EPILOGUE

The Eighth and Ninth Moments—Qualitative Research in/and the Fractured Future

Yvonna S. Lincoln and Norman K. Denzin

The end of a work such as this should signal neither a conclusion nor a final word, but rather a punctuation in time that marks a stop merely to take a breath, and, indeed, that is what we intend in this epilogue. The breadth that the contributors to this volume have tried to span marks a multidimensional map of territory traversed, including multiple moments, multiple histories, multiple influences, and multiple paradigms, perspectives, and methods, as well as increasing sensitivity to and awareness of new issues and problems. The contributors have also marked out this territory as terra incognita to be explored. Many have been as provocative as they have been historical, and that is as it should be, for we merely pause now on the border of a new vision for the social sciences. We would characterize this new vision as the realization of the seventh moment (although not its fulfillment) and a course charted toward the eighth and ninth moments in qualitative research.

The realization of the seventh moment lies in two signal achievements. First, we see, with this Handbook and the growing body of literature on specific methods, theoretical lenses, and paradigms, that a mature sophistication now characterizes the choices that qualitative researchers, practitioners, and theoreticians deploy in inquiring into social issues. No longer is it possible to categorize practitioners of various perspectives, interpretive practices, or paradigms in a singular or simplistic way. The old categories have fallen away with the rise of conjugated and complex new perspectives. Poststructuralist feminist qualitative researchers are joined by critical indigenous qualitative researchers. Critical poststructuralist feminist reconstructionists work in tandem with postmodern performance ethnographers. Labels perform double duty, or they are not applied at all. The important thing to note about many practicing interpretivists today is that they have been shaped by and influenced toward postmodern perspectives, the critical turn (as powerful an influence as the interpretive turn and the postmodern turn were in their own times), the narrative or rhetorical turn, and the turn toward a rising tide of voices. These are the voices of the formerly disenfranchised, the voices of subalterns everywhere,
the voices of indigenous and postcolonial peoples, who are profoundly politically committed to determining their own destiny. We are at the “end of history” (Fukuyama, 1989, 1992), or at least at the end of history as we have known it. We are all “after the fact” (Geertz, 1995).

Although Hammersley (1999) objects to our historicizing, or punctuating, moments in the awakening or creation of qualitative research, we believe that there are genuine ruptures in the fabric of our own histories, precise or fuzzy points at which we are irrevocably changed. A sentence, a luminous argument, a compelling paper, a personal incident—any of these can create a breach between what we practiced previously and what we can no longer practice, what we believed about the world and what we can no longer hold onto, who we will be as field-workers as distinct from who we have been in earlier research. Indeed, we would argue that what we call moments are themselves the appearances of new sensibilities, times when qualitative researchers become aware of issues they had not imagined before. They are the “ah-ha” moments, the epiphanies, much like the “click” moments so deliciously recounted 30 years ago in the pages of M, magazine by women coming to consciousness. So, believing in our project as one of description and interpretation—the ethnographer’s job—we continue to think of even the most contemporary history as a history emphasized and underscored by revelatory moments that shudder through the interpretive communities we inhabit. Those are the moments we try to describe, with the full understanding that, in the poststructural moment, our textual descriptions fall far short of what the lived experiences of individual researchers and inquiry and disciplinary communities look and feel like.

We have called the current moment the methodologically contested present, and we have described it as a time of great tension, substantial conflict, methodological retrenchment in some quarters (see Denzin & Lincoln, Chapter 1, this volume), and the disciplining and regulation of inquiry practices to conform with conservative, neoliberal programs and regimes that make claims regarding Truth (Cannella & Lincoln, 2004a, 2004b; Lincoln & Cannella, 2004a, 2004b). It is also a time of great tension within the qualitative research community, simply because the methodological, paradigmatic, perspectival, and inquiry contexts are so open and varied that it is easy to believe that researchers are everywhere. What appears to be chaos to outsiders, however, is nothing less than the intense desire of a growing number of people to explore the multiple unexplored places of a global society in transition. But where these people study, what they study, with whom they study, how they study the phenomena of interest with a communitarian sensibility, what they write about what they have studied, who writes about what they have studied—all these are subject to debate and struggle.

Out of this debate, struggle, and contestation will come the next moment. In some ways, it will share characteristics with the present moment; for example, it seems clear that the next moment will also be methodologically contested. The National Research Council’s Scientific Research in Education (2002) will now stand next to the National Science Foundation’s Workshop on Scientific Foundations of Qualitative Research (Ragin, Nagel, & White, 2004) as a boundary of the contested ground. It may well be the case that, as Alasuutari (2004) contends, we are undergoing a stunning compression of time, of moments, at this period in our history. Certainly, from our perspective as the editors of this volume, we see that advances in qualitative methods and models of inquiry appear to be developing somewhat more swiftly than in the past, with inventions, improvisations, and other forms of bricolage becoming both more sophisticated and more highly adaptable and adapted. It is also clear that many “moments”—in the form of real practitioners facing real problems in real fields and bringing with them real and material practices—will continue to circulate at the same time. Thus practitioners, scholars, and researchers are spread out, to varying degrees, over nine moments, often moving between moments as they seek—or are found by—new sites for inquiry. We are not discomfited by this; on the contrary, we believe it adds to the strength of qualitative research as a
field and discipline, for it signifies that practitioners are willing to live with many forms of practice, many paradigms, without demanding conformity or orthodoxy.

There will also be some differences in the next moment. In the pages that follow, we try to portray some of the shifts, repositionings, and meta-morphoses that we see coming and that we have asked this volume's contributors to address.

### VIII The Eighth and Ninth Moments

Although methodological contestation will continue within and among the many disciplinary communities of qualitative research—business, marketing, nursing, psychology, communications studies, cultural studies, education, sociology, anthropology, medical clinical practice and epidemiology, and others—methodological sophistication will grow. The days when the teachers of qualitative research courses needed to search hard for good methodology texts are over; multiple enriched, cosmopolitan, transnational, and practice-seasoned literatures—and internal critiques of these same literatures—have been created, resulting in a veritable feast of paradigmatic arguments, interpretive practices, analytic and data management choices, and application issues. The problem for these scholars today is not in finding sound materials, but rather in choosing among and between them so as not to appear extravagant in assigning readings for classes.

The next generation of qualitative researchers will face the same areas of contestation as did their earlier counterparts, but they will also face several new improvisations on old issues. It seems to us that arguments around four major issues will characterize the forthcoming generations, or moments, of the history of qualitative research. These issues are the reconnection of social science to social purpose, the rise of indigenous social science(s) crafted for the local needs of indigenous peoples, the decolonization of the academy, and the return “home” of Western social scientists as they work in their own settings using approaches that are vastly different from those employed by their predecessors.

We provide some explanation of each of these major issues in the pages that follow. We then complete our forecast by discussing other issues that we believe will mark the next moment.

### The Reconnection of Social Science to Social Purpose

Ruth Bleier (1984, 1986) has argued that the resources available to social science are too short, too scarce, to be used simply to satisfy scientific curiosity. Rather, she proposes, social science research should be driven by an ameliorative purpose; it should seek to solve some problem, to allay some maldistribution of resources, to meet a genuine need. Too often, however, guided by the modernist presupposition of objectivity in science, social scientists have lost sight of the purposive, intentional meanings of their work, circled back to their disciplinary roots, and left to chance and heaven the wending of findings into the policy arena. In contrast, seeking an engaged social science leads to what Conklin (2003) and Wildavsky (1975) have called “speaking truth to power.” Addressing the issue of indigenous advocacy, Conklin (2003) suggests that we can start to sort out these sticky issues, particularly the places where “the priorities of academic and activists diverge,” by “locating points where professional ethics and political effectiveness converge” (p. 5). Roth (1990) suggests much the same thing when he observes that “anthropological knowledge [indeed, any putative knowledge] is also to be judged in regard to how it integrates with what else passes as knowledge” (p. 276).

The professional ethics issue that has begun to engage social scientists, particularly interpretivist qualitative researchers, most forcefully is the issue of social justice. The coupling of historically reified structures of oppression—whether educational, medical, ecological, nutritional, economic, social, or cultural—with unjust distribution of social goods and services creates a flood tide of injustice that threatens to engulf developed and developing nations and indigenous peoples alike.

The rise of a new ethic—communitarian, egalitarian, democratic, critical, caring, engaged,
performative, social justice oriented—and a new emphasis on ethics that includes the reformulation of ethical issues in response to the new felt ethic signals a new interpretive community (Christians & Traber, 1997; de Laine, 2000; Zeni, 2001; see also Christians, Chapter 6, this volume). This new community is characterized by a sense of “interpersonal responsibility” (Mieth, 1997, p. 93) and moral obligation on the part of qualitative researchers, responsibility and obligation to participants, to respondents, to consumers of research, and to themselves as qualitative fieldworkers. This includes the quality of “being with and for the other, not looking at” the other (de Laine, 2000, p. 16). The new participatory, feminist, and democratic values of interpretive qualitative research mandate a stance that is democratic, reciprocal, and reciprocating rather than objective and objectifying.

The methods and methodologies game is not for members of the Western or European interpretive community only, however. The rise of multiple voices, some of them previously all but ignored by Eurocentric researchers, heralds a new era in qualitative inquiry. The firmness with which African American, Asian American, Native American, Latina/o, and border voices have begun to assert themselves lends a frisson of excitement, uncertainty, anticipation, and unpredictability to the field. These developments are yet another characteristic of the next wave, the eighth and ninth moments.

The Rise of Indigenous Social Science(s)

The rise of a social science that is indigenously designed and indigenously executed, more or less independent of Western or colonial and postcolonial influences, except where invited, is already a reality (De Soto & Dudwick, 2000; Fajtik, 1982; Guglerber, 1996; Gupta & Ferguson, 1997, 1999; Harrison, 2001; Smith, 1999; see also in this volume Smith, Chapter 4; Bishop, Chapter 5). Indigenism, a label once paradoxically manipulated to distinguish between the so-called civilized and the uncivilized (Ramos, 1998), now provides a framework for both critique of Western deployment of social science methods among native peoples and the creative genesis of new forms of systematic inquiry into community conditions, problems, and concerns devised by members of indigenous communities themselves. As we point out in Chapter 1 of this volume, Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999) succinctly describes the state of social science research in her own Māori community as well as other indigenous communities: “The term ‘research’ is inextricably linked to European imperialism and colonialism” because “imperialism frames the indigenous experience. It is part of our story, our version of modernity” (pp. 1, 19).

Why should this generative spirit arise in social science at this particular moment in history? A tremendous number of forces have collided in the political economy of nations to create conditions that are favorable for subaltern and indigenous peoples to speak. Most prominent among these forces are the rising numbers of individuals from indigenous communities who have achieved terminal degrees and taken their places on faculties or in other positions where they can make their voices heard; the forces of globalization, which have enabled individuals all around the world to be connected via media in ways unknown a generation ago; a profound resistance to some forms of this same globalization and its Westernized, late-capitalist formations that result in the importation of Western ideas and corporatist values at the expense of local and indigenous languages, cultures, customs, and traditions; and the deep desire for self-determination among indigenous peoples everywhere. Education (and, more generally, literacy), access to means of mass communication (including the Internet), and powerful urges toward voice, liberty, and self-determination have foregrounded the dreams of oppressed peoples all over the globe. Indigenous voices are not all heard in the same ways, however; rather, the geography of place (Bhabha, 1990; Gupta & Ferguson, 1999) lends a distinctive tang to the expression of indigenous desire, as do indigenous peoples’ particular experiences of colonialism and postcolonialism.
Indigenous voices in Latin America. Yúdice (1996) has a slightly different take on the emergence of indigenous assertions to the right to speak:

More than any other form of writing in Latin America, the testimonio has contributed to the demise of the traditional role of the intellectual/artist as spokesperson for the “voiceless.” As some major writers . . . increasingly take neconservative positions and as the subordinated and oppressed feel more enabled to opt to speak for themselves in the wake of the new social movements, Liberation Theology, and other consciousness-raising grassroots movements, there is less of a social and cultural imperative for concerned writers to heroically assume the grievances and demands of the oppressed . . .

In contrast, the testimonialista gives his or her personal testimony “directly,” addressing a specific interlocutor . . . The speaker does not speak for or represent a community but rather performs an act of identity-formation that is simultaneously personal and collective. (p. 42)

Yúdice’s implication is that when the intellectual/artist retreated into neconservative (or neoliberal) political stances, the subordinated found a need to speak for themselves. And they did so, although not through any genre or rhetorical form known in the conventions of Western writing, or from any political stance previously recognized in Western literary traditions. Testimonio, a particularly Latin American form, serves the critical historical function of witnessing (see in this volume Beverley, Chapter 22; Hartnett & Engels, Chapter 41), often in the form of testifying to events unknown or unwitnessed by Western and colonial/postcolonial observers. Testimonio serves the political function of supporting solidarity while also serving the psychological purpose of establishing a separate and clear cultural identity for the group whose identity is being witnessing. In some ways, testimonio is unique among indigenous writings in that both its form and its political capacity are quite unknown in the Eurocentric and colonial rhetorical panoply.

Native voices in India and the Middle East. The experience of postcolonialism and an oppositional ethnographic method are worked out very differently in India and the Middle East (Mohanty, 1988; O’Hanlon, 1988). Whereas Latin American forms, particularly testimonio (but also other forms of writing around the oppressed), appear to focus little, if at all, on the relationship between the colonized and the colonizer, Indian, Middle and Near Eastern, and south Asian indigenous writings are frequently indexed to a sharp awareness of the presence of the colonizer and postcolonizer. The works of Ashis Nandy, Edward Said, Chandra Mohanty, Gayatri Spivak, and Homi Bhabha explore this colonial presence in several ways: by deconstructing how this presence has been responsible for suppressing or destroying portions of national or regional identities and languages, by capturing a mourning for what has been lost, by exploring indigenous means for recovering the lost “self” of national identity, and by providing critiques of the ways in which representations created—indeed, invented—by the West have shaped ongoing relations between the East and West (Said, 1979) in arenas as wide ranging as tourism and foreign policy. Indeed, as all of these authors have argued (albeit in different ways), social scientists’ failure to grasp the cultural grounds and boundaries of the colonized has led to recurring missteps, gaffes, and social and political displacements. Much of the indigenous critique that proceeds from the Orient, consequently, revolves around the deconstruction of the culture-reasing effects of colonialism and postcolonialism; it does not seek a specific genre of ancient knowledge in which to ground new forms of social inquiry or autocrítica (Conklin, 2003).

Indigenous inquiry at the antipodes and the United States. Harrison (2001) notes that the voices of the indigenous peoples of Australia, New Zealand, the United States, and Canada are often juxtaposed for the simple reason that the First Nations peoples of Canada, Native Americans and Alaska Natives in the United States, Aborigines in Australia, and Māori in New Zealand have established regular means of communicating about the things that they now have in common. . . . Political movements aimed at achieving recognition
research and curricular concerns, the globalizing influence of international faculty may lead to a more pronounced set of sensibilities regarding the cultural, political, and artistic variety that is possible and desirable as a positive outcome of globalization.

International faculty also bring to U.S. colleges and universities both subtle and pronounced differences in modes of graduate training and graduate mentoring. Institutions of higher education in the United States have grappled for some time with the issue of how to mentor graduate students, including how to socialize them into faculty roles of their own. The perspectives of international faculty members, as well as those of the increasing numbers of faculty of color, bring to the forefront considerations regarding what mentoring might mean and how different forms of mentoring might be effective for diverse students (and for diverse new faculty members, for that matter; see Stanley & Lincoln, 2005) as well as how the academy’s range and repertoire of possible collegial relationships may be expanded through mentoring. Each of these changes opens the academy to decolonization by lessening the hegemony of the Western canon and creating a new consciousness of global citizenship.

Most important, the infusion into U.S. institutions of non-Western, indigenous, and “colored” epistemologies has created a vital mix of new paradigmatic perspectives, new methods and strategies for research, contested means for establishing validity in texts, new criteria for judging research and scholarship, and competing cosmologies from which knowledge and understanding might grow. The era of a shared and largely modernist model of inquiry has likely passed away. Some scholarship will still be presented and judged from a positivist paradigm, but other collegial relationships will be traveling the margins and borders, searching for new and innovative forms through which to express non-Western modes of knowing and being in the world.

The Homecoming of Western Social Science

Perhaps the most striking hallmark of the next moment will be the reconsideration of how the social sciences are practiced in the West as well. The phenomenological, postpositivist, postmodern, emancipatory, qualitative, liberationalist sensibility that challenges modernist master narratives holds within it the seeds of a reformed vision of what the social sciences might accomplish and how ethnographers might reconceive what they have already produced for evidence of its contributions to a democratic imaginary on its own soil.

We are now approaching a serious moral confrontation in Western social science. On the one hand, some social scientists (including the two of us and the contributors to this volume) are examining critically the purposes and projects of past and future social science, questioning whether, when, and under what conditions our knowledge has served to enhance democratic ends and extend social justice as well as when and under what conditions it has served to rely historical power and resource distributions. On the other hand, other, equally responsible, inquirers and researchers are seeking to reestablish the supremacy of “one method/one truth,” the “gold standard” of research strategies. Political battles that are normally fought in legislative circles, leaving social scientists untouched and unmoved, have shifted directly into the arenas of educational, social, and behavioral sciences. The evolving political struggles between liberal and neocorporate/neoliberal views of the world have become progressively sharper and more distinct in Western life, concomitantly creating more fissures in American life than have existed for a half century. This is reflected in legislation affecting education (e.g., the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001) and in policy documents that represent stances on what research designs are to be considered appropriate and meaningful (e.g., National Research Council, 2002).

This is the first of the serious fractures in the social science community. What had been a sometimes mild-mannered disagreement between research methodologists, leading to a courteous détente between schools of thought (Lincoln, 2004), has become a firework, with substantial resources, including funding through grants and contracts, and political and policy power hanging

in the balance. The key questions are: What does the future hold for public and social research? How do we craft responses to the serious moral consequences that have been generated by the work of social science? How can we keep the integrity of public inquiry from being subverted by commercial, political, or ideological pressures? How do we ensure that the ethical barriers of social science continue to serve to protect the public from the moral, political, and ethical consequences of the actions of some researchers?

The specific purpose of this volume is to approach these questions in a way that is both empirically specific and theoretically speculative. As we have stated that "the purpose of this collection is to celebrate the future as a site for the use of qualitative research" (Lincoln & Bernals, 2002; Mays, 2000; Wright & Hurd, 2001; Wright & Hurd, 2000; Wright & Mays, 2002). We present this volume with an outlook toward the future, but one in which social science and researchers have acknowledged and accepted the fact that the future is not static, that the pace of social change and the rate at which society is changing will continue to change, and that we are in the process of a passionate, if not a healthy, conversation about the role of qualitative research in society (Lincoln & Mays, 2001). That mistake is avoided in part by following the lead of some of the most innovative and exciting studies of our time in the field of qualitative research. This volume is an effort to robustly address these critical issues in a way that will remain relevant as the issues develop and as the social science community responds to these challenges.
in the balance. This methodologically contested moment will not subside anytime soon.

In the meantime, qualitative research practitioners are engaged in earnest and consequential work of their own. Despite accusations of "advocacy" and of "ideology parading as intellectual inquiry" (Mosteller & Boruch, 2002, p. 2), post-positivist inquirers of all perspectives and paradigms have joined in the collective struggle for a socially responsive, democratic, communitarian, moral, and justice-promoting set of inquiry practices and interpretive processes (for a review of some of this literature, see Scheurich, 2002). The search for "culturally sensitive" research approaches—approaches that are attuned to the specific cultural practices of various groups and that "both recognize ethnicity and position culture as central to the research process" (Tillman, 2002)—is already under way (Anzaldúa, 1987; Bernal, 1998; Bishop, 1998; Collins, 2000; Dillard, 2000; Gunaratnam, 2003; Harrison, 2001; Hurtado, 1996; Parker & Lynn, 2002; Sandoval, 2000; Smith, 1999; Wing, 2000). Many of the issues associated with such approaches are captured with comprehensiveness and nuance in this volume. Qualitative researchers' concerns for social justice, moral purpose, and "liberation methodology" will mark this next moment with passion, urgency, purpose, and verve. When we argued in an earlier edition of this Handbook that qualitative research had "come of age," we were mistaken. It had merely reached a zesty and robustly athletic late youth. The genuine coming of age in methodology, we see now, will be the maturing of the field into a new set of practices and purposes—a new praxis that is deeply responsive and accountable to those it serves.

THE NEXT MOMENT:
THE FRAC TURED FUTURE

We predict that in the ninth moment the world of methods will enter what we term a fractured future—a future in which, unless an intervention we cannot currently imagine takes place, methodologists will line up on two opposing sides of a great divide. Randomized field trials, touted as the "gold standard" of scientific educational research, will occupy the time of one group of researchers while the pursuit of a socially and culturally responsive, communitarian, justice-oriented set of studies will consume the meaningful working moments of another. A world in which both sides might be heard, and their results carefully considered as differently produced and differently viewed purposes on social realities, now seems somewhat far away, mixed-methods advocates notwithstanding.

In a battle where the warriors on the frontlines are fairly evenly matched and not much progress is being made, the skirmishes, conflicts, and engagements are likely to move elsewhere. We predict that the next encounter will be a scrimmage over federal ethics regulations. Extremely useful, but out of date for the purposes of qualitative research and entirely useless for the development of culturally, racially, and ethnically sensitive methods (for a critique of the ways in which federal regulations fail to respond to qualitative research, see Lincoln & Guba, 1989; but see also Lincoln, 2001), the current federal regulations—regarding informed consent, privacy of records, confidentiality, and the role of deception—form one kind of quality floor under research practices. As the American Association of University Professors (2001) has argued well, however, the current regulations and laws are better suited to biomedical research than to social science.

In the absence of a substantive effort to revisit the federal regulations on human subjects protections or any grave reconsideration of the applicability of the regulations either to the social sciences or, more specifically, to qualitative research (write large, as in the pages of this book), several professional associations have constructed their own statements on professional and field ethics. The American Anthropological Association, the American Sociological Association, the American Historical Association, and the American Educational Research Association have all constructed exemplary statements on professional ethics. The American Anthropological
Association in particular has been extremely attentive to concerns about the rights of indigenous peoples, and the association's newsletter, Anthropology News, features a continuing dialogue, pursued for more than a decade, on field ethics, indigenous rights, and other ethical dilemmas of an "engaged anthropology."

We know from the applications of technology we see around us that technology frequently sweeps far ahead of both public policy and civic engagement in debates around public policy. The technologies associated with genetic engineering and cloning are good examples. Currently, scientists' ability to clone living organisms is much further advanced than any rational civic debate about whether and under what circumstances cloning should be allowed. We have no idea what Americans "moral boiling point" is with respect to cloning. In precisely the same way, "McDonaldizing," "corporatizing," and globalizing efforts around the world have ensnared social scientists who wish to understand the effects of late capitalism's expansion and penetration around the globe. Technologies and technoinimaginaries of communication, travel, and cyberspace have far outpaced deliberate and considered debate about what is moral, useful, and culturally respectful. The ethics, aesthetics, and teleologies necessary for a globalized world have not yet come into being, although they are being born in this volume and elsewhere. Social scientists, men and women of conscience, are devising their own standards in collaboration with indigenous peoples, people of color, and marginalized groups everywhere, but it would be heartening to see the U.S. federal government take on additional leadership role in this arena.

Qualitative researchers in the next moment will face another struggle, too, around the continuing issue of representation. On the one hand, creating open-ended, problematic, critical, polyphonic texts, given the linearity of written formats and the poststructural problem of the distance between representation and reality(ies), grows more difficult. On the other hand, engaging performative forms of social science can be difficult in many venues. Traditional texts are far more portable, albeit far less emotionally compelling. Performing social justice, examining ways in which our work can serve social justice, may be the teleological framework for a reimagined social science. Attention to the representations we make, to the possibility that messages may further disenfranchise or oppress (Fine, Weis, Weseen, & Wong, 2000; see also Tedlock, Chapter 18, this volume) when they begin circulating in the wider world, and respect for the wisdom of people who are not like us, who know all too well the unfortunate images that surround their lives, may be the start of our performance of justice. It is a place to begin.

NOTES

1. Ivan Brady (2004) makes this point in a recent journal article titled "In Defense of the Sensual." (=do (Hartnett and Engels in Chapter 41 of this volume): The "unfinalizable" nature of ethnicity arises not so much from the problem of unknowables (although they always exist) as it does from the overriding problem of plural "knowabilities" and the frustration that having to choose among them causes. Worse still for the researcher is having someone choose for him or her, some individual or some institution with the power to enforce the choice. See Brady(2004, p. 632).

2. Finkelstein et al. (1998) make the point that public institutions of higher education have diversified more swiftly than have private institutions, likely because of public pressures to do so. This has resulted in the exposure of a broader range of graduate students to diversity, given that public institutions, as a group, typically produce more doctors than do private institutions in any given period of time.
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