
interviews. See interview analysis (interactional)
as cultural events, 166, 211
as intercultural events, 186–188, 198
as interculturality in the interview content-based approach, 166
critique of, 67, 68
discourse-centered approach, 68–69
drawing on cultural resources, 68
ethnographic, 111
open-ended, 69
traditional assumptions, 67
intonation. See prosody
intra-cultural variability, 42
and acculturation scales, 108–109
and history, 204
in knowledge of survey topic, 141
joint displays
as method of cross-cultural comparison, 224–227
as triggers for new insights and questions, 231
categorizing variations (pancultural, cultural, historical, idiosyncratic), 225, 230
participant vs. researcher accounts for findings, 225, 229
relating individual quantitative and qualitative findings, 225, 229
shared vs. group specific discourse, 225, 230–231
kappa coefficient, 146, 159
knowledge scores. See culture experts, See answer key
and pairwise agreement, 138
first factor loading in consensus analysis, 141
first factor loadings, 145
Index

reading in consensus analysis results, 155, 156
systematic variation and, 143–144, 145, 158

language of coding
and source language transcripts, 99
English as metalanguage, 99–100
language of transcription. See translation and transcription sequences
donimance of English, 116
languages
lack of attention to, 43
language varieties, 54, 86, 95
reduction to English, 44, 86, 91
languages and publication of results, 232
displaying key survey items in original languages, 233–234
excerpts displayed in interlinear fashion, 235
excerpts displayed in parallel columns, 234
excerpts displayed in successive language blocks, 234
morphosyntactic interlinear glosses, 236
transparency about translation practices, 96
lexical choices, 74, 211

Malinowski, B. 27, 248
matrices. See consensus analysis, See measures of association
participant-by-item, 131, 141
participant-by-participant, 131, 150, 153, 155
similarity and dissimilarity matrices, 150
step-by-step instructions for creating in UCINET, 149
meaning. See denotation and indexicality
meaning for meaning equivalence, 91–93, See translation and meaning
meaning in context, 92, See indexicality
measures of association. See matrices
chance corrected, 155, 156
covariance, 134
match (simple), 134, 151
Pearson correlation, 134, 151
mixed methods
data transformation pathways, 84
definition, 7
handbooks, 7
independence and interdependence of phases, 101
notation system, 8–9
mixed methods designs

Ochs, E. 52, 69, 181, 183, 249
overlaps, 59

paradigmatic associations, 50, 51, 92
pauses, 74, 79, 192, 193
performativity, xi, 47, 48–50, 65, 76, 166, 170
language as diacritical feature of cultural identity, 170
performatives, 48
performing social worlds during the interview, 175
phonology
definition, 12
positioning, 62, 64, 82, 85, 127, 223, See subject positions
Potter, J. 47, 56
pragmatic markers, 195, 197, See discourse markers
pragmatics, 47
definition, 12
listener inference, 13, 80, 81
pragmatic implicature, 13
speaker implicature, 80, 81
pragmatisms, 23, 34–35, 42, 215
prosody, 13, 61
definition, 12
in reported speech, 184–185
pitch, 75, 202, 204
prosodic marking, 192, 193, 202
prosodic quotative, 195, 196, 197
quotatives, 205
zero quotatives, 205
psychological anthropology, 24
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qualitative methods
cross-cultural. See cross-cultural comparisons (qualitative)
standard approaches, 5, 6
quantitative methods
cross-cultural. See cross-cultural comparisons (quantitative)
standard approaches, 2–3

recipient design, 59
recruitment to role, 177, 179, 195, 202

report speech, 71, 74, 75, 195, 195–197, 196, 202, 203
and prosody, 184–185
not verbatim report, 183
quotatives, 185–186, 195, 196, 197, 202
shift in deictic center, 184
shifting authorship and responsibility to someone else, 184
voicing, 75
zero quotatives, 186, 195
response options, 79, 80, 82
Romney, A.K., 128, 139, 239, 251

Sacks, H. 47, 59, 216, 251
sampling
consensus analysis and sample size, 144
identification of cultural or ethnic groups, 103
maximum variation sampling, 105
participant self-selection, 104, See ethnic identity:self-ascription
probability sampling, 103
purposive sampling, 103
reputational case-selection methodology, 104
stratified sampling in the Alzheimer’s Beliefs Study, 107
Saussure, F, 50, 51, 52, 242
Saussurean linguistics, 50–52, 92
script formulation, 179–181, 202, 205, 208
Silverstein, 14, 47, 52, 53, 54, 55, 92, 175, 177, 179, 253
social desirability, 81
social field. See sociocultural field and nation states, 36
social network analysis, 134
contrasted with virtual network map, 135
social positions. See subject positions
sociocultural field, 85, 127, 222
patterns of alignment within, 128
virtual maps of, 130

speaker implicature, 13, 80, 81
speech act theory, 47
Austin, 48–50
stance, 13, 48, 62–65, 76, See stance triangle
definition, 63
epistemic, 64
in social science interview, 64–65
preserved on spreadsheet, 77
self-positioning, 64, 82
stance markers, 57, 64, 82
stance object, 62, 82
types of, 62
visual maps of, 151
stance profile, 77, 82, 84, 85, 127, 134
and alignment, 84
and spreadsheets, 83–84
stance triangle, 62–64

statistical procedures
consensus analysis, 138, See consensus analysis
correspondence analysis, 37–38, See correspondence analysis
factor analysis, 139, See factor analysis
geometric data analysis, 38
kappa coefficient, 146, 159
multiple regression, 144
Pearson correlation, 158
Spearman correlation, 158
structural linguistics. See Saussurean linguistics
subject positions, 15, 17, 127, 191
survey analysis
item-by-item approach, 126, 130–131
participant-by-participant approach, 131–134, 164–165
social dynamics of group agreement, 126
traditional item-by-item approach, 126
survey topic. See discourse domain surveys
“answer keys”, 142
critique, 78–80
discourse topic, 77, 138
face-to-face, 77
interviewer effects, 78
paper-and-pencil/computerized, 77
traditional approach, 78
syntagmatic relations, 51, 92
syntax
definition, 12
talk-in-interaction, 48, 58–62
theme analysis, 69
transcription
as filtering data, 69
cyclic, 85, 111–115
iterative or multi-layered, 70
selecting an interactional subcorpus, 113–114, 171–172, 189
successive forms, 84
transcription conventions, 69–70
GAT-2, 73
interactional, 72
Jeffersonian, 73
Santa Barbara, 73
table of, 73
transcriptionists, 112
also serving as interviewers, 113
and intersubjectivity, 113
in dialogue with the data, 114
transcriptions (kinds of)
comparison of content vs. interactional, 74–75
content oriented, 72
interactional, 73–74
orthographic, 69
verbatim, 69, 70, 71–72, 111–113
transduction, 92
translation and meaning. See translation, See bilinguals
and population shift, 89
as reorganization of meaning, 92
conceptual equivalence, 88
importance of context, 92
meaning equivalence, 88
normative equivalence, 88
semantic equivalence, 88
translation and mixed methods
between phases, 98
cyclic translation, 96, 121–122
in qual – quan designs, 98–99
in quan – qual designs, 98–99
in quan + qual designs, 99
within phase translation, 98
translation and quantitative instruments
back translation. See back translation
element of translation of survey item, 116–121
in a quantitative survey, 87–89
native language versions, 116–121
pre-existing instruments, 89
translation and the interview
and literature on the interview, 87
as data transformation, 94
coding, 90
in social science, 86
problems with English as
a metalanguage, 100
translation and transcription
sequences, 97
source language audio to target language
transcript, 97–98
source-language transcript into target
language transcript, 97
truth
and agreement, 129
and literature on the interview, 87
and literature on the interview, 87
and literature on the interview, 87
and literature on the interview, 87
and literature on the interview, 87
and literature on the interview, 87
of the group, 138
UCINET, 135, 140
creating matrices, 149–151
step-by-step instructions for consensus
analysis, 154–155
variation
at the interactional level (interview
methodology), 222–224
at the societal level (survey methods), 222–223
demographic predictors of, 157–159
pancultural, historical, idiosyncratic, 225
variationist approach to comparative research
description, 221–222, See variation
ethnographic development of, 223
joint displays as a method. See joint
displays
Weller, S. 128, 139
Wetherell, M. 68