

Introduction

The essays presented in this Part bring forward various themes from earlier Parts, especially Part I and Part III, and apply them to recent developments in Ethnomethodology. In addition, many pick up a consideration which is given more prominence in Garfinkel's later work than in his earlier efforts, namely the probativeness of investigative disciplines. Garfinkel attributes probativeness to the natural sciences and in doing so, intentionally or not, invites its consideration in regard to the social sciences including Ethnomethodology. The backdrop to all the discussions is Garfinkel's *Ethnomethodology's Program* [Garfinkel 2002], his final summary statement of what constitutes an ethnomethodological sociology.

With the search for probativeness as a background consideration, in the first essay on Garfinkel's inclined plane experiment we delve deeper into what is involved in mounting a successful ethnomethodological investigation. We emphasise the set-up aspects of selecting a perspicuous setting and defining the actor's point of view appropriately and discuss the approach Garfinkel deployed to mount his own version of Galileo's famous experiment. Central to the inclined plane experiment (though we only lightly touch on it in our discussion) are the question of disciplinary relations (or rather *interdisciplinary* relations) and the making of findings in interdisciplinary contexts. This provides the focus for the third and fourth essays. Here the issues we drew out from the discussion of Institutional Ethnography also come into play. In the third, we pick up the notion of 'hybridity' and the possibility of hybrid EM-disciplines of the kind Garfinkel tried to illustrate with his inclined plane study. Our conclusion is not that these are impossible, only that their requirements are extremely demanding, both conceptually and practically. In the fourth essay, the issue of interdisciplinarity is set in the context of recent trends towards greater accommodation with other social sciences. Here what we have our eyes on are what might be called cross-border relationships, and so whatever lessons there might be for us from Institutional Ethnography's experience of how a well-meant pursuit of alignment led ultimately to loss of distinctiveness and assimilation become highly relevant.

We conclude with a Coda, a brief review of the issues and the choices related to them which seem on face to Ethnomethodology at this point. Each of the options has its attractions. But each too comes with drawbacks. Whilst we are clear about the range of choices, they are not ours to make. It is for those in early- and mid-career to sort and weigh them. It is they who must pick up the burden of forging Ethnomethodology's future and they must do so in a context which is very different from that in which it was founded. We can only point out which way we think they should go and wish them well on their journey. We have done all we can. It is up to them now.

Bibliography

GARFINKEL, H. 2002. *Ethnomethodology's Program*. Roman and Littlefield, New York.