ABBY DAY

# THE RELIGIOUS LIVES OF OLDER LAYWOMEN

*The Last Active Anglican Generation*

OXFORD

# THE RELIGIOUS LIVES OF OLDER LAYWOMEN

# The Religious Lives of Older Laywomen

*The Last Active Anglican Generation*

ABBY DAY

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford, OX2 6DP,
United Kingdom

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,
and education by publishing worldwide. Oxford is a registered trade mark of
Oxford University Press in the UK and in certain other countries



First Edition published in 2017

Impression: 1



Published in the United States of America by Oxford University Press
198 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016, United States of America

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
Data available

Library of Congress Control Number: 2016949770

ISBN 978–0–19–873958–6

Printed in Great Britain by
Clays Ltd, St Ives plc

*For my mother*

# *Preface*

This book has been several years in the making, from the time in 2009 that I first proposed it for funding, through to the fieldwork on which it is based, and the many talks, presentations, and work-in-progress publications. During that time I have received helpful encouragement and constructive feedback from an enormous variety of people, not least the women I studied. There have been colleagues, conference delegates, editors, friends, family (and thanks to my children, Jake and Alex, for their patience in being dragged around churches wherever we happened to be!), and often complete strangers who happened to hear about my work and wanted to talk about it. The wonderful response I received from them kept me energized and enthusiastic. Like me, they realized that there was no in-depth record of this unusual and yet taken-for-granted generation, often known as 'the backbone of the church' or 'the silver ladies' or 'the tea-makers' or the 'brass polishers'.

To begin to thank everyone is a daunting task, as even the small comment or two at a conference, or the telling anecdote at a social event, have all enriched my understanding. I will limit myself to only a handful of people, and apologize to anyone I have not included by name.

First, to Simon Coleman who encouraged me from the beginning, and reassured me, at the end, that there often is no end because all research based on people is ultimately about relationality; and to Grace Davie, whose enthusiasm and interest never wavered and who understood about the complexity of research relationships, also gave me a good piece of advice: be careful not to lose the detail of the ethnography in the act of creating theory. I hope I have accomplished that. Jay Demerath cheered me on, and offered advice and wisdom. Matthew Engelke helped me shape the project by advising me to keep it focused on a single institution. That was excellent advice as I had been tempted to spread the theme across other religions, as I know similar dynamics occur there, but the work would have lost in depth what it gained in breadth. Gordon Lynch, whose advice and direction throughout helped me focus and not lose my nerve, was also instrumental in helping me pull together a fine group of scholars at our symposium in Canterbury.

I am grateful to the many professional staff in churches and at Church House who provided key resources, background briefings, and advice, particularly Anne Richards and Bev Botting. Paul Bramadat and colleagues at the Center for Studies in Religion and Society at the University of Victoria in Canada provided a warm place and a creative, stimulating environment for me to visit as a Research Fellow in the summer of 2014. And, thanks to Simon Blundell for advice on historical aspects and resources.

Other colleagues I would like to thank for their time and advice include those who formed the initial advisory group to help frame the project and its method and were available for advice and ideas as it began: Eileen Barker, Fenella Cannell, Sylvia Collins-Mayo, Helen Cameron, Kirk Hadaway, Tim Ling, Charles Kadushin, Ariela Keysar, Sarah Lloyd, Penny Marler, Linda Woodhead, and David Voas. Part-way through the project Gordon Lynch and I organized a two-day symposium to discuss the Anglican Communion, including its women, and those who attended provided fascinating papers and also feedback on my own work. Several people who could not attend later contributed chapters to our edited collection. For all their contributions that help me put my study in the context of the Anglican Communion and the wider social context I would like to thank Anna Strhan, Gemma Penny, Michael Kennan, Diane Rees, Adrian Stringer, Anderson H. M. Jeremiah, Joanne McKenzie, Andrew McKinnon, Nancy Nason-Clark, Leslie Francis, Catherine Holtmann, Martyn Percy, Callum Brown, and Bev Skeggs.

In 2010, several close colleagues joined me on a panel I organized at the annual conference of the Society for the Social Scientific Study of Religion (SSSR), under the title 'Exploring the Gender Gap: Why Women May Be More Religious/Spiritual Than Men'. That was the first time I tried out some of my arguments concerning the apparent imbalance of religiosity, particularly concerning risk theory. I am grateful to the SSSR for funding, and to my dear friends and colleagues for participating with me as we moved against the flow: Charles Kadushin, Ariela Keysar, Adam Klin-Oron, and Bethamie Horowitz.

I thank the Economic and Social Research Council for funding the project, and its anonymous reviewers for providing constructive and generous feedback. To Oxford University Press, and particularly Commissioning Editor Tom Perridge and Assistant Commissioning Editor Karen Raith: thank you for the opportunity to work with you again and for the close care and attention that is paid to the review,

editorial, production, and marketing processes. The anonymous reviewers who provided detailed comment have helped make this, I hope, a strong publication.

To the many Generation A women who shared their time, opinions, stories, and skills, I can't thank you enough or even, as we agreed, name you or your churches publicly. All names and several markers of identity have been changed, but you know who you are.

Finally, and most importantly, I dedicate this book to my mother, Gwen Day, a consummate woman of Generation A. Like most women of my age, I have not met the high religious standards of her generation, but I thank her for believing in me anyway.

# *Contents*

# Section I

# Roots and Branches

The first two chapters are designed to show how the women studied here are located both spatially and temporally. The Anglican Communion is the international body to which most of the churches discussed here belong, and the time period the women share of post-war challenges and possibilities have shaped them as a 'generation'.

# 1

# Introduction

The Anglican Church was conceived through the love for a woman. Since then, women have formed the heart and soul, but not the head, of the Church throughout its history; from the moment King Henry VIII fell in love with Anne Boleyn to contemporary schisms over women priests and bishops. Hervé Picton (2015, 1) notes that the English Church's final break with the Church of Rome in 1534 was not only about Henry's love life:

> Indeed, the Church in England had long been estranged from the papacy when King Henry ascended the throne. Long before the 16th century it had acquired a distinct national character partly due to its insularity.

And yet, despite their prominence in church politics and power struggles, in-depth knowledge about the everyday experiences of laywomen remain remarkably absent from the record.[1] As Prelinger remarked (1992, 3) 'Oddly, few so far have addressed the situation of women in the mainline or asked what it may have to tell us about the mainline's widely analyzed "decline".'

One reason for the gap in knowledge about women is methodological. The Church of England, in common with other national churches, has never collected statistics about gender. Large-scale data about women in the Anglican Communion and, more generally, Christianity is therefore limited to inferences based on other surveys. The churches I studied were all part of the worldwide Anglican Communion and the women were the laywomen I call Generation

[1] Earlier drafts of portions of this chapter and book have been discussed at conferences such as the ISSR 2011, Socrel 2012, and through publication in Day 2015a, 2015b; Day and Lövheim 2015.

A: the predecessors, and often the mothers, of the post-war generation, the 'baby-boomers', and many were grandmothers and great-grandmothers of the so-called generations X, Y, and Z. They belong to the Church of England, the core institution at the focus of this work, part of the international, colonial-era inspired loose network of churches created in 1867, where three-quarters are in former colonies. Colonialism still marks the religious landscapes of the Global South, as Jeremiah (2015, 191) described:

> Nevertheless, the complex socio-cultural make-up of South Asia offers a challenging context to situate the life and work of the Anglican Church. India, Pakistan and Sri Lanka are characterised by complicated socio-religious landscape, with overwhelming religious majority and minority communities, compounded by ethnic, linguistic and regional differences. These differences are often corroborated and shaped by the region's colonial history, be it the ethnic conflict between Sinhalese and Tamils in Sri Lanka or Caste-based social discrimination in the Indian subcontinent.

The worldwide Anglican Communion thus provides a background international story for Generation A, sometimes speaking to issues of mission, power, sexuality, and gender. The Communion also has particular significance for the women being studied, as I will discuss in detail in the next chapter when I consider their shared generational imaginary.

In their book *Why are Women more Religious than Men?* Trzebiatowska and Bruce (2012, 3) begin by noting that evidence on national churches is scant and therefore their evidence will be based on statistical evidence from secondary data (surveys and censuses) and statistics gained from Nonconformist and other sects. The omission from the record of the two UK national churches, the Church of England and Church of Scotland is glaring: there is not even mention of those churches in the index. Their chapters explore gender through non-mainstream movements such as new religions, spirituality, and Pentecostalism.

As the American research centre Pew presented in March 2016, the question of greater female than male participation in religion only applies to Christianity in the West. The Pew report explains:[2]

[2] <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/03/24/a-religious-gender-gap-for-christians-but-not-for-muslims/>, last accessed 5.4.2016.

> One of the most striking findings in a new Pew Research Center analysis of survey and census data on gender and religion is that while Christian women are on the whole more religious than Christian men, Muslim women and Muslim men have similar levels of religious commitment. And when it comes to attendance at worship services, Muslim men are more active than Muslim women.

That same point was made by Walter and Davie (1998) nearly two decades earlier, when they wrote their formative paper about women and religiosity in 1998 which specifically focused on 'why women belong in large numbers to mainline, patriarchal religion' (Walter and Davie 1998, 641). And yet church officials and academics have known for decades that first-hand, primary research on gender in the national churches was lacking. For example, an edited collection about the Anglican Communion did not include any chapters about laywomen (Wingate et al. 1998). One chapter titled 'Five Years In: Where are the Women in the Church of England' tells only the story of women priests (Pemberton and Rees 1998, 22–6). A report commissioned by the think-tank Respublica, in 2013,[3] showed that the majority of voluntary church activities consisted of 'Promoting Church, e.g. Coffee Mornings'. No further detail was given in the report about those activities or, significantly, the people who organized them. As I will show in this book, the 'people' are women of Generation A. The neglect of that cohort fits a general pattern.

As Davie wrote in 1990 and again in 1994 about religion in general, although there were large data sets available, and some small studies about the 'exotic edges' of religion in Britain, 'the picture in the middle remains alarmingly blurred', with very little known about 'the beliefs of ordinary British people in everyday life' (Davie 1994, 6). As national churches and academics have not collected statistics about gender, one wonders if they only count what counts? In the next chapter I will review in more detail the explanations academics have given about reasons for the apparent gender disparity, and offer some thoughts about how those explanations reify essentialist notions of women and religiosity.

My work here, in contrast, attempts to make visible the invisible by focusing on a particular cohort known to be the most active in mainstream Christianity. It is not a study of 'ageing' but of a certain

[3] <http://www.respublica.org.uk/our-work/publications/holistic-mission-social-action-church-england/>, last accessed 30.1.2016.

generation generally described as 'the backbone of the church'; a generation that is dying, that has not been researched in depth, and will not, I argue, be replaced. The gender/age component is therefore critically important in terms of the mainstream churches' decline.

Writing about the UK religious landscape in 1994, Davie (1994, 2) made two statements that caught my imagination when I conducted my doctoral research nearly a decade later:

> The churches attract an audience which is disproportionately elderly, female and conservative [ . . . ] the nature of family life, including the traditional codes of morality, are altering rapidly [ . . . ] Changes in gender roles have for better or for worse, penetrated the churches and influenced theological thinking.

The women of Generation A were in their sixties when she wrote this, and were then witnessing the kinds of changes she was writing about. Davie's source was primarily the European Values Survey, a large quantitative data set. The problem with those data and related methods lay, as she noted, in a preference for that which was easily defined and measured. As McGuire (2008, 5) commented when describing her preferred approach to studying lived religion, quantitative data on their own are of dubious value.

The most common reason for church decline is the demographic profile. When elderly churchgoers die, they are not being replaced by the next generation, and nor are they attracting or retaining children or teenagers. A consultancy project commissioned by the Church of England and carried out during the same period as my research was tasked to identify factors affecting church growth and to make recommendations for increasing it. They concluded that:[4]

> In nearly half of our churches there are fewer than five under 16s. On the positive side, the research highlights that churches where there is a high ratio of children to adults are twice as likely to be growing; There is an urgent need to focus on children, young people and their parents and a challenge to identify how the church can best invest in people, programmes and strategies which will encourage young people actively to continue exploring faith.

While that recommendation is unsurprising, and reflects the general advice I have heard in every church I have studied, it is implausible.

[4] <http://www.churchgrowthresearch.org.uk/UserFiles/File/Reports/FromAnecdoteToEvidence1.0.pdf>, 26, last accessed 1.10.15.

It contradicts generally accepted social theory (Voas and Crockett 2005): religious activity is stable,[5] closely tied to generational effects, and every contemporary generation in the UK is less religious than the one before. I will argue that social and cultural shifts, combined with the Church's intransigence on significant moral issues, resulted in alienating the sons and daughters of Generation A—the baby-boomers, born in the late 1940s. The Church lost that middle generation and, consequentially, their children, the X, Y, and Millennials. And so, I contend, it ends. Children are unlikely to arrive at a church door on their own. Further, the Church alienated women in particular, a dangerous move considering that most research also shows that mothers are more important than fathers for religious transmission.

In November 2015, launching a programme to reverse church decline, the Church of England's director of finance, John Spence, said that the evidence for decline was 'indisputable':[6]

> Twenty years ago the demographics matched the population as a whole. Now we're 20 years older than the population. Unless we do something, the church will face a real crisis.

While I agree that the evidence is clear, I will be less optimistic that the church can reverse such a trend. In the chapters to follow, the picture I create is one of an institution not simply divided by an age gap, but by significant values and practices. Again, the importance of those differences has not, I will argue, been fully researched or appreciated. For example, Picton (2015, vii) situates his detailed history book in the realm of hierarchal and institutional power and admits that, while 'One might also regret the scant treatment of clergy and parish life', the historical record is necessary to understand current trends and issues. His summary of the issues focuses on the now-familiar list (2015, 2):

> the ordination of female bishops, homosexuality, and other ethical or societal issues. More generally, its role in an increasingly secular society is being questioned.

[5] I will return to this point in Chapter 9, as the stability of religious identity (see, in particular, Wink and Dillon 2003 for longitudinal evidence) makes it unlikely that the church will recruit otherwise non-religious converts.

[6] <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/nov/21/justin-welby-church-england-new-synod>, last accessed 8.9.2016.

> Some, inside and outside the Church, have even called for its disestablishment, arguing that it is no longer a national Church.

Those issues are, I will argue, symptoms rather than causes of what is an inevitable, irreversible, decline embedded more in 'parish life' than peer politics. A closer inspection of parish life reveals important characteristics, which is why this book draws on ethnographic fieldwork, cross-cultural comparisons, and relevant theories exploring the beliefs, identities, and practices of the women I refer to as 'Generation A'. Although many religious organisations share the same age profile, I have chosen to focus specifically on Anglican laywoman born in the 1920s and early 1930s, now in their eighties and nineties, often described as the 'backbone' of the Church, and likely, I will argue, to be its last active generation. The prevalence of laywomen in mainstream Christian congregations is a widely accepted phenomenon that will cause little surprise amongst the research community or Christian adherents. What is surprising is that we know so little about them, and therefore about how their beliefs, behaviours, and patterns of religiosity can inform us about the character and changing nature of contemporary and future religion. This is the generation that has sometimes been seen to lead a parallel church. They attend the mainstream churches every Sunday, polish the brasses, organise fund-raisers, keep the church open on weekdays, bake cakes, and visit vulnerable people in their homes. Their often invisible labour not only populates the physical space of the church but helps ensure its continuity and enriches surrounding communities.

For the purpose of this book I will describe the women I studied as 'Anglican', following Livingstone (1977, 21): those belonging to churches which are 'in communion with, and recognising the leadership of, the see of Canterbury'. For many Generation A women, the Anglican term meant almost literally 'English', with all its historical and symbolic meanings, and warm associations with the ultimate woman of their generation, Queen Elizabeth II. I will review that relationship in more depth in the Chapter 2.

The development and decline of the worldwide Anglican Communion followed the course of the development and decline of British colonies, particularly understood according to Mann's (2012, 91) analysis of power, where he argued that power is not a resource, but should be analysed in terms of overlapping networks. Resources might emerge as a means to attaining and maintaining power, he

argued, defined as the capacity to organize and control people through organization, control, logistics, and communication. His four types of social power can be related directly both to the decline of the British Empire and the worldwide Anglican Communion: ideological, economic, military, political relationships.

Generation A's contribution to the continuation of the worldwide Anglican Communion was to sustain its ideology through participating in the services and prayers that explicitly named and bonded its members and through supporting mission and exchange. As the main fundraisers, they often supported members of the Communion and their communities through direct economic contributions. In the chapters that follow, I will describe in detail how they did that, and why successive generations are not, and likely will not, follow their example. First, I will turn to the means by which I produced my data and interpretations.

## METHOD

Thanks to funding from the Economic and Research Council, I was able to enrich the story of those women through a study carried out, half-time, over two years. My objective was to begin by immersing myself in the daily routines of one mainstream Anglican church in southern England, where I would identify key themes. I would then broaden and interrogate those themes by comparing them through study visits to other UK and international churches. In total, I attended sixty-four services and visited eighteen churches. In my 'host' church I was also involved throughout the week in non-service events, of which my regular participation in twenty-five 'church watch/opening' duties were the most regular.

Every researcher makes choices about method. Ideally, these choices should be provoked by the research question. As Davie, mentioned earlier (1994, 6), pointed out, 'the picture in the middle remains remarkably blurred' with little known about 'ordinary British people'. Writing more than twenty years before my study was to begin, Davie pointed out that although there were large data sets available, and some small studies about the 'exotic edges' of religion in Britain, 'the picture in the middle remains alarmingly blurred' with

very little known about 'the beliefs of ordinary British people in everyday life' (Davie 1994, 6).

It was that single phrase that drove my research questions then as now: what do ordinary people believe in everyday life, and how do we find out? The question was fraught with difficulty: what is meant by ordinary and everyday? Who does this include and exclude? Describing my research as 'everyday' and fitting within a broader method of 'anthropology at home' does not excuse me from casting my research informants as 'other'. The 1980s' critique in anthropology about the propensity to study the 'other' as simply, if implicitly, constituted as distant and primitive (encapsulated by Trouillot (1991) as 'the savage slot') sparked new moves to study anthropology closer to 'home'. George Marcus (1995) provoked researchers to think about multi-sited ethnography as a technique to break the fetishization of the far-away field, focusing not on territorial place but on an ethnographic theme or topic that often transcended place. This observation informed my own research design, a dialectic between 'home-place' peopled by a few handfuls of informants I came to know well, and several other sites created through purposive sampling according to emerging themes. The challenges of studying people in one's immediate society is aptly described by Buch and Staller (2014, 112) as an attempt by 'Native' ethnographers to 'denaturalize taken-for-granted aspects of their own social worlds'. The subjective sense of what is taken for granted therefore depends on ethnographers' ability to use themselves as instruments of knowledge-gathering, staying attuned to 'their own culturally conditioned common sense' (Buch and Staller 2014, 108).[7]

During the course of my research, I was to reflect often on the realization that I did not have to travel far to experience the 'other'. Most of the people I met during my daily research encounters were different from me in outlook, age, and national history. Further, it helped me realize the effect of locality and how any one church is a contextualized social institution that to some extent reflects its surroundings. Knowing, over time, who belonged, who did not, and who perhaps nearly did helped me realize that the congregation both

[7] One of the most distinctive qualities of feminist ethnography is the emphasis on long-term relationships in the research, they say (2014, 108). While this certainly chimes with my own experience, I think it is fair to point out that long-term research practice is also a feature of the classic anthropological method.

encourages and filters out strangers. In reviewing Trouillot's contribution to anthropology, Robbins (2013, 449) said that the shift in place reflected a more general acknowledgement of:

> transformations in this broader symbolic organization that defines the West and the savage, transformations by which the narratives of development and progress that had driven Western history were beginning to lose their power to organize our understanding of the world.

Robbins claims (2013, 450) that a new 'other' has emerged in anthropology, that of the 'suffering subject', and calls for a new kind of anthropology that focuses both on the vulnerability that all we as humans share, and considers how the people we study 'organize their personal and collective lives in order to foster what they think of as good, and to study what it is like to live at least some of the time in light of such a project' (Robbins 2013, 455). It gradually became evident to me that my enquiry was not focusing so much on the theologies of the women, but on my growing fascination with how they constructed their lives to do what they perceived to be good.

In my earlier research, when I wanted to find out how people described their beliefs and why they self-identified as Christian on the UK decennial census, it was appropriate to ask them in such a way that would not skew the conversation immediately to religious categories. My critique of surveys thus far had concluded that forming the research around pre-existing religious definitions only helped to funnel the responses into predetermined routes. My task then was to design a method, and questions, that did not select people on the basis of their adherence to or rejection of religion, or to ask them using vocabulary that rested on assumptions about what religion, belief, or Christianity meant to people. It was inappropriate to do so through a formal, closed-question survey because the vocabulary itself was unknown and untested. Researching religion without asking religious questions was the challenge, and one to which I responded in various ways, which are described in detail elsewhere (Day 2009b, 2011 [2013]).

The research questions concerning my study described here were not about why the women would self-identify as Christian on a census, nor about how they would describe their religious beliefs. Rather, I wanted to find out more about who they were in the context of their occupation of an unusual set of church-attending women, what they did, how they did it, and what difference it might make

when they disappeared. What did they know about being regular church-attending women? What kinds of knowing were important to the richness of their experience and those in the congregation and, perhaps, the wider community? What were their habits and techniques of acquiring and performing that knowledge, and how, if at all, had that knowledge been transferred to future generations? The kind of knowledge they had would be, I assumed, situated, relational, everyday, lived, and embodied. From my previous work on belief I was aware that just as there were different forms of belief, there would also be different forms of knowledge. Having already made the case for multidimensional, felt, embodied belief along with forms of propositional or creedal belief (Day 2013f), it was likely that I would find belief and knowledge embedded together, rather than produced in a parallel sequence or in some kind of conflict. Such research would depend on the ethnographic method, set in the context of everyday, lived religion. The effect of using such a method to create fine-grained studies will, I hope, be seen to be particularly useful for researchers in the sociology of religion, ageing and religion, and feminist research into older women's religious lives.

## Being There

The American Anthropology Association (AAA) describes ethnography as 'the researcher's study of human behaviour in the natural settings in which people live'.[8] I therefore chose to observe women in their 'natural setting' of their church. Further, the AAA definition describes ethnography as producing a 'description of cultural systems or an aspect of culture based on fieldwork in which the investigator is immersed in the ongoing everyday activities of the designated community'.

Bielo (2015) explores how religious ethnography poses distinctive issues. He asks how we manage the intense relationships we forge through fieldwork alongside our scholarly research goals. What does it mean to do participant observation, a hallmark of ethnography, in religious settings where the stakes of participation can be especially

[8] <http://research.fiu.edu/documents/irb/documents/ethnographyReview.pdf>, last accessed 2.2.2016.

high? What, if anything, is compromised or gained when a researcher finds personal value in the religion that they are in the field to learn about? What is the proper place, if any place at all, for notions such as 'objectivity' or 'bias' in doing religious ethnography? (Bielo 2015, 30). He succinctly describes ethnography as 'being there, wherever there is' (Bielo 2015, 31).

Brewer (2000, 6) picks up the same themes, describing ethnography as:

> the study of people in naturally occurring settings or 'fields' by methods of data collection which capture their social meanings and ordinary activities, involving the researcher participating directly in the setting, if not also the activities, in order to collect data in a systematic manner but without meaning being imposed on them externally.

Those intentions have met, over time, with significant critiques whether from a 'positivist' or natural science quarter (for an extensive review, see Hammersley and Atkinson 1995, 1–26) summarized by Brewer (2000, 20):

> Ethnography also breaches dearly held principles in science concerning the nature of data. The natural science model of social research seeks to describe and measure social phenomena, but both description and measurement are achieved by assigning numbers to the phenomena. In short, it deals with quantity and collects numerate data. Ethnography also describes and measures, but it does so by means of extracts of natural language (long quotations from interviews, extracts from field notes, snippets from personal documents) and deals with quality and meaning [ . . . ]

Not only can ethnographers become 'too subjective', but they can recognize themselves as an important tool of data collection—possibly, I will argue, as important as a notebook or recorder. As Brewer points out (2000, 20):

> The natural science model of research does not permit the researcher to become a variable in the experiment, yet ethnographers are not detached from the research but, depending on the degree of involvement in the setting, are themselves part of the study or by their obtrusive presence come to influence the field.

I would also add to his observation that ethnographers do not visit a field; they create it. Ethnographic fieldwork is often said to be the *sine qua non* of anthropology, and what distinguishes it from other

disciplines such as sociology or human geography. As anthropologists Gupta and Ferguson described it (1997, 1):

> The single most significant factor determining whether a piece of research will be accepted as (that magical word) 'anthropological' is the extent to which it depends on experience 'in the field'.

Anthropologists have also recognized that one site or location would not be a self-sufficient, bounded container of cultural knowledge and practice that can be studied in isolation. As Coleman and Collins point out (2006, 5), the 'field' is not a place waiting to be discovered, but a construction where researchers map:

> certain understandings of culture and theoretical concern on to regions, thus naturalizing their subsequent 'discovery' or elucidation by the ethnographer. Such processes of cultural cartography have reflected and reinforced the colonial legacies of the discipline.

Not being unique to anthropology, fieldwork became progressively something fiercely protected by the discipline, they suggest, creating increasingly more difficult and remote excursions to exotic locations generally inaccessible to those from competing disciplines of, say, human geography, and marking the anthropologist as someone different from, and implicitly superior to, even the most intrepid tourist. In their process of deconstructing such terms as field and place, Coleman and Collins remind us that the spatial metaphors and related language we use reveals much about our implicit assumptions. 'Field', of course, is easily construed as a physical place bounded by a fence, neatly described in maps, set apart from other 'fields', and properly inhabited by non-roaming entities such as sheep and, presumably, people. If people do leave such fields they inhabit another bounded place called 'diaspora', itself another metaphor presuming a distant and fragmented movement from the original, intact, 'field'.

## Being Where?

Conventionally, anthropologists have often created more than one field site for the purpose of comparisons, but Marcus (1995, 102) suggested a multi-sited ethnography would go beyond simple comparison by referring to:

> an emergent object of study whose contours, sites, and relationships are not known beforehand, but are themselves a contribution of making an