CBS COPENHAGEN BUSINESS SCHOOL
HANDELSHØJSKOLEN

From Participant Observation to Observant Participation

Anthropology, Fieldwork and Organizational Ethnography

Moeran, Brian

Document Version
Final published version

Publication date:
2007

License
CC BY-NC-ND

Citation for published version (APA):
Moeran, B. (2007). *From Participant Observation to Observant Participation: Anthropology, Fieldwork and Organizational Ethnography*. Samfundslitteratur.

Link to publication in CBS Research Portal

General rights
Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy
If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us (research.lib@cbs.dk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Download date: 24. Apr. 2024

CREATIVE ENCOUNTERS

Creativity at Work:

From Participant Observation to Observant Participation: Anthropology, Fieldwork and Organizational Ethnography

By Brian Moeran

July 2007

Copenhagen Business School
HANDELSHØJSKOLEN

imagine.. | 造

Abstract

This paper looks at the relationship between anthropology, fieldwork and what is referred to as 'organizational ethnography'. It starts by distinguishing between *fieldwork*, which is a method of conducting qualitative research, initially in the discipline of anthropology, and *ethnography*, which is the writing up of that research. The paper makes use of the author's fieldwork experiences in a Japanese advertising agency to illustrate a number of features that define fieldwork as a methodology. It argues that it is the shift from participant observation to observant participation that enables the fieldworker to move from front stage to back stage in the study of an organization, and thereby to gain information and knowledge that is otherwise available only to insiders.

Keywords

Fieldwork, Anthropology, Organizational Ethnography, Observant Participation

Author

Brian Moeran is Professor of Business Anthropology in the Department of Intercultural Communication and Management at the Copenhagen Business School, Denmark. He may be reached by e-mail at bdm.ikl@cbs.dk

From Participant Observation to Observant Participation:

Anthropology, Fieldwork and Organizational Ethnography

Anthropology and Fieldwork

Although, as a discipline concerned with cultural and social life, anthropology has much in common with other social sciences and humanities, it is particularly characterised by two features. One of these is theoretical and emphasises comparison as the anthropologist looks for regularities, patterns and generalizations in the development of 'rules' or 'laws' concerning human and social behaviour. The other is methodological and stresses the role of participant-observation in the close-up study of social and cultural environments (Eriksen 1995:9). Anthropology – and, by implication, its sub-discipline of organizational anthropology – is thus marked by a dual nature that makes it both science and humanity: 'the most scientific of the humanities, the most humanistic of the sciences' (Wolf 1964: 88). It is as an anthropologist who has conducted a number of fieldwork studies in Japan in particular, and written several cross-culturally comparative ethnographic monographs, that I compose my reflections here.

Strictly speaking, when anthropologists go off to study groups of one sort or another (families, villages, communities, corporations) and follow the people they find there through their everyday lives, they conduct fieldwork. Fieldwork may be defined as 'intimate participation in a community and observation of modes of behaviour and the organization of social life' (Keesing and Strathern 1988: 7). Ethnography is what they do when they have finished their fieldwork and start to write up research material gathered during participant observation. Ideally, then, we should distinguish between two rather different practices: interacting with people and writing about them.

Nevertheless, anthropologists themselves tend to confuse the two, if only because they are constantly writing descriptive and analytical notes about their daily interaction with people whom they have chosen to study and with whom they are sharing their lives. In other words, the writing process is never entirely separate from the fieldwork process.

Anthropology is a comparative discipline and fieldwork − as well as its variant, organizational ethnography − is a method. Yet, at the same time, this method has over the decades given rise to numerous theoretical reflections − for example, on the fieldwork process itself (e.g. Powdermaker 1967; Rabinow 1977), as well as on the ethics of fieldwork (e.g. Rynkiewich and Spradley 1976), ethnographic writing (e.g. Clifford and Marcus 1986; Van Maanen 1988), multi-sited ethnography (Marcus 1998), organizational ethnography (Schwartzman 1993; Moeran 2005), and so on.

If part of the difficulty of keeping these two concepts separate stems from the means by which the researcher tries to record her fieldwork experiences, another emerges from the fact that fieldwork is no longer the defining feature of anthropology, in the way that it once was back in the heady days of the discipline's formation. The advantages of participant observation as a method of obtaining data were soon recognised by sociologists at the University of Chicago and, during the 1920s and 30s, the so-called 'Chicago School' conducted systematic fieldwork studies of a wide variety of urban communities (including Jewish ghettos, mental patients, professional thieves, hobos, taxi-dance halls, drug addicts, and so on).

That fieldwork did not have to take place among some remote 'Bongo Bongo' tribal people, but could be conducted in contemporary industrialised settings may have been lost at one stage on many anthropologists, but it came to be adopted by scholars working in a wide range of disciplines: including cultural studies, development studies, education, folklore, geography, psychology, social work, and socio-linguistics. Acknowledgement of the advantages of fieldwork has also spread – primarily through sociology – into the field of management and organization studies (e.g. Kunda 1992), although we should perhaps note that anthropological studies of corporations have been conducted in Japan since the early 1970s (e.g. Dore 1973; Rohlen 1974). Nowadays, in somewhat more bastardised form, 'ethnography' is promulgated as the new Holy Grail of marketing method by advertising agencies, market analysts, managing consultants, and one or two other kinds of business practitioner.

What is so special about fieldwork? What differentiates it from other methods? And what makes it such a popular paradigm for the study of people in different social and cultural settings? The answer, I think, is that fieldwork fits in with other core elements that define the discipline of anthropology – with its emphasis on culture, comparison, holism, humanism, science, and that inimitable combination of 'emic' (subjective participant) and 'etic' (objective observer) perspectives. In other words, fieldwork sets up, and is itself predicated upon, a series of conceptual and theoretical oppositions, including:

- *Ethnography (micro-analysis) / Cross-cultural comparison (macro-analysis)*
- *Differences (particularizing) / Similarities (generalizing)*
- *Synchronic (the 'ethnographic present') / Diachronic (long-term)*
- *Humanism / Science*
- *Participant (subjective) / Observation (objective)*

(Sluka and Robben 2007: 5)

More specifically, fieldwork sets certain demands upon the researcher not found in other methods of qualitative or quantitative research. Firstly, it requires *intensive participant observation* (Clifford 1992), during which the researcher finds herself closely involved − participating in and observing − the everyday lives of a particular set of actors or informants. Secondly, participant observation obliges the fieldworker to take into account *all aspects* of a particular community of people. It thus enables her to synthesise disparate and apparently disconnected observations into an integrated whole, and thereby to arrive at a *holistic* interpretation or construct of the social or cultural form under

study (Stewart 1998: 6). As Bronislaw Malinowski pointed out in a seminal introduction to the fieldwork method: 'An Ethnographer who sets out to study only religion, or only technology, or only social organisation cuts out an artificial field for inquiry, and he will be seriously handicapped in his work' (Malinowski 1922: 10).

This kind of synthesis is made possible by the fact, thirdly, that the fieldworker makes use of *contextualised* explanation to generate 'rules' of behaviour, and learns to explain one set of observations in terms of its connections with others. In other words, it is by focusing on particular contextualised incidents that the fieldworker is able to develop general theoretical concepts (Stewart 1998: 7) and so turn apparent differences into similarities.

Fourthly, both context sensitivity and the holistic approach characteristic of fieldwork are dependent − in some degree, at least − on the *duration* of fieldwork. Ever since, because of his Polish nationality, Malinowski was obliged to spend the First World War years on a remote Australian protectorate in the South Pacific, it has generally been agreed that fieldwork should be long-term. Ideally, 'long term' is translated as a year (Okely 1992), although this is often no longer feasible in an age of budget cuts and shortened sabbaticals, so that a period of six months may be seen as acceptable.[1] It is long-term immersion that enables the fieldworker to see connections where they are not immediately apparent, to move beyond the half-truths and deceptions of her informants, to put together an account that is reasonably objective and contextually sensitive. This is impossible in the kind of short-term 'rapid appraisal', 'focus ethnography' and 'micro-ethnography' types of research espoused by marketers (who seem rather more attuned to the early American tradition of fieldwork as numerous short trips rather than a single extended stay). In this respect, we need to be mindful of the inescapable truth that 'the less time for fieldwork, the less the ethnography will be an ethnography' (Stewart 1998: 20).

Finally, until very recently anthropologists have recognised that fieldwork cannot be conducted by means of long-distance communication, but requires that the researcher be physically present – what Clifford Geertz (1988: 4-5) has referred to as 'being there' – and undergo *total* (or near total) *social immersion* (Hastrup and Hervik 1994: 3-4; Okely 1992).[2] It is the 'totality' of participant observation, of course, that facilitates holism, but it also gives rise to an intimacy between researcher and informants not provided by other research methods (Amit 2000: 2-3). This is where the 'humanism' of the participation experience comes to the fore, in contrast to its 'scientific' observation, analysis and explanation. In other words, at the heart of participant observation lie the Scylla and Charibdis of involvement and detachment (Powdermaker 1967: 9).

---

[1] The Department of Anthropology at the University of Oslo, for example, stipulates that fieldwork should last at least six months. (Personal communication, Marianne Lien.)

[2] The issue of physical presence is nowadays questioned because of the development of digital technology that allow, for example, videophone interviews and cyberspace research on the Internet.

Organizational Ethnography

How do the above comments on fieldwork and anthropology fit in with what is termed 'organizational ethnography'? Is fieldwork in organizations (by which I am referring primarily to agencies, associations, corporations, institutions, and other group forms associated with contemporary capitalism, but also to hospitals, schools, city halls, and so on) any different from fieldwork on a Melanesian island – say – or in a pottery community in southern Japan? In principle, no. Intensive participant observation, holism, context sensitivity, long-term duration and total social immersion are all ideals adhered to by organizational ethnographers. Of course, the extent to which each will be practised depends on the particular circumstances in which the fieldworker finds herself, but comparison and the formulation of 'rules' are still the central aim.

Each ideal presents its own difficulties. Just how much will a fieldworker be allowed to participate in, as well as observe, what is going on around her in an organization? How immersed can s/he ever be in practice − especially if s/he wishes to retain some semblance of sanity and/or family life? Is it realistic to suggest that the fieldworker can somehow 'bond' with her informants? Are all fieldworkers equally context sensitive? What happens when an organization refuses to allow fieldwork to continue beyond − say − three months? Does long-term fieldwork automatically lead to an anthropologist's being able to link credibly socio-cultural features that are apparently unconnected?

These are all important challenges, but there are also more immediate, pragmatic issues that someone wishing to conduct fieldwork in an organization needs to consider. The study of business – and, indeed, of all kinds of – organisations is fraught with difficulties, not least of which is the fact that managers (that is, potential informants) are often themselves already disaffected from the practices of business research (Chapman 2001: 2). For a start it is often very difficult to get initial access to an organisation. Even when this has been achieved, and as a researcher you get one foot in the corporate door, the kind of access you are permitted may well prove problematic. Will you be able to watch people in their working environment – at their computers, in meetings, having lunch together, visiting customers, and so on? Or will you be confined to interviews with selected managers and/or employees of the organisation? What will be the nature of those interviews? Will you be obliged to submit questions in advance and structure them accordingly? Or will you be able to roam more freely from one topic to another in an unstructured manner that allows those you are interviewing to talk about what is closest to their hearts? Or will you get no further than being allowed to administer a questionnaire? In which case, what percentage of respondents will actually take the trouble to answer your carefully thought-out questions? Will they even think those questions relevant to what they actually do in their everyday lives? And how are you to find out?

Clearly, answers to these questions vary enormously and define whether in fact a researcher does or does not carry out fieldwork in the anthropological sense, as outlined above. My own experiences in Japan (and, to a much lesser extent, in France, Hong Kong, the UK and USA) suggest that there are a number of basic principles that every potential fieldworker needs to take into account when undertaking research in a particular organisation or community of people. Briefly, a fieldworker has to: make use of connections to target the right person in the group being studied; be able to make a succinct presentation (or, in advertising jargon, pitch) of what her intended research is all about; display an appropriate attitude towards those with whom she is liaising in the organization concerned; accept whatever is offered but always aim for more; and somehow engineer a lucky break and turn it into a golden opportunity.

I am firmly convinced that these principles apply to a greater or lesser degree whenever a fieldworker goes about trying to get access to a research site. People always want to know why you are there, what you are doing, where you come from, and who let you in in the first place (see Moeran 2005 for examples). I will illustrate this point by showing how these principles affected one particular fieldwork experience − in ADK, the Japanese advertising agency in which I conducted a year's fieldwork in Tokyo in 1990 – but add that they have come into play in different combinations at other times as I conducted fieldwork in a pottery community, department store art galleries, and women's fashion magazines.

Getting In

Probably the most difficult – certainly the most tense – part of the fieldwork experience is gaining access to a particular community of people. Generally speaking, all fieldworkers have to effect an introduction to their would-be informants before being allowed to start on their research. But how can they get an introduction to people whom they have never met, who cannot immediately understand why they should be 'studied', and who may well have never heard of 'fieldwork' or 'anthropology'? Do they write a letter or e-mail message to someone whose name they (perhaps fortuitously) discover? Do they turn up at the fieldwork site unannounced and hope for the best? The latter option may work in a South Pacific island or jungle village, but it certainly will not in a modern organization.

The problem of access is in fact a double one. In the first place, the fieldworker needs to be able to make, and take advantage of, connections. Who you know counts initially for far more than your nationality, status, university affiliation, and so on. Secondly, you have to know – or be able to guess – whom to target in the organisation in which you intend to study. This is where using the right connection is vital.

For example, when I first decided to conduct a study of an advertising agency, I used to mention the idea to Japanese friends and colleagues during my comparatively frequent visits to Japan in the late 1980s. One of these was a Mr. Suzuki, the foreign correspondent of a Japanese regional newspaper in

London.3 Suzuki and I had first met when he contacted me as Chair Professor of Japanese Studies at London University to ask whether I would contribute the occasional column to the Hokkaidō Shimbun. This I did three or four times a year, and continued to do so after Suzuki was recalled to Japan in 1987. I used to call on him when visiting Tokyo – both because of past relations and because I was at the time involved in setting up a student exchange programme between London University and the Hokkaido University of Education. The Hokkaidō Shimbun proved to be an active supporter of the initiative. In late 1988, I mentioned my advertising agency project and, during my next visit early in 1989, Suzuki introduced me to the advertising manager of the newspaper.4

The first aspect of targeting, then, is that the person who introduces you to the fieldwork group or community must be the 'right' connection, and not just anyone who happens to know somebody in the targeted group. Thus I could have tried to gain access to the agency by way of Suzuki, but the latter was smart (and diffident) enough to realise that − since I was trying to do fieldwork in an advertising agency – it should be his newspaper's advertising manager, Honda, rather than an international news journalist, who should act as the go-between.5 The former asked me a few questions about what I wanted to do and why, before suggesting that I study an agency of which I had never heard: ADK (or, as it was then called, Asatsū). "It's very Japanese", he said proudly, "I'll try to arrange a meeting with the CEO while you're here. Asatsū is a very good customer of our newspaper."

This marked the second aspect of targeting. A fieldworker must be introduced to the decision-maker in the group to be studied (and, as every advertising agency account manager knows – often to his cost – those in official positions in an organizational hierarchy are not necessarily the ones who make the decisions [cf. Moeran 1996: 71-98]). In the case of an earlier study of folk potters, for example, I was introduced to a younger potter working in the community and not to the elected leader of the potter's cooperative. Although the community was so small that I was able to address them all together and explain my aims and objectives, before going to ask official permission to do my research from the cooperative leader, there were later occasions when some of the elder potters expressed their resentment that I had not come through 'official channels'.

In the case of the agency, this was not a problem. The Hokkaidō Shimbun's advertising manager took me straight to the top. Two days later, at 9 a.m. on a

---

[3] I have changed the names of all individuals mentioned in this paper, with the sole exception of that of ADK's former CEO and now chairman, Inagaki Masao, since it would be a little ridiculous to try to conceal his name.

[4] I made it clear, incidentally, that I did not want to study the largest agency, Dentsu. This was, firstly, it was too big an organisation; and secondly, because I have always believed in the 'Avis principle': that those behind the leading organisation anywhere are probably 'trying harder'.

[5] If I had wanted to conduct fieldwork in the News Department of a major newspaper or television company, however, I would have used Suzuki to introduce me to someone – unless he happened to know of someone more suitably placed to help me.

Saturday morning, I found myself with Honda visiting ADK's CEO, Inagaki Masao. He was joined by the chief of his 'President's Office', a Mr. Takano, and his PA, Ms Iwao. It was at this point that the presentation principle came into effect. Honda effected a masterly introduction (see Moeran 2005: 86-7) that, among other things, carefully positioned me and my university vis-à-vis his own newspaper and the ad agency that I wished to study, before inviting me to take over.

It was then, as I looked across the Board of Directors' table at the enquiring face of Inagaki CEO, that I learned a third basic lesson in fieldwork access: how to make a pitch (that most crucial of all advertising practices). Instinctively realising that this was a make or break situation, I mustered as much self-confidence as I could and embarked upon a two to three minute presentation of myself and my research plans. I kept things fairly simple and as much to the point as I could. As an anthropologist, I was interested in how people related to things and in how things themselves tended to organize people. In other words, although advertisements were remarkable examples of contemporary popular culture, I wanted to study how people went about making ad campaigns. What were the social processes underlying these products and their images? What kinds of people were involved in which stages of an advertisement's production? How were they organized so that they could carry out their work effectively? What kind of problems and challenges did they face, and why? This could only be learned by carrying out fieldwork in an advertising agency, which − I added, with the necessary hint of flattery − was a unique kind of organization that nobody had hitherto studied, either in Japan or in the rest of the world. I would therefore be extremely grateful if Inagaki CEO would allow me to study his agency.

Inagaki watched and listened to me carefully throughout, and I was conscious of being judged, of having every phrase carefully weighed by a shrewd businessman who had established his own agency 40 years earlier and taken it to the Number 6 spot in Japan's advertising industry. When I had finished, he picked on something that I had not said (indeed, something that I was keen to avoid, if at all possible), but that he himself implied from my discussion of social processes. "Yes, we Japanese are always being misunderstood," he said quickly. "Just look at the way in which the Americans are complaining about unfair trade practices. Somebody has to explain to them what we Japanese really are about."

I was not all that keen to get involved in this kind of discussion in my research, unless there was some obvious connection between international trade friction and domestic Japanese advertising practices. However, what I later realised was that a question that most decision-makers surely ask themselves, when approached by an academic's request to do research is: "What's in it for us?" Inagaki was looking for a way to justify my presence in his company, should he decide to accept me as a researcher. This he was doing primarily for his two subordinates (and possibly for himself), rather than for me. Although, it took some time for me to understand this, I did at the time instinctively make use of another basic lesson in fieldwork and advertising. This was one of attitude: I

made sure to agree (or, at least, not to disagree) with the client. So, I made various sympathetic comments about the plight of Japanese trade negotiators and criticisms of American cultural practices, before steering the discussion back to my project.
Inagaki asked various questions – presumably to get more factual information, as well as to give himself more time to judge if I was acceptable (that is to say, trustworthy) as a person, or not. How was I going to survive financially in Tokyo? It was an expensive city to live in. Did I know that? Was I sure I could manage on my own salary? Hopefully, I replied, especially if I was awarded a research grant. And how long did I wish to stay in the Agency doing fieldwork? At this point I took a deep breath. One year, I replied.
Inagaki was silent for a few seconds, weighing up all that I had said. Well, he concluded, I could stay for three months perhaps. One year was a very long time to be there. He suggested that I start out by doing three months and then he could see how things were going before committing himself further. That was the best offer I could get, but it taught me another lesson in advertising (or in Japanese advertising, at least): accept the little that a client first offers you and make sure you get more later.
I learned yet another advertising professional's lesson a few months later when I was awarded a Japan Foundation fellowship. This not only reassured Inagaki that I would not be a financial burden on his agency in any way. It also convinced him that I was a recognised bona fide scholar who could add (just a little) prestige to his organisation by my presence there. In short, I learned the lesson of the contagious magic of status. It was this status and the fact that I did not make any major faux pas during the first weeks of my stay in the Agency that enabled me to stay the full year. During the entire period of my fieldwork, people in the Agency would refer to me as a 'professor of London University' and 'Japan Foundation scholar' when introducing me to clients (at formal presentations or informal meetings). That was what was in it for ADK. I could be classified in such a way that brought credit upon the agency, since the 'symbolic capital' (to use Bourdieu's term [1984]) of my own academic institution and financial guarantor could be used to enhance that of ADK and thereby, perhaps, its economic capital.

Fieldwork practice

As we have seen, one of the tenets of fieldwork is that you should collect as many concrete data as possible over a wide range of facts. But one difficulty facing the fieldworker has been how best to embark upon the research process. It can be difficult – if not impossible – to start out by collecting data on magical beliefs and practices, for example, if, as a foreign researcher, you are not fully conversant with the language of those you are studying. Under such circumstances, philosophical issues need to be put aside until a later date. At the same time, as I learned to my own cost in a pottery village (Moeran 2005: 23-34), it may not be advisable to start off participant observation by enquiring into your informants' financial affairs, so that household genealogies may be the way to go.

In other words, fieldwork tends to proceed initially along somewhat haphazard lines, as the anthropologist instinctively keeps to subjects deemed 'safe' by her informants. Only later, will she begin to bring up topics that she wants to pursue, rather than discuss those that her informants wish her to pursue. But what about fieldwork conducted in organizations? Is it less haphazard, more organised? After all, the fieldworker in an organization is not situated at the higher end of the kind of power relationship characterising anthropologists working in colonial environments in the 1950s and 60s. Rather, she is 'studying up' (Nader 1969).

It was agreed that I should start my fieldwork in ADK on the first working day after the New Year in 1990. A few weeks before I left England, however, I received a letter from Takano, chief of the President's Office, outlining the Agency's proposals regarding how my fieldwork should proceed. I was to spend the first two weeks in his office, familiarising myself with the Japanese advertising industry, before spending a month in the Media Buying division where I would learn about magazine, newspaper, television and radio advertising. I was to move from there to the Marketing division, and thence to Market Development. After that, I should join Account Services, before studying in the Creative, Promotions, International, Personnel, Finance and Computer divisions. All in all, I was to spend approximately one month in each division. By the end of my year of fieldwork, I should have gained a thorough, rounded comprehension of Japan's advertising industry.

This prepared programme both surprised and worried me, although at the time I merely wrote back to confirm Takano's plan and thank him for his time and trouble in arranging everything on my behalf. I was pleasantly surprised because, for the first time in my fieldwork experience, I did not have to work out for myself where to start my fieldwork enquiries. Whereas, on previous occasions, I had had to learn by trial and error how to go about studying a particular community of people, this time my collective informant, the advertising agency, was itself telling me where to begin. My immediate worry was that the Agency's management might be guiding me to examine what it wanted me to examine, rather than what I myself might wish to follow up. After all, as someone 'studying up', I was here dealing with a collective organisation that was in an infinitely stronger power position than my own, and with people therein who might well manage the terms of my research engagement (Marcus 1998: 121-2). I began to envisage arguments about academic freedom, on the one hand, and an ethical deadlock of some kind resulting in my leaving the Agency, on the other. In fact, this worry proved to be totally unfounded, since – once fieldwork had started – I found myself more or less free to study what and where I wanted, provided that I liaised with Takano and others concerned to make sure that everybody knew what I was doing and where I was located at any one particular time. (This was, in fact, standard practice for all employees in the Agency.)

A second remarkable feature of my agency fieldwork was that I found myself frequently being given lectures on the 'theory' of advertising, before being

immersed in its actual practices.6 The advantage of this type of fieldwork was that I was able for the first time to practice a form of 'grounded theory' that allowed me to pursue formal lines of enquiry by the informal means of participant observation. Previously, when in the field in rural areas, I did not have access to books or materials enabling me to apply theories to data gathered during research and to let this combination of theory and data inform my fieldwork investigations as part of an ongoing project. In ADK, however, there was a wealth of statistical detail and case study material to support the stories that I was told during my everyday interviews and conversations. I was thus able to practise a grounded fieldwork that made use of these data and materials continuously to inform my further research enquiries. Such grounded fieldwork – and the emphasis here is on its 'grounded' rather than theoretical nature (cf. Stewart 1998: 9) – was a crucial element in my ability to understand and grasp the complexities of the advertising industry that I was studying.

All of this in itself, however, was not sufficient means to ensure that fieldwork proceeded towards a successful conclusion. Here I come to what I earlier referred to as 'the lucky break'. Many anthropologists can recount particular moments in the participant observation process when they were afforded insights that they might not otherwise have had, or suddenly found themselves closer to informants than might otherwise have been the case.7 These moments are in retrospect used to justify or validate particular positions adopted or held by anthropologists. Certainly, they form a rite de passage in the research process. I am myself very aware of such moments in all three of my longer periods of fieldwork. While the first two depended in large part on a particular personal relationship I established with someone in the community being studied (in other words, on my personality and interpersonal dynamic between myself and those I was studying [cf. Powdermaker 1968]), the last came about as a result of a particular business problem to which I was able to make – as it turned out, a successful – contribution. As every advertising account executive knows, one has to create circumstances that allow the lucky break to occur (so that the break is rationalised as being not as 'lucky' as it might at first glance appear); then one must take maximum advantage of the opportunity offered.

I do not intend to go into all the details that enabled me to come up with a tagline for an advertising campaign presentation which, in turn, helped the Agency win a multi-million dollar account from a prestigious Japanese electronics firm called Frontier (for these details, see Moeran 2006: 3-17). What is important about the lucky break is that it invariably enables the fieldworker to shift in status, and thus in the perceptions of those working in the organization being studied. In ADK, my success meant that I was no longer regarded exclusively as a visiting foreign researcher or 'professor', but that my informants came to realise that I might be able to contribute to the work that

---

[6] Hine (2001: 65) reports a slightly similar experience upon her arrival to do fieldwork in a science laboratory in England.

[7] Clifford Geertz's (1973: 412-417) famous opening description of the Balinese cockfight is a case in point.

they were doing. I thus found myself invited to take part in and contribute to a number of other ongoing projects. These ranged from dreaming up a name and associated services for All Nippon Airways' business class (Club ANA) to devising a marketing and creative concept for a Nihon Lever fabric softener (Happiness is a Soft Blanket).

As a result of this participation in all kinds of projects in which I would not otherwise have been involved, I was able to begin to put together the numerous pieces of information that I had gathered during the Frontier presentation preparations and fit them into various theoretical jigsaw puzzles of the kind that I have written about over the years. In a way, then, the Frontier case marked a subtle shift in my role as fieldwork researcher. Instead of being a participant observer in the classic anthropological manner, I became an observant participant. Although not too much is said about this sort of thing in the anthropological literature, observant participation should, I believe, be the ideal to which we all aspire during our research.

Now, it may seem to one or two of my readers that there is not that much of a distinction to be made between participant observation and observant participation, and that I am merely splitting hairs by stressing the importance of the latter. But what I want to get across is the fact that this distinction – however crude or subtle it may seem – in fact marks an important rite de passage in fieldwork itself and affects the quality of information given and later analysed. The problem facing any researcher – whether she be anthropologist, sociologist, historian, political scientist, or whatever – is the validity of materials gathered. Does this survey ask the right kind of questions so far as the research hypothesis is concerned? Is this historical document dug up in a castle attic as authentic as it seems, or is it a fake – written deliberately to pull the wool over an unsuspecting reader's eyes? Is this informant telling me what he really does in a particular situation, or what he should be doing, but in fact does not do? In every field of study scholars have to wrestle with such problems of validity.

In fieldwork, the real difficulty facing the anthropologist is trying to distinguish between what people say they do and what they actually do. Indeed, this is the problem facing all those in management and organization studies who make use of interviews to gather primary research material. People are always trying to manage impressions and to put across an image that may in fact be rather different from their 'real' selves. This is fairly easy to do when their interviewer has just walked in off the street with a series of prepared questions to ask during the next hour. It becomes less so when that same interviewer had been hanging around the office for the past three months, watching what is going on and asking questions of anyone who has the time or inclination to talk to her. For her own part, the fieldworker is desperately trying to make sense of this new social world into which, for one reason or another, she has made her way. What those around her take for granted as 'the normal course of events' often strikes her as not just strange, but from another planet. In a slightly different sense from that originally intended by Oliver Sacks, the fieldworker may well feel as if she is an 'anthropologist on Mars'.

What marks the shift from participant observation to observant participation, I think, is precisely the ability to see beyond the social front that informants present to strangers in their everyday lives, to know that there is a difference between what Erving Goffman (1990) refers to as 'front stage' and 'back stage' behaviour, and to have ready access to that back stage. As I remarked earlier, fieldworkers initially find themselves pursuing topics that their informants want them to pursue and are severely restricted in their access to more sensitive themes. The problem facing all fieldworkers, then, is how to move beyond surface appearances and study what they, rather than their informants, think is important. The ability to move back stage depends partly on your personality as fieldworker, partly on the intimacy that you forge with your informants through participant observation, and partly on your ability to seize a fortuitous occasion and turn it to your advantage.

Once you have crossed the invisible line separating front stage from back stage, things are never again the same as they were before. You, too, like your informants, can play both games according to context and social role. Moreover, your informants realise that you have learned the rules and know the difference between front and back stage games and, as a result, they stop pretending when in your presence, and allow themselves to be seen as they are. This is immensely helpful in terms of the quality of research that you, as fieldworker, are able to conduct, and therefore of the quality of analysis that follows. You learn to separate fact from fiction, gossip from information, while strategically using both to gain further (more reliable) data. The sheer wealth of information, criticism and commentary that is made available by informants leads to further intimacy and spurs holistic analysis. In short, observant participation leads to the kind of involved detachment that characterises the very best of anthropological analysis.

Thus, in my own case, once I had done my bit in the Frontier presentation and came to be seen as an ad man, I was – so to speak – accepted by agency employees as 'one of them', rather than as an outsider. This led to my being freely given access to informal, inside knowledge of agency-client and agency-media relations, as well as of the Agency's own organizational features. Although, of course, there is no guarantee that length of fieldwork in itself will bring about the passage from participant observation to observant participation, this shift from front to back stage would never have been possible without the long-term duration of my fieldwork.[8]

In spite of these 'successes', however, total social immersion and intimacy have depended very much on the type of fieldwork being conducted.[9] For example, in a rural community in southern Japan where I lived with my family for four

[8] For the record, I should perhaps add that it usually takes me about three months of intensive participant observation before the façade that separates front from back stage begins to crack. I have no idea if there is a norm for this movement from tolerated outsider to accepted insider or, if so, what the norm might be.

[9] I have elsewhere distinguished between two types of fieldwork available to the practising anthropologist: frame- and network-based ethnography (Moeran 2005: 198-9).

years, our lives were entirely sucked up by community affairs. During these goings-on, all of us developed close friendships with local potters, farmers, foresters and their wives and children and shared in their daily mis/fortunes (see Moeran 1997, 1998). In the advertising agency, however, the situation was rather different. For a start, there is a limit to the amount of time anyone in any walk of life – even the most devoted banker, shop owner or academic – spends in his place of work. Even though, from time to time, I would stay late at my desk on weekday evenings, and occasionally go into the Agency on a Saturday to see who else was there, doing what with whom, while overtly catching up on my notes, I rarely put in the long hours of overtime that were customary for my Japanese informants. Nor did I ever meet them in their home environment. The nearest thing I got to an invitation to extra mural activities was a comparatively quick drink in a neighbourhood bar and occasional slap-up meal with a managing director, who would take me along as an 'interesting rarity' to help entertain a client.

If my fieldwork in the Agency was not entirely true to the ideal of total social immersion – a feature that has come under some scrutiny in recent years (Amit 2000: 5-11) – it was marked by the development of quite close personal working relationships with individual personnel employed there. It is almost certainly the quality of such relationships that influences what kind of findings and insights a fieldworker gets. As mentioned earlier, the intimacy developed with informants is very important because it helps the ethnographer depict people not as one-dimensional research subjects, but as rounded individuals (Amit 2000: 2-3). At the same time, it enables the researcher to see crucial connections between totally unexpected – and seemingly separated – things, events and practices. This is where fieldwork has the measure of all other research methodologies.

Problematics

So much for the eulogy. It is now time to recognize that not all the grass in the anthropological field is necessarily greener. Fieldwork brings with it certain problems that we need to face up to in the study of organizations and which make it a tricky methodology to market successfully. Two of the most enduring of these problems are fieldwork duration and method.

Let us start with duration. I have argued that, for professional anthropologists, fieldwork should last a minimum of six months, and ideally one year. For professional businessmen seeking to make use of the ethnographer, however, this is clearly a ridiculous proposition. Business moves too fast, they would say, for us to hang around and wait six months for an answer to our problems. We need answers tomorrow or − at the latest − next week, not next year!

Fair enough, except that a lot of organizational problems (like ad agency employees spending an undue amount of time away from their desks in cafés, for example) are in fact surface reactions to unchanging fundamental issues (connected, in this case, with the tension arising from the demands of corporate identity, on the one hand, and the need as a businessman to cultivate independent personal networks, on the other). In such cases, an organization

would be well advised to employ a fieldworker to carry out a study of its practices, since good fieldwork will undoubtedly reveal surprising links (like that between café frequentation and inherent structural tensions in Japanese corporate organization) that ordinary questioning might take years to disclose. Nevertheless, there are certainly issues that can and should be studied and resolved in a shorter period of time. One way for a fieldworker to go about this is to team up with fellow fieldworkers and conduct a group study of the issue in question. This saves time and enables a lot of information to be gleaned over a week or two as those concerned pool their cumulative knowledge at regular (half) daily intervals and use that knowledge to further their enquiries. The only trouble is that a group study of this kind does not usually permit its participants to see through the distinction between what people say they do and what they actually do. In other words, it hinders the move from front to back stage that, I have argued, is a vital stage in fieldwork. This necessarily affects the quality of the following analysis, so that every organization hosting one or more fieldworkers will have to balance this quality-time equation to meet its most urgent requirements. For many in the advertising and consumer marketing professions, for instance, even the briefest fieldwork's results are often so superior to those produced by the various methods of market analysis (surveys, questionnaires, focus groups, and so on) practised hitherto that 'ethnography' is understandably preferred.

This brings me neatly to the second main challenge of fieldwork: its method. The central problematic of organizational ethnography is that is promotes a method that cannot be carried out consistently. This is because as fieldworker you invariably find yourself in a series of processual social situations, in which all kinds of unexpected and unplanned events occur. You are thus obliged to make innumerable small decisions at every twist and turn of your daily routine – to choose between attending a media awards event or sitting in on a business guru's lecture, between having lunch with a group of women employees or with a mid-rank manager, and so on and so forth. Each choice necessarily invites, and simultaneously excludes, certain kinds of potential information which itself then guides, or partially obstructs, you as you blunder on in search of enlightenment about the social world into which you have plunged. Under these circumstances, you have no alternative but to be adaptable – both to the events and to the people that you come across there. This would be virtually impossible were you to stick to some idea of 'method'.

For example, even though Takano had carefully drawn up a schedule for me prior to my starting fieldwork, by the fifth week, I was already going off at a research tangent as I followed the production of animated cartoons (as a follow-on to television programme buying). Within three months I found myself involved in preparations for a presentation put on by the International Division, even though I did not begin my formal study there until the eighth month of my research. During four to five months in the middle of my fieldwork period I was following the day-to-day development of a contact lens campaign, while also formally learning about market development, account services, creative work, and promotions, as originally planned.

So fieldwork demands an immense amount of flexibility that makes method a bit of a moveable feast, and consistent methodology bad methodology (Miller 2003: 77). Perhaps this is why some scholars regard fieldwork as a 'messy, qualitative experience' (Marcus and Fisher 1986: 22), and suggest that its methods are in large part a 'myth' (Karp and Kendall 1982: 251). However, we should not dismiss the idea of method entirely. After all, we are always talking to people, watching how they interact, and trying to put two and two together, as we make use of our disciplinary training to see how individuals manoeuvre within an organizational structure and how that structure itself constrains and yields to such manoeuvring. Prolonged fieldwork enables the regular cross-checking of facts and opportunities to confirm or disconfirm observations. Participant observation allows the recording of 'speech-in-action' (Sanjek 1990: 211). Multiple modes of data collection enable triangulation that close down possibilities of serious bias on the part of the fieldworker.

There are 'tricks of the trade' (Becker 1998), of course, to help you along. The best one I know is the 'Close the notebook' trick. When someone starts telling you some really interesting stuff that is definitely back and not front stage, and when that informant seems slightly self-conscious or hesitant about whether s/he is doing the right thing, then you very deliberately close your notebook and put it away in your pocket so that s/he knows you are no longer taking notes (cf. Chapman 2001: 28). And when somebody is only telling you front-stage stuff and seems embarrassed, for whatever reason, by your presence, you can do the same. In the first instance, your informant can carry on saying what s/he wants to say without fear of being recorded. In the second, there is a good chance that s/he will suddenly open up to reveal things that the notebook inhibited her from saying. All you have to do is try to remember the gems that then litter the conversation. If nothing else, it is a good way to train your memory.

But this trick of the trade itself invites another: what I like to call 'Case the joint'. Like a thief before a burglary, you always need to check out the area round where you are going to conduct an interview. On the assumption that something might well happen to make you close your notebook (and you can see from these examples that, for better and for worse, I am one of those fieldworkers who prefer not to use tape recorders), you should make sure you know where to run to in order to get down everything you have not been able to record – and write up in fuller detail what you have recorded while it is still fresh in your mind. So, the trick is to find a café or restaurant or reasonably quiet bar – even a car (Powdermaker 1967: 157-8, 215) – where you can sit, think through, recall and, these days, type up on a laptop computer, the interview you have just completed.

But, as I said above, there are probably not that many objectively useful and practical tips for the participant observer, for whom fieldwork is primarily a combination of understanding and causal explanation (Burowoy 1991: 3), and a movement from observation (where method helps) to participation (where it does not) and thence to interpretation (where it might). This is probably why it is theorists and not fieldworkers who occupy the high status positions within

the field of anthropology and sociology. After all, 'fieldworkers are notorious analytic bricoleurs, sniffing out and sifting through current theory for leads as to how fieldwork materials might be conceptualized' (Van Maanen 1988: 66).

Concluding Points

So what does this slightly confessional narrative about fieldwork and anthropology tell us about organizational ethnography?

In the first place, I have tried to show the strategic use to which randomly struck-up connections can be put by the fieldworker – in the same way that they are regularly used by people in the business world. One chance can lead to another, and it is the ability or inability of both fieldworker and businessman to make the most of opportunity that leads to success or failure in the endeavour in hand. Thus, although access to the Agency depended to some extent on chance, in spite of what Buchanan et al. (1988: 56) say to the contrary, skill was needed to take advantage of initial opportunity.

Secondly, I have highlighted how access is crucial to success or failure in anthropological, as well as in management, business and organisation studies research. The fact that I had the blessing of the Agency's CEO in conducting my research led to my having a whole fieldwork schedule prepared for me in advance. It also meant that I was properly introduced to all the Agency's staff at its monthly early morning assembly (where I again had to introduce myself and state my research aims), and that I was then taken around every section and department in every division of the Agency by a senior member of the President's Office. For better or for worse, everyone knew who I was and could approach or avoid me, depending on how they felt.

But access in itself was not necessarily sufficient to ensure quality research since it had to be renegotiated (Hirsch and Gellner 2001: 5) every time I moved about the Agency from one division to another. I mentioned earlier the difficulty facing a researcher in all organisations, where people are very willing to talk about things that they want to talk about, but are usually equally competent at not talking about what they do not want to talk about. This kind of impression management may not be noticed by the management studies-kind of researcher who confines himself to conducting one-off interviews with people in an organisation. But it usually hits the full-time participant observer a few months into research, when she comes up against a brick wall designed to prevent further understanding of how an organisation really works. In other words, the fieldworker somehow has to move from front-stage impression management where people tell you what they do, to back-stage reality where you can see what they actually do.10

It is for this reason that I have my reservations about research based only on formal and informal interviews. On the basis of past and present practice, I firmly believe that only full-immersion fieldwork can provide a means of breaking down this wall and of seeing how an organisation really functions and

[10] This is one of the essential 'commitments' of fieldwork (cf. Miller 1997: 16-17).

why, as one moves from participant observation to observant participation. In this respect, as a methodology, fieldwork offers a broad approach whose 'open-ended flexibility' can incorporate other research methods like in/formal interviews, text analysis, questionnaires, historical research, and so on (Macdonald 2001: 78).

Let me illustrate this methodological point. As I said earlier, one of the problems I faced in doing my research at ADK was finding out about agency-client relations, since these were shrouded in mystery. 'Client confidentiality' was the phrase almost invariably used to brush off my questions. And yet it was clear that the advertising industry was structured somehow around agency-client relations. After all, it was the clients who provided the agencies with the accounts, or sums of money, that enabled them to produce the advertising that we see in newspapers and magazines, on television, billboards, airport baggage trolleys, items of clothing, and so on. It was vital that I find out in concrete terms how agencies got those accounts by interacting with clients, if I were to be able to make sense of the world of Japanese advertising.

The Frontier presentation provided me with this opportunity and I was able, by attending the ultimate 'front stage' performance of impression management (in terms of setting, personal appearance, and manner [Goffman 1990: 32-36]), to see the kinds of things that went on 'back stage' in the advertising industry (cf. Moeran 2006: 59-77). But it was only a brief glimpse behind the scenes and much of what I observed did not make all that much sociological sense at the time, until I experienced it again and again in other agency-client contexts. That this in itself was possible was due to the small part I played in the build-up to the Frontier presentation. By coming up with a series of creative ideas that, by chance, fitted in with the Agency's own assessment of how Frontier should approach the German and American markets, I showed that I could be more than a visiting 'professor'. I could actually be of use to the organisation that I was studying. Once news of my contribution to ADK's success in securing the Frontier account spread around the Agency,11 others began to come to me to ask if I couldn't help out in this or that project that they were working on. Thus, for the first time, informants came voluntarily to the fieldworker, rather than have the fieldworker come to them (usually at an inconvenient moment). As a result, I learned an awful lot (though never enough, of course) about the world of Japanese advertising, both in breadth and in depth.

During agency-client meetings, I frequently witnessed the kind of 'impression management' that I myself had earlier been subjected to as a not-fully-integrated researcher. The difference now was that my informants-cum-colleagues knew that I knew that they were managing impressions of one sort or another. This led to a certain sense of solidarity and rapport between us (of the kind often commented upon by anthropologists in their account of

[11] I should make it clear that the account was primarily won as a result of the close personal relationship developed over some time between ADK's account executive in charge of the presentation and his opposite number in Frontier.

fieldwork). But the fact that I was now more of an 'insider' meant that, when I was part of an account team dealing with external organisations, I had to participate in the very same arts of impression management that I had previously sought to tear asunder. In this respect, solidarity also involved a certain 'complicity' (Marcus 1998: 105-131) with, or 'dramaturgical loyalty' (Goffman 1990: 207-210) to, my informants-cum-colleagues.

However, this sense of complicity, which was enabled by and sustained rapport, did not derive from the kind of 'inherent moral asymmetry' between anthropologist and informant discussed by Geertz (1968: 151) and Marcus (1998: 110). Rather, it arose from the institutional and financial asymmetry that existed between advertising clients, who distributed advertising accounts, on the one hand; media organisations, which ran the advertising campaigns, on the other; and the advertising agency itself, which moved restlessly between the two.

This complicity was thus inter-organisational, rather than inter-personal, and was driven by how money – in the form of the split account system – circulated within the advertising industry. By recognising this, I came to realise just how the advertising industry as a whole was structured by the tripartite relationship between these three different players of advertising clients, media organisations and agencies. This then prompted me to examine how the agency itself was internally structured to meet the demands of the industry, or field, as a whole (Moeran 2006: 21-35). In this respect, my 'intervention' in the preparations for the Frontier competitive presentation not only led to immediate interaction with different people in the Agency, but allowed me in the long term to work out the structure of the field of advertising and the social mechanisms by which it operated.

In these and one or two other respects, the case study mentioned here provided me with the classic benefits of participant observation. By 'being there', and being there long enough to make a difference, I was able to hear and structure the multiple voices of my informants (Moeran 2006: 37-58). By looking at their interaction during both front- and back-stage performances, I became aware of unanticipated details, as well as of the relevance of apparently irrelevant things said and done (cf. Chapman 2001: 24). As a result, I was able to arrive at a holistic study with general theoretical implications for the advertising industry both in Japan and elsewhere (cf. Hirsch and Gellner 2001: 9-10).

But are there not disadvantages to the kind of fieldworker integration that I have argued for here? Does not successful observant participation imply that the fieldworker has succumbed to anthropology's occupational hazard by 'going native' (Powdermaker 1967: 115-119)? Clearly, the fact that, as fieldworker, I came to understand and participate in the back stage behaviour of my informants precluded me from entering the back stage of other – media, entertainment and client – organizations that formed part of the field of Japanese advertising. Yet I have argued that the very richness of the data that derived from observant participation overcame this disadvantage. I am convinced that this is always the case.

Of course, there is a fine line between 'going native' and remaining a committed fieldworker – a line between participation and observation that defies detection for much of the time. In a way, I think, observant participation enables the fieldworker to reconstruct 'the relationship between objectivity and subjectivity, scientist and native, Self and Other' as mutually constituent, rather than see it as 'an unbridgeable opposition' (Tedlock 1991: 71). In this way, it helps the anthropologist cross the great disciplinary divide, bringing a scientific approach to the humanities and much needed humaneness to the social sciences.

Amit, Vered 2000 'Introduction: Constructing the field'. In his edited *Constructing the Field: Ethnographic fieldwork in the contemporary world*. London & New York: Routledge.

Becker, Howard 1998 *Tricks of the Trade*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre 1984 Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste. *London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.*

Buchanan, D., Boddy, D., and J. McCalman 1988 'Getting in, getting on, getting out and getting back'. In A. Bryman (ed.) Doing Research in Organizations*, London and New York: Routledge.*

Burowoy, Michael 1991 'Introduction'. In his edited Ethnography Unbound: Power and resistance in the modern metropolis*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.*

Chapman, Malcolm 2001 'Social anthropology and business studies: some considerations of method'. In D. Gellner and E. Hirsch (eds.) Inside Organizations*. Oxford: Berg.*

Clifford, James 1992 'Traveling cultures'. In L. Grossberg, C. Nelson and P. Treichler (eds.) *Cultural Studies*. New York & London: Routledge.

Dore, R.P. 1973 *British Factory-Japanese Factory: The origins of national diversity in industrial relations*. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Eriksen, Thomas Hyulland 1995 Small Places, Large Issues: An introduction to social and cultural anthropology*. London: Pluto Press.*

Gellner, David and Erik Hirsch (eds.) 2001 Inside Organizations*. Oxford: Berg.*

Geertz, Clifford 1968 'Thinking as a moral act: Ethical dimensions of anthropological fieldwork in the new States'. Antioch Review *28 (2): 139-58.*

Geertz, Clifford 1973 'Deep play: notes on the Balinese cockfight'. In his The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.*

Geertz, Clifford 1988 *Words and Lives*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Goffman, Erving 1990 (1959) The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.*

Hastrup, Kirsten and Peter Hervik (eds.) 1994 *Social Experience and Anthropological Knowledge*. New York & London: Routledge.

Hine, Christine 2001 'Ethnography in the laboratory'. In D. Gellner and E. Hirsch (eds.) Inside Organizations*. Oxford: Berg.*

Karp, Ivan and Martha Kendall 1982 'Reflexivity in fieldwork'. In P. Second (ed.) *Explaining Human Behavior, Human Action and Social Structure*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Keesing, Roger and Andrew Strathern 1998 'Fieldwork'. In *Cultural Anthropology: A contemporary perspective*. 3rd Edition. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace.

Kunda, Gideon 1992 *Engineering Culture: Control and commitment in a high-tech corporation*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Macdonald, Sharon 2001 'Ethnography in the Science Museum, London'. In D. Gellner and E. Hirsch (eds.) Inside Organizations*. Oxford: Berg.*

Malinowski, Bronislaw 1922 Argonauts of the Western Pacific*. New York: Dutton.*

Marcus, George 1998 *Ethnography through Thick & Thin*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Marcus, George and Michael Fisher 1986 *Anthropology as Cultural Critique*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Miller, Daniel 1997 Capitalism: An ethnographic approach*. Oxford: Berg.*

Miller, Daniel 2003 'Advertising, production and consumption as cultural economy'. In T. de Waal Malefyt and B. Moeran (eds.) *Advertising Cultures*. Oxford: Berg.

Moeran, Brian 1996 *A Japanese Advertising Agency*. London: Curzon.

Moeran, Brian 1997 *Folk Art Potters of Japan*. London: Curzon.

Moeran, Brian 1998 *A Far Valley: Four years in a Japanese village*. Tokyo and New York: Kodansha International.

Moeran, Brian 2005 *The Business of Ethnography*. Oxford: Berg.

Moeran, Brian 2006 *Ethnography at Work*. Oxford: Berg.

Nader, Laura 1969 'Up the anthropologist.' In Dell Hymes (ed.) *Reinventing Anthropology*. New York: Pantheon.

Okely, Judith 1992 'Anthropology and autobiography: participatory experience and embodied knowledge.' In J. Okely and H. Callaways (eds.) *Anthropology and Autobiography*. New York & London: Routledge.

Powdermaker, Hortense 1967 *Stranger and Friend: The way of an anthropologist*. London: Secker & Warburg.

Powdermaker, Hortense 1968 'Field work'. In D. Sills (ed.) *The International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*. New York: Macmillan and Free Press.

Rabinow, Paul 1977 *Reflections on Fieldwork in Morocco*. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Rohlen, Tom 1974 *For Harmony and Strength: Japanese white-collar organization in anthropological perspective*.

Rynkiewich, Michael and James Spradley (eds.) 1976 *Ethics and Anthropology: Dilemmas in fieldwork*. New York: Wiley.

Schwartzman, Helen 1993 *Ethnography in Organizations*. Qualitative Research Methods Series 27. Newbury Park: Sage.

Sluka, Jeffrey and Antonius Robben 2007 'Fieldwork in cultural anthropology: an introduction'. In their (eds.) *Ethnographic Fieldwork: An anthropological reader*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Stewart, Alex 1998 *The Ethnographer's Method*. Qualitative Research Methods Series 46. Newbury Park: Sage.

Tedlock, Barbara 1991 'From participant observation to the observation of participation: the emergence of narrative ethnography'. *Journal of Anthropological Research* 47 (1): 69-94.

Van Maanen, John 1988 *Tales of the Field*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wolf, Eric 1964 Anhropology. *Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.*

www.cbs.dk/creativeencounters

Working Papers List:

#1 **Making Scents of Smell:**
Manufacturing Incense in Japan
By: Brian Moeran
June 2007

#2 **From Participant Observation to Observant Participation:**
Anthropology, Fieldwork and Organizational Ethnography
By: Brian Moeran
July 2007

#3 **Creative Encounters in the Film Industry:**
Content, Cost, Chance, and Collection
By: Mark Lorenzen
August 2007

#4 **Hvilke kulturtilbud bruger den kreative klasse?**
By: Trine Bille
August 2007