© Kamla-Raj 2014
PRINT: ISSN 0972-0073 ONLINE: ISSN 2456-6802
Anthropologist, 18(1): 33-42 (2014)
DOI: 10.31901/24566802.2014/18.01.04

Exceptional Luck? Conducting Ethnographies in Business Organizations

Alfons H. van Marrewijk

Department of Organization Sciences, Faculty of Social Sciences, VU University Amsterdam
De Boelelaan 1081, 1081 HV Amsterdam, The Netherlands
Telephone: +31 (0)20 598 7640 , Fax +31 (0)20 598 6765
E-mail: a.h.van.marrewijk@vu.nl

KEYWORDS Business Anthropology. Methodology. Fieldwork. Consultancy

ABSTRACT Anthropological fieldwork methods are increasingly becoming popular with management and business. This paper discusses the experiences of business anthropologists with conducting ethnographies in organizations. Based upon a review of organizational ethnographies and three personal vignettes four issues have been found; access to business organizations, role taking, involvement versus detachment and freedom to publish. To deal with these issues other than traditional anthropological requirements are needed for business anthropologists. It is not so much exceptional luck, but rather a strategic use of one's networks, negotiation skills and social skills to handle these issues. Therefore, business anthropologists need to develop networking and negotiating capacities and commercial sensitiveness to conduct ethnographies in business organizations.

INTRODUCTION

Isn't it strange that anthropologists take great pains to study the daily life and the spiritual world of so-called primitive people, but hardly devote their energies to study organizational rituals in Western companies (Van der Ende and van Marrewijk 2014)? Already in 1978, William Foot Whyte hoped that the growing interests in organizational culture would become a major field for applied anthropologists. However, other academic disciplines have embraced anthropological theoretical concepts and field research methodologies for organizational culture research. It was only toward the end of the 1970s that anthropologists began to show interest in organizational cultures (Smircich 1983; Baba 1986; Van Maanen and Barley 1985; Schwartzman 1993; Chanlat 1994; Jordan 1994).

The anthropological perspective on organizations differs from other organizational perspectives as a method of fieldwork process (the "doing"), as a paradigm (the "thinking") and as a narrative style (the "writing") (Bate 1997). The stronghold of anthropologists is the "doing" of ethnographic fieldwork by means of participant observation (Moore 2011b; Jordan 2013). The "thinking" of anthropologists includes a perception of organizations as cultural phenomenon. An organization is perceived as a modern 'tribe' with its own cultural values and norms that prescribe the behavior of employees. Finally, the "writing" of ethnographies by anthropologists distinguishes organizational anthropology from other organizational studies in that it can be narrative, poetic, fictional, autobiographical and post-modern (Moore 2011a).

Increasingly, these practices of "doing", "thinking" and "writing" attracted attention in the businessworld (Baba 2014). American corporations hired anthropologists to design new technology, to learn to know their customers and to improve their business (Treitler 2014; Jordan 2014; Tian et al. 2013). Consequently, Davenport claims the success of business anthropologists in the Harvard Business Review; 'I have been predicting for years that anthropologists would soon be in demand in the workplace, and now this is finally coming to pass' (Davenport 2007: 2).

Notwithstanding the growing interest in and production of ethnographic studies in business, organizations are not commonplace for anthropologists (Fine et al. 2008). Bate (1997) for example explains this lack of papers, which are difficult to publish, and it takes the researcher away from the academic scene. Jordan (2003) wonders why anthropologists do not use their thorough knowledge of local cultures and cultural processes to study corporations and to obtain work opportunities. What is it that makes anthropologists infrequently entering business organizations for conducting ethnographies?

In the light of the discussion above this paper explores the difficulties that anthropologists face when executing ethnographic studies in business organizations. To do so a literature review is done among a small selection of business ethnographies. Furthermore, three personal vignettes of business anthropological research executed by the author are discussed. Vignettes are used in research to support authenticity in the presentation of research findings (Humphreys 2005).

The paper is structured as follows. After discussing the used methodology, a literature review is executed. In the first part of this paper, the fieldwork process of entering the field of study, obtaining permission, role taking, involvement of researcher, and limitations in publication are discussed. In the second part, three cases of the fieldwork process of ethnographic research in organizations are presented. The differences and similarities among the cases are compared. Finally, conclusions are drawn.

METHODOLOGY

A review of organizational ethnographies provided a first understanding of methodological problems in the fieldwork. This review include work of Baba (1986), Jordan (1994), Watson (1994), Orr (1986), Moeran (2005), Kunda (1992), Jordan (2003), Wright (1994), Parker (2000), Gellner and Hirsch (2001), Bate (2006), Smits (2013), Van den Ende and Van Marrewijk (2014), Treitler (in press). From reading and decoding these ethnographies specific understanding of issues were found.

Furthermore, three vignettes of business ethnographies have been explored in which the author participated as researchers/consultant. The researcher/consultant penetrates in an organization and listens, observes, participates, helps, advises, and reflects to understand a variety of cultural forms (Ybema et al. 2009). Such an insight into boardrooms, organization politics, informal gatherings and implementation problems result in a deeper understanding of change processes in organizations (Van Marrewijk et al. 2010). By engaging actors in organizations in a dialogue such research discovers underlying values.

Researcher roles and selves are not separable from the interpretations and events in any study and reflecting upon these must shed light on both the theory and practice of how applied fieldwork is done in contemporary contexts, about which we know relatively little (Yanow and Schwartz-Shea 2006). Humphreys (2005) calls these self-reflexive personal vignettes which add authenticity and exposure to interpretations, and, importantly, and are useful for others. The role of researcher/consultant is not rare as academic experts are actively involved as employees of Disneyworld (Van Maanen 2001), cross cultural specialists (Smits 2013), empowerment (Watts-Englert et al. 2014).

The three vignettes discussed in this paper overviews different periods of ethnographic presence in the business organizations by the researcher. In the first vignette a two-year ethnographic study is executed of the international co-operation in different strategic alliances of Telecom Operator. The second vignette concerns ethnographic research to evaluate the organization and management model, formal and informal organizational practices in a large infrastructure project named Mega Project. The third case focuses on ethnographic study of a cultural change process in Public Office that was intended to make it a more service-oriented organization. Field research notes, contracts, publications, methodological field notes, and personal experiences were used to reflect upon the three research projects (Yanow and Schwartz-Shea 2006).

RESULTS

Based upon a literature review of business ethnographies four topics were found related to the problems that anthropologist face when executing ethnographic field work in business organizations; (1) entry of field, (2) role taking, (3) involvement and detachment, and (4) freedom to publish. These four topics will be discussed below.

Entry of the Field

When anthropologists decide to turn towards ethnographic research in organizations they often find it hard to obtain assignments (Treitler in press). Czarniawska claims that it is easier to obtain access in a workplace where no qualifications are needed:

These examples [of participant observation in organization] *indicate that such studies - no doubt superior to all other types- are possible to carry out either due to exceptional luck in obtaining access or because a given working* *place does not require specific qualifications (Czarniawska 1998: 25).*

Managers' perceptions of business anthropologists are based upon the stereotype of otherworldly researchers of exotic and distant cultures. There is no clear image of an anthropologist doing work domestically as they have been as evaluators, consultants, federal investigators, spies from other companies or agencies, and journalists (Schwartzman 1993: 49).

Managers are the gatekeepers of organizational research fields but to them it is not clear what the specific qualities of anthropologists are and how anthropological research contributes to the organization. In many ethnographic studies, tensions arise from research sponsors that are unfamiliar with the time needed and usefulness of results (Van Maanen 2001: 237). Therefore, Giovannini and Rosansky (1990: 36) advises business anthropologists to learn the client's language and business; expect the unexpected; keep an open mind; monitor their influence on the organization; and act with honesty and integrity. But most important, business anthropologists need self-confidence when entering organizations (Jordan 1994: 21). When anthropologist Karen Smits studied the execution of the Panama Canal Expansion Program it was hard to get access to informants until a group of experts from the Netherlands, who visited the site, included her in the meetings.

I was invited to be part of workshops and arrived at the office wearing a suit. The ACP employees noticed my change of attire and made remarks like: "wow, you are part of the delegation, the important people…" and "What? You are not a student? (Smits 2013: 70).

The gatekeepers are used to dealing with dressed consultants and researchers speaking the organization's language. Organizations are willing to pay for organizational research butgenerally assignments for organizational cultural research have a managerial perspective. Traditionally, anthropologists strongly identify with the communities they study. The possibility that anthropologists could have harmed the interest of the Latin American people if they participated in, the US army financed, project Camelot shocked the professional community. This has negatively affected the relationship between anthropologists and consulting work (Ellen 1984: 138; Jordan 2003: 14).

When Moeran (2005) wanted to study the social processes in a Japanese advertising agency, he used his professional network. The Japanese newspaper he was coincidentally writing regular papers for connected him with a Japanese advertising agency by emphasizing his status and position and the reciprocal relations between the newspaper and the agency. In a meeting Moeran could elaborate on his proposed study but found it hard to convince the agency about the practical relevance:

The difficulty for any academic, when talking to people who are not themselves in academia, lies in putting across complex ideas in as straightforward a manner as possible and in persuading others of the practical relevance of one's research (Moeran 2005: 87).

Role-taking

The gatekeeper's willingness to give permission is related to the role taken by the researcher. Generally, a business anthropologist penetrates in an organization and listens, observes, participates, helps, advises, reflects to understand a variety of cultural forms (Van Maanen 2001). But it can be very frustrating hanging around in an organization. Reciprocity is needed in order to achieve the practical goals. Kunda (1992) wrote:

There is nothing as seductive for the fieldworker as being made to feel like an insider, likes someone with something to contribute, particularly in an environment where "value added" is the ultimate measure of a person's worth (Kunda 1992: 236).

Usually, research is executed with permission from management and with a clear role for the researcher (Schwartzman 1993: 47). However, this role is not always clear to managers. When business anthropologist Smits entered here fieldwork site:

They hoped I would study the local communities and how the Expansion Program and the changes around the Panama Canal affected them, while my main interest was on the internal dynamics of the project organization (Smits 2013: 69).

The role of the organizational anthropologist differs from that of the organizational consultant (van Marrewijk et al. 2010). The first and most important difference between the two is related to the question: 'whom are you working for?' The organizational anthropologist tends to work with employees on the work floor. In contrast, organizational consultants typically work with the top management, which gives more status, clearer results and new commissions. The organizational anthropologist is scientifically interested in the view of employees:

Microstudies are more often than not on the side of the underdogs, be they managers or workers and, on the side of the rebellion. By showing how macropictures are drawn, microstudies problematize the taken for granted (Czarniawska 1998: 49).

The consultant on the other hand, who is hired by the company to investigate or solve a problem may use a clinical perspective for collecting data by means of a quick scan or a limited number of interviews (van Marrewijk et al. 2010). A clinical research perspective results in a different relationship to the object of study than the ethnographic perspective and can therefore result in different findings. The organizational anthropologist can help management to understand cultural processes on the 'work-floor' and suggest interventions (van Marrewijk et al. 2010). He or she is more capable of working on the 'work-floor' than the organizational consultant who is inclined to adopt a management perspective. However, Parker (2000) did not feel comfortable with the former role:

..I was assumed to be a channel of communication between the bottom and the top. It was expected that I would be feeding information back to the directors or managers who had employed me (the management spy) to do this research on them (the employees) (Parker 2000: 238).

The second difference between organizational anthropologists and organizational consultants is the time they need for the research. While organizational anthropologists need one to two years to uncover and unravel the organizational culture, organizational consultantshave to do this in a much shorter period (Jordan 2014). The method of participant observation used by the organizational anthropologist - a historical, contextual and process based approach - is very time-consuming. When Moeran (2005: 88) explained he needed a year to study a Japanese advertising agency, the CEO replied: *'One year's rather a long time. Why don't we say three months to begin with?'* Time needed for research reduces anthropological interest for ethnography of organizations (Bate 1997). For many of the university-based researchers research time is limited and fragmented over the year.

The third difference between organizational-anthropologists and organizational consultants is found in the presentation of data. While the organizational anthropologist tends to include sensitive and critical data in the presentation because of the commitment to the 'work floor', the organizational consultant are inclined to adopt a management perspective.

Involvement and Detachment

The anthropologist must commit to the organization while maintaining a degree of detachment (Ellen 1984: 227). Traditionally, anthropologists run the risk of being too committed to their community of study. Ellen (1984: 88) names this "over engagement" of the anthropologist. In organizational research this going native approach is slightly different. Commitment can be in an active role as consultant, 'parachutist', expert, or temporary employee. In exchange for this commitment the anthropologist receives a salary or consultancy fees, payment of expenses, travel allowance, and sometimes a company car. Due to the financial situation at universities and research institutes, there is a risk that the anthropologist is being taken away from the academic scene as much organizational research is conducted in commercial corporations.

Being involved in business organizations can result in the loss of one's professional identity as thebusiness anthropologist is confronted with new roles, colleagues, language, clothing, behavior and informal networks. Participation in organizational life can elicit a strong emotional involvement (Kunda 1992: 273). Czarniawska (1998) for example, gives a personal account of losing her professional identity when doing fieldwork and concludes that the threat of losing one's identity is the most painful aspect of organizational field studies. She experienced feelings of *'being dumb'* and *'continually running up against blank walls'* (Czarniawska 1998: 42). It is difficult to hold on to one's professional identity when the anthropologist wants to become part of the formal and informal organizational networks. Kunda (1992) signals the hierarchical system and the informal networks in organizations as two limiting aspects of participant observation. The researcher belongs to a hierarchy and can't move around without permission. At the same time the researcher doesn't belong to an informal network as the researcher is new and temporary in the organization:

I started by just being in the office. At the ACP offices I was provided a desktop and a cubicle, at GUPC there was always a desk that I could use to work from my laptop, and with that came the first contacts with my respondents. I became part of several groups in the project organization and developed a number of friends who invited me to be part of their social lives. … With the friends I made, I was invited to more private parties, such as dinners, birthday parties and weekend outings (Smits 2013: 73).

Maintaining a degree of detachment is not easyin ethnographic research in organizations. This is especially the case for the *pracademics* as they are or have been organizational members. These are business anthropologists who have been turned into practitioners and practitioners who have developed into researchers. However, they experience other advantages (Orr 1996; Czarniawska 1998: 25; O'Neill 2001). Orr's (1996) work experience as a technician for example, was helpful to enter the field and win the trust of the technicians. However, his experience blinded him for the most common:

However, it [his experience as a technician] *was a problem in analysis since my note omitted things that were obvious in the field but are less so at a distance. I also found I had a tendency to regard certain phenomena as unremarkable which are not really so to outsiders (Orr 1996: 7)*

O'Neill (2001) experienced difficulties when reentering the field of study where he had worked for many years as a trained ambulance staff member, as a researcher. He describes an incident during his research in which he had to use his knowledge as an ambulance staff member to save the life of a baby (ibid: 225). The emergency medical crewwas busy with a patient when an emergency call came in for a five-hour-old baby, which had stopped breathing. Together with an emergency medical technician, O'Neill found himself running and shouting through the hospital with a stretcher to reach the ambulance. He was no longer a professional observer but preparing medical equipment. When they arrived at the patient's house, the emergency medical technician was able to recover the baby (ibid: 226). To him, his role and responsibility as a researcher was secondary to his roles a person:

I found I was in the position, as every ethnographer is, of being involved in social relations with others who occupied the field, not only ambulance staff but also patients, hospital workers, and members of the public (O'Neill 2001: 229).

Limitations and Freedom

The business anthropologist runs the risk of being limited in the execution of the research and in the publication of findings. Generally, a contract is a used form of dealing with the issues of access and financial support (Ellen 1984). Typically, business anthropologists have to negotiate with potential clients over the topics of ethnographic study. Especially, it is necessary to negotiate over the possibilities of studying the daily activities of employees. Kunda (1992: 233) for example, participated in the corporate culture program in exchange of a presentation about his findings. Parker also negotiated with management for access:

In each study the research took place over at least an 18-month period and access was gained partly on the basis of already existing contacts but also by agreeing to deliver a report or presentation on the management of technological change once it was complete (Parker 2000: 236).

And even if permission for publication is given, it can still be difficult to publish the ethnographic material. The limitations on traditional anthropology have increased because of a growing awareness among local governments and communities. The field situation is so complex now that legal consultation at an early stage of project design is required (Jordan 2003). Respondents read and comment the publications:

My respondents recognized my interpretations, agreed to most of them and were surprised by the dynamics I unraveled. This work was also presented to my supervisors, practitioners and academic colleagues at conferences, and finally, published in an academic journal. Ultimately, a draft of the complete dissertation was sent to key respondents (Smits 2014: 86).

By now it is clear which topics business anthropologists are confronted with when executing ethnographic fieldwork in business organizations. To illustrate these findings, three vignettes of business anthropologic fieldwork, executed by the researcher are described.

Vignette 1: Cross-cultural Specialist

The first case concerned the ethnography of Dutch Telecom. This organization expanded their business to foreign markets and was confronted with new questions concerning cross-cultural cooperation. They were in need of an intercultural specialist to support the process of internationalization. It took quite a few presentations and negotiations to obtain the assignment for the research as the relevance of the ethnographic study had to be made clear.

Telecom asked for advice on questions of intercultural management. As a former Telecom employee, it was easy for the researcher to enter the field of study. It also offered the opportunity participate in different departments and strategic alliances. This position provided an excellent starting point for the necessary in-depth research and increased both the researcher's credibility and trustworthiness in the organization. Maintaining close contacts with colleagues resulted in a deeper insightinto their personal lives and the strategies they employed in coping with cultural differences.

Due to the researcher's earlier employment and active participation in the company for more than two years it was difficult to avoid the risk of going native. Each day, the researcher was reminded of the differences between the academic and business worlds. Telecom Operator was interested in quick and applicable solutions such as cross-cultural training, and consulting. By bringing in new knowledge, supporting intercultural training, and helping to evaluate prior experiences, the researcher could help the organization to cope with and successfully manage cross-cultural differences. The results of the researcher's evaluation were presented to the organization's employees and managers. The close relationship between the research and the practical implementation of its results was stimulating for the researcher. This form of action research (van Marrewijk et al. 2010) helped me to participate in the organization. It was difficult to monitor the researcher's influence on the organization, as Giovannini and Rosansky (1990) suggested.

Although it was difficult to enter the organization, the researcher experienced a large degree of freedom in executing the research. Limitations were mainly focused on publication of confidential information. The contract stated that;

Permission for publishing will be withheld: if the publications contain confidential information that can damage Telecom Operator, its subsidiaries or its partner organizations, and if information is included, which Telecom Operator has defined in advance as not to be used in the research.

Fast changes in the telecom sector and the slow tempo of scientific publication, however, made it possible to publish detailed ethnographic data. By the time the researcher finished the researcher's writing, the situation in the company had completely changed and many of the studied strategic alliances had already collapsed.

Vignette 2: Evaluation of Mega Project

The second case concerned anethnographic research in Mega Project. To evaluate the organization and management model, formal and informal organizational practices were studied. Earlier consultancy assignments in the project helped me to enter the field of study. Mega Project was interested in an evaluation study to support their knowledge management objectives. The research proposal was discussed with project management before obtaining permission. Apart from a report to the project management, the results of the research were to be presented in knowledge management meetings in order to improve future operations.

At an early stage the research project leader fell seriously ill and the researcher took over his role. The research team consisted of four internal experts and two external experts on ethnographic research. The team membersknew the project and were trusted by project employees. Team members worked in pairs to conduct almost 100 biographical interviews with organizational members. The quality of data was sometimes pooras the internal researchers had attended ethnographic training for only a few days.

The research team became strongly involved in day-to-day organizational life as thefour internal members were employees. The team had their office in project headquarters, joined management meetings, discussed the progress of the research with the project's employees, and participated in social events. The research group worked together intensively and frequently organized informal gatherings among themselves. During this period the researcher's contacts with the researcher's academic research institute were less intensive.

The political context of Mega Project limited publication of the findings, as the organization was thesubject of a parliamentary inquiry on cost overruns. It was less the conclusions than the detailed observations and interview fragments in the evaluation report gave rise to much debate with the project management. When finally accepted in April 2005, the internal report wasdeemed still too detailed to be published, and not more than five copies were distributed internally. Although presentations within the Mega Project and its partner organizations on the results were no problem, scientific publications were restricted. The requirement of confidentiality clearly indicated that preliminary permission of the client had to be asked:

The researcher will commit himself not to make public any information, knowledge, data or results obtained within the scope of the researchbeforewritten permission of the client……….After obtaining permission of the client, the researcher is restricted to do everything possible to protect the rights and interests of the client……… The client had the right, without judicial intervention, to impose a fine of 10.000 • for every breach of the rules (paper 7 of Mega Project's contract with researcher).

The contract generated ethical dilemmas concerning publication. In this case time has not been very helpful, as the project will be the subject of political focus for the next several years. Solutions have been found by negotiating publication with project management, making the project anonymous, and using public sources.

Vignette 3: Cultural Change Manager

The third vignette focuses on ethnographic study of a cultural change process in Public Office that was intended to make it a more service-oriented organization. Due to prior consultancy with the organization and a friend who was appointed manager of the Human Resources department, the researcher was able to enter the field of study. As interim manager of the Consultancy Department, the researcher was responsible for twelve consultants, trainers, and organizational developers who implemented the change program in Public Office. The researcher's problem was that the primary focus of the assignment was on management andnot on ethnographic research. Negotiation with Public Office resulted in permission and financial resources for ethnographic research. A master student researcher was recruited to study informal cultural processes in the organization and the daily experiences of the employees with the change process.

From the first day on, the researcher was fully involved and totally absorbed by the job as interim manager. The change program had already started and a number ofvacanciesstill had to be filled. For some consultants/trainers the direction of the change program was not clear; for others the quality of the program was disputable. From the early morning until early evening the researcher was occupied with meetings, employee evaluations, training sessions, measuring work progress and reading proposals. This was so demanding that there was almost no time to write field notes, to re-think observations or to reflect on the findings of the external researcher. After six months of laborious interim management, the researcher was completely tired and had little in the way of research to show for the researcher's work. There were no contract limitations on publishing, but only the master student researcher published a report and a master thesis.

DISCUSSION

The vignettes discussed present insights in the problems related to business ethnographies. Fierce negotiations on permission (as with Telecom Operator), publication (as with Mega Infra Project), or research activities (as with Public Office) were needed. Managers expected consultancy and training (Telecom Operator), an evaluation report (Mega Project) or change work (Public Office). When the three vignettes are compared, differences and similarities in experiences with fieldwork roles and fieldwork process can be found (see Table 1).

The three vignettes differ in organizational characteristics as Telecom is a business organization, Public Office is a public organization, and Mega Project is a public-private partnership. The 'selling' of ethnographic research was more difficult in the commercial oriented Telecom than in Public Office. Telecom managers were not used to support ethnographies with unclear outcomes. The vignettes also differ in the role of the anthropologist and the time spent in the organization: the business anthropologist participated in different roles of project leader, interim manager and researcher/consultant (see Table 1).

Table 1: Fieldwork roles and processes in three vignettes

	Telecom operator	*Mega project*	*Public office*
Ethnographic Focus	Cross-cultural cooperation in strategic alliances	Evaluation of project-management	Cultural change processes
Access the Field	Experience as telecom engineer and personal network	Earlier consultancy assignments and personal network	Personal network
Assignment	Fierce negotiation and proving organizational value	After presentation of research proposal	Manager HRM department
Role Taking	Researcher/consultant in international support	Project leader of research team	Interim manager of Consultancy Department
Involvement	Day-to-day activities, lectures, training, consultancy presentations	Day-to-day activities, team commitment, field-notes	Strongly, absorbing, tiring, no time and energy for
Limitations	Permission for publishing in contract, turbulence made it easy to publish	Permission for publishing in contract, political context made it difficult to publish	No limitations, no scientific publication
Period of Fieldwork	Two years	One year	Six months
Time	Four days a week	Three days a week	Four days a week

Similarities are found in issues of entering the field, as personal networks were very helpful and even necessary for obtaining access. Furthermore, formal contracts proven to be important means of agreement when accessing business organizations. The contracts remained at the background during the ethnographic fieldwork period and in the period of publications. In two cases (Telecom and Mega Project) external publication was restricted with reference to the contract. Especially, the details in ethnographic writing were an unpleasant surprise to the political stakeholders. However, due to the different pace of time between business and academia, publications appeared in journals long after the decay of sensitive topics.

CONCLUSION

The paper asked the question what it is that makes anthropologists infrequently entering business organizations for conducting ethnographies. Business organizations have a growing interest in ethnographies to better understand their production processes, their customer behavior, international business and cross cultural collaboration. However, this growing interest has not directly resulted in a large number of anthropologists turning towards business anthropology. Based upon a literature review of business ethnographies four topics were found related to the problems that anthropologist face when executing ethnographic field work in business organizations; (1) entry of field, (2) role taking, (3) involvement and detachment, and (4) freedom to publish.

To conduct ethnographies in business organizations anthropologists have to cope with these topics. This is a challenging endeavor as anthropologists are not trained to 'sell' their ethnographic skills to business. Generally, anthropologists have not chosen their profession to become commercial oriented consultants. However, the execution of anthropological methods of fieldwork by anthropologists in business organizations has many payoffs to anthropologists. The payoffs for anthropologists include interesting fieldwork, financial resources, and work opportunities in the fields of consumer behavior, organization cultural change, cross cultural management, merger and acquisitions and spatial interventions.

RECOMMENDATIONS

To deal with the topics of getting access, role taking, involvement and publishing fieldwork other than traditional anthropological requirements are needed for business anthropologists. It is not so much exceptional luck, but rather a strategic use of one's networks, negotiation skills and social skills to handle these issues. Therefore, business anthropologists need to develop networking and negotiating capacities and commercial sensitiveness to sell ethnographies to business organizations. The needed commercial and entrepreneurial attitude is not natural to anthropologists. Therefore, more attention to these requirements should be given in the academic training of anthropology students. Learning the basics economics of organizations will help to communicate with the gatekeepers of organizational fields of study.

The "doing" and "thinking" is increasingly becoming popular in business organizations but managers, who generally don't appreciate the narrative style of ethnography, have to be convinced that ethnographic research contributes to their business goals. There is no need to feel uncomfortable with this marketing of business anthropology. There is so much interesting research work to do for anthropologists in contemporary business organizations. It would be a pity not to use these opportunities.

REFERENCES

Baba M 1986. *Organizational and Industrial Anthropology: An Overview*. National Association for Practice of Anthropology AAA. San Francisco: University of California Press.

Baba M 2014. De-anthropologizing ethnography: A historical perspective on the commodification of ethnography as a business service. In: RM Denny, PL Sunderland (Eds.): *Handbook of Anthropology in Business*. Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, pp. 43-68.

Bate P 1997.Whatever happened to organizational anthropology? A review of the field of organizational ethnography and anthropological studies. *Human Relations*, 50(9): 1147-1171.

Bate P 2006. Ethnography with 'Attitude': Mobilizing narratives for public sector change. In: M Veenswijk (Ed.): *Organizing Innovation. New Approaches to Cultural Change and Intervention in Public Sector Organizations.* Amsterdam: IOS Press, pp. 105-132.

Chanlat J 1994. Towards an anthropology of organizations. In: J Hassard, M Parker (Eds.): *Towards a New Theory of Organizati-ons*. London: Routledge, pp. 155-190.

Czarniawska B 1998. *A Narrative Approach to Organization Studies*. *Qualitative Research Methods Series 42*. London: Sage University Paper.

Davenport T 2007.The rise of corporate anthropology. *Harvard Business Review*, 28: 1-2.

Ellen R 1984. *Ethnographic Research: A Guide to General Conduct*.ASA Research Methods in Social Anthropology.London: Academic Press.

Fine GA,Morrill C, Surianarain S 2008.Ethnography in organisation settings. In: D Buchanan, A Bryman (Eds.): *Handbook of Organizational Research Methods.* London: Sage: pp. 424-451.

Gellner D, Hirsch E (Eds.) 2001. *Inside Organizations: Anthropologists at Work*. Oxford England: Berg Publishers.

Giovannini M, Rosansky L 1990. Anthropology and Management Consulting: Forging a New Alliance. *Napa Bulletin* 9, American Anthropological Association. San Francisco,CA: University of California Press.

Humphreys M 2005. Getting personal: Reflexivity and auto-ethnographic vignettes. *Qualitative Inquiry,* 11(6): 840-860.

Jordan A (Ed.) 1994. *Anthropology in Corporate America: Consulting on Organizational Culture. Napa Bulletin* 14, American Anthropological Association. San Francisco: University of California Press.

Jordan A 2003. *Organizational Anthropology*. Long Grove, Illinois: Waveland Press.

Jordan B (Ed.) 2013. *Advancing Ethnography in Corporate Environments: Challenges and Emerging Opportunities*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Jordan B 2014. Notes on the state of Business Anthropology. *Journal of Business Anthropology*, 3(1): 126-131.

Kunda G 1992. *Engineering Culture: Control and Commitment in a High-Tech Corporation*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Moeran B 2005. *The Business of Ethnography: Strategic Exchanges, People and Organizations*. Oxford, England: Berg Publishers.

Moore F 2011a. Ambivalence, anthropology and business: A review of ethnographic research in international organisations. *Social Anthropology*, 19(4): 506–519.

Moore F 2011b. Holistic ethnography: Studying the impact of multiple national identities on post-acquisition organisations. *Journal of International Business Studies,* 42: 654-671.

O'Neill M 2001. Participation of observation? Some practical and ethical dilemmas. In: D Gellner, E Hirsch (Eds.): *Inside Organizations: Anthropologists at Work*. Oxford: Berg, pp. 221-230.

Orr J 1986. *Talking About Machines: An Ethnography of a Modern Job.* London: Cornell University Press.

Parker M 2000. *Organizational Culture and Identity: Unity and Division at Work.* London: Sage Publications.

Schwartzman H 1993. Ethnography in Organizations. *Qualitative Research Methods Series* 27. London: Sage Publications.

Smircich L 1983. Concepts of culture and organizational analysis. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28(3): 339-359.

Smits K 2013.*Cross Culture Work. Practices of collaboration in the Panama Canal Expansion Program.* Gildeprint Drukkerijen, Enschede.

Tian R, Van Marrewijk A H, Lillis M 2013. *General Business Anthropology*. 2nd Edition. Miami, FL: North American Business Press.

Treitler I 2014. Backyard ethnography: Defamiliarize the familiar to transform business. *International Journal of Business Anthropology*, 5(1): 26-37

Van den Ende L, Van Marrewijk AH. The ritualization of transitions in the project life cycle: A qualitative study of transition rituals in the transformative rituals in construction megaprojects. *International Journal of Project Management*, (In Press).

Van Maanen J, Barley S 1985.Cultural organization: Fragments of a theory. In: P Frost (Ed.): *Organizational Culture.* London: Sage Publications, pp. 31-53.

Van Maanen J 2001. Afterword: Natives 'R'Us: Some notes on the ethnography of organizations. In: David Gellner, Eric Hirsch (Eds.): *Inside Organizations: Anthropologists at Work*. Oxford, England: Berg Publishers, pp. 233-261.

Van Marrewijk A, Veenswijk M, Clegg S R 2010.Organizing reflexivity in designed change: The ethnoventionist approach. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 23(3): 212-229.

Van Marrewijk A, Veenswijk M, Clegg SR 2014. Changing collaborative practices through cultural interventions. *Building Research and Information*, 42(3): 330-342

Watson T 1994. *In Search of Management: Culture, Chaos and Control in Managerial Work*. London: International Thomson Business Press.

Watts-Englert J H, Szymanski M, Wall P, Sprague A. 2014. Collaboration for impact: Involving stakeholders in ethnographic research. *International Journal of Business Anthropology*, 5(1): 47-59.

Wright S 1994. *Anthropology of Organizations*. London: Routledge.

Yanow D, Schwartz-Shea P (Eds.) 2006. *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretative Turn*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Ybema S, Yanow D, Wels H, Kamsteeg F 2009. *Organizational Ethnography: Studying the Complexities of Everyday Life*. London: Sage.