2014

Collaboration between Management and Anthropology Researchers: Obstacles and Opportunities

Alex Stewart, *Marquette University*

Howard Aldrich, *University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill*

Perspectives

Collaboration between Management and Anthropology Researchers: Obstacles and Opportunities

Journal:	<i>Academy of Management Perspectives</i>
Manuscript ID:	AMP-2013-0161-A.R2
Document Type:	Article
Keywords:	Cultural anthropology < Theoretical Perspectives, Management History < Topic Areas, Ethnography < Qualitative Orientation < Research Methods

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Management scholarship is built on a foundation imported from older disciplines, particularly economics, psychology and sociology. Anthropology also once played an important role in the history of management thought, and currently includes many “practicing” anthropologists who work in the private sector. Yet it now has a demonstrably marginal influence. Why is this so? What is the potential for greater collaboration with anthropology? Pursuing these questions, we draw upon recent writings in applied, business, and practicing anthropology. On this basis, we identify eight properties of anthropology that affect the potential for collaboration. For each property, we consider the extent to which it presents obstacles for management scholars to work together with practicing anthropologists. We find that most impediments can be overcome, with patience and preparation, and offer suggestions for greater collaboration.

THE PUZZLE: A MARGINAL CONTRIBUTION

Management scholarship is an enterprise built on a foundation of more established disciplines (Bedeian, 2005; Pearce, 20087). In Campbell’s colorful term (2009, p. 331), it is a “hodgepodge” built upon the various other hodgepodes from which it both “imports” and “exports” knowledge. Three of its source disciplines - economics, psychology, and sociology - are particularly influential (Khurana 2007, p. 309; Landström, Harirchi & Åström, 2012; Pfeffer & Fong 2002). However, another older discipline, anthropology, plays a marginal role (Lockett & McWilliams, 2005, p. 141). This is puzzling. On the face of it, social and cultural anthropology should be contributing significantly, given that anthropologists once played an important role in the development of management thought (Morey & Luthans, 2013; Luthans et al., 2013). Moreover, they are currently enjoying a resurgence of employment as “practicing” (non-academic) anthropologists in the private sector (Nolan, 2013a).

Despite this history and recent developments, anthropology's influence in management pales beside its sister social sciences. How can we explain this puzzle? Would collaboration with anthropology be infeasible or fruitless? We identify eight characteristics of anthropological research that hold great promise for enriching the work of management scholars. We note that these characteristics also pose potential obstacles to greater collaboration, but that we believe they are not insurmountable. After reviewing the eight, we consider the possibilities for fruitful collaboration between anthropology and management, and we urge cooperative efforts for graduate education in business anthropology. We conclude by envisioning the benefits that each field could derive from deeper engagement.

The Resurgence of Business Anthropology

From the 1930s through 1950s in the United States, and into the 1980s in the UK, anthropologists played an active role in developing the emerging field of management. Anthropologists such as Len Sayles, Burleigh Gardner, W. Lloyd Warner, Conrad Arensberg, and Eliot Chapple made major contributions to the Hawthorne studies and to the development of the human relations school (A. Jordan, 2013, Chap. 2; Morey & Luthans, 2013). Several sociological field researchers, such as William Foote Whyte, also contributed to the empirical grounding of the field. Moreover, after a hiatus of several decades in the 1960s and 1970s, academically trained anthropologists are again finding employment in a wide range of positions in the private sector (Mitchell, 1998). Many anthropology graduates have sought work outside academia because of declining faculty positions (Baba, 2009; Nolan 2013b). Some of these "practicing" anthropologists work in the not-for-profit and public sectors (Strang, 2009), and thousands of trained anthropologists work for corporations (Welker, Partridge, & Hardin, 2011).

Some corporate employers are modest in size, such as small engineering firms (Collins,

2009) and advertising agencies (Malefyt, 2009). However, many anthropologists work in large firms such as Motorola (Metcalf, 2013), General Motors (Briody, Cavusgil & Miller, 2004), Intel (Bell, 2011) and Rolls Royce Aerospace (Baird, Moore & Jagodzinski, 2000; Collins, 2009). “Practicing anthropologists” (i.e. those working outside academia) also work in numerous consultancies that are draw on their anthropological skills (e.g. Practica Group, Ethnographic Insight, Segmedia, ReD, Weinman Schnee Morais, LTG Associates – the largest such firm; see Malefyt, 2009; Sunderland & Denny, 2007). Practicing anthropologists also have two annual meetings the Ethnographic Praxis in Industry Conference (EPIC), and an ethnography symposium co-hosted by University of Liverpool Management School.

Limited Impact in Management

Despite this efflorescence of business anthropology, its research has not diffused throughout management scholarship. The limited extent of its diffusion can be seen in the scarcity of Ph.D. anthropologists with faculty positions in business schools, and in the paucity of citations to anthropological articles in management journals. To document the limited business school market, we examined the doctoral disciplines of faculty in “top” business schools. We found 751 tenure track faculty members in management in the 44 schools that are listed in the “top 25” by either *Business Week*, *The Economist*, *Financial Times*, or *U.S. News*. Of these faculty members, about 60% obtained their doctorate in management; 16 % did so in psychology; 10 % in economics; and 7 % in sociology; but only 0.1% -- one person -- in anthropology.

A second indication of weak diffusion is the discrepancy in management journals between citations to anthropology journals and to other social science journals. We examined Web of Science citations in 23 management journals for the years 2010-2012, using the three

journals with the highest two year journal impact factors (JIFs) in 2012, making sure we achieved general purpose coverage in the case of Psychology, as well as coverage of cultural and social anthropology.ⁱ Comparisons across these journal must hold constant the likelihood of their being cited, for which reason we calculated the ratio of the total two year impact factors for anthropology journals relative to the other disciplinary journals. We found that if anthropology journals had been as cited as frequently as economics journals there would have been about 889 citations. The 70 actual citations to the anthropology journals were only about 8% of the expected figure. Most striking is the comparison with sociology. The anthropology journals were cited only about 3% as frequently as the sociology journals, holding impact factors constant.

Why is anthropological research cited so infrequently? One possible explanation is that such research seldom deals directly with management. For example, the four-volume *SAGE Handbook of Social Anthropology* (Fardon et al., 2012) has no chapters related to business, management, or entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship, which was relatively widely discussed in the anthropology of the 1960s and 1970s (Stewart, 1991), has attracted little anthropological interest in the last two decades (Rosa & Caulkins, 2013). The paucity of attention to entrepreneurship can be seen in the coding by the Web of Science of “topics” in 23 management and 17 anthropology journals. Whereas entrepreneurship is a topic in about 6% of the former, it is a topic in less than 1% of the latter. Similarly, anthropology journals pay much less attention to issues of leadership or finance. The contrast is most striking for the topic of “business,” as it appears about 44 times more frequently in management than in anthropology journals.

Of course it would be most peculiar if management journals did not pay more attention to management topics than anthropology journals. Perhaps the same applies to economics, psychology and sociology journals. Therefore, we compared the 17 most cited journals in these

fields for their attention to “business” as a topic.ⁱⁱ We found that these journals do indeed pay relatively more attention to business than do the anthropology journals. The topic is flagged 2.8 times more frequently in psychology, 3.4 times more frequently in sociology, and 5.7 times more frequently in economics journals. However, compared with its prevalence in management journals – about 22% of all articles – “business” appears in only about 1% of psychology articles, 2% of sociology articles, and 3% of economics articles. Other disciplines seen as contributing to management scholarship apparently need not overlap much with business in their topical concerns.

**EIGHT PROPERTIES OF ANTHROPOLOGICAL
SCHOLARSHIP: BENEFITS AND OBSTACLES**

To explore the possible reasons for anthropology’s surprisingly small impact, we draw on recent writings on applied anthropology and the emerging fields of business anthropology and practicing anthropology.ⁱⁱⁱ Scholars in these fields work on the boundary between management and anthropology and experience the benefits and challenges of an anthropological approach. On the basis of these readings, we identify eight properties of anthropological scholarship that might limit anthropology’s integration into management scholarship. These are: (i) expertise about the remote and exotic, (ii) sympathy for the remote and the less powerful, (iii) ethnography as a primary data source, (iv) challenges of fieldwork access, (v) lengthy fieldwork duration, (vi) a tendency to solo authorship, (vii) complex, contextualized findings, and (viii) a higher value placed on monographs than on journal articles. For each of these eight properties, we consider the extent to which they present obstacles for management scholars. Because we conclude that none of these are obdurate, we develop a proposal for greater collaboration between anthropology and management.

Expertise about the Remote and the Exotic

Anthropologists gravitate towards “tribal and nonurban societies” and pay less attention to “modern society” (J. W. Bennett, 1996, p. S23; also Buckley & Chapman, 1996). Consequently, even if they are favorably inclined towards business, they may lack business-specific expertise (Graffam 2010; Malefyt & Morais, 2012; Rosen, 1991). They can seem out of their element with business terminology, such as when Lien (1997, p. 202) referred to “added values” for “value added.” Nonetheless, anthropology’s history of studying diverse cultures across the globe has also resulted in expertise with application to many business contexts. One example is anthropological kinship theory, which has recently been applied in “family business” studies (Stewart 2010; 2014). Another benefit has been the development of knowledge of both particular cultures and of inter-cultural transactions and communication (Baba 2005; Malefyt & Morais 2012, Chap. 4; Strang 2009). This knowledge base becomes more valuable as managers are increasingly challenged to develop a “global mindset” (Story et al., 2014).

How intractable an obstacle is this? Anthropology certainly has expertise regarding small-scale and remote societies. In addition, we argue, anthropologists using ethnographic methods have documented many organizational practices in large-scale and contemporary societies at a fine-grained level, thus developing extensive expertise highly relevant to management theory and practice. Discovery-oriented fieldwork skills have allowed anthropologists to gain business expertise (Metcalf, 2013; Morais 2010) and practicing anthropologists who serve as internal consultants have gained extraordinary opportunities to learn about firm-specific matters, such as jargon, markets, and technologies (Metcalf 2013; Mitchell 1998, Chap. 3). Even academic anthropologists may spend enough time in fieldwork to gain an understanding of practical matters and even make contributions to the businesses they are

1
2
3 studying. For example, Moeran contributed to advertising campaigns in a Japanese agency, even
4
5 to the extent of creating new tag lines for their clients (2006, pp. 7, 38, 117). Collins (2009) was
6
7 able to help a small engineering firm save on training costs.
8
9

10 When anthropological fieldwork *works*, discoveries follow. We see this potential at the
11
12 micro level of individual ethnographies. For example, Riles (2011, pp. 239-240) was able to
13
14 repeatedly witness “the failures of the [global asset swap] network, the points of nonfit,
15
16 miscommunication, dislocation, and nonportability.” Based on her observations, Riles developed
17
18 her concept of “the placeholder,” an assertion of a legal fiction placing in abeyance the
19
20 ambiguities of property claims that cross the boundaries of national legal systems and moments
21
22 in time, within a trading context predicated on a precise but impossible equality of valuations
23
24 (2010, p. 803). We also see this potential at the macro level in sociological studies of “the
25
26 population of organizational ethnographies,” which is Hodson’s (2004b) term for a dataset he
27
28 created from more than 100 ethnographic studies. Using that dataset, he unearthed a variety of
29
30 statistically significant relationships on matters including worker participation, organizational
31
32 citizenship behavior, and gender (Hodson, 2002; 2004a; 2004b; 2005). In another example,
33
34 Blomberg and Karasti (2013) surveyed a quarter century of ethnographic research in computer
35
36 supported cooperative work and adduced seven important concepts such as *situated action* that
37
38 emerged from these studies.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 As examples of relevant anthropological studies, we examined two different sets of
47
48 scholarly books. The first book series is the decades-long study of the Otavalo entrepreneurs of
49
50 Ecuador and their involvement in the global economy (Collier & Buitrón, 1949; Colloredo-
51
52 Mansfield, 1999; 2009; Colloredo-Mansfield & Antrosio, 2009; D’Amico, 2011; 2012; Meisch,
53
54 2002; Parsons, 1945; Rowe, Miller & Meisch, 2007). In the Otavalo case, Meisch (2002, p. 15)
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 taught “textile techniques”; Colloredo-Mansfield and Antrosio (2009, p. 155) developed
4
5 “constructive ways of defending cultural-economic boundaries” and protecting indigenous
6
7 intellectual property and livelihoods. In another Otavalo example, Rowe (2007) included a 97-
8
9 item glossary on textiles, with seven distinct variants of the root term “warp.”
10
11

12
13 The second book series comprises ten anthropological studies of management in financial
14
15 service organizations (Hertz, 1998; Ho, 2009; Hughes, 2012; Johns, 2012; Lépinay, 2011;
16
17 Miyazaki, 2013; Preda, 2012; Riles, 2010; 2011; Zaloom, 2006). In the study of modern global
18
19 enterprise, some anthropologists gained genuine expertise. For example, Riles (2011) made
20
21 subtle legal arguments about Japanese civil law regarding swap collateral in global financial
22
23 markets. Other legal and financial experts have endorsed her “interesting and difficult
24
25 interpretation[s]” (Hughes 2012, p. 205). Preda (2012, p. 447) referred to her “deep knowledge
26
27 of both the theoretical legal issues and her particular field (see also Johns 2012). In another
28
29 example, Lépinay’s study of a major French bank demonstrated how the bank’s “financial
30
31 practices,” new products, organizational design, and tension between exploration and
32
33 exploitation, led to “a self-defeating form of innovation whereby a bank’s organization
34
35 undermines its financial practices...” and vice versa (2011, p. ix). Moreover, as Riles (2013, p.
36
37 558) observed, the 2008 financial crisis precipitated “a new market for sociological and
38
39 anthropological techniques for making sense of markets as cultural spaces.” On balance, then, a
40
41 perception of anthropology as relevant only for explaining the exotic and remote is a problem of
42
43 perceptions, not reflecting the current state of the field or its history (Greenwood in Luthans et
44
45 al., 2013).
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 **Sympathy for the Less Wealthy and Powerful**
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Anthropologists tend to align themselves with the interests of the people they study, regardless of their power. Accordingly, they have often become advocates for their research subjects, many of whom are small-scale entrepreneurs. In these cases, advocacy is consistent with sympathy for the less powerful. Early examples among the studies of Otavalo entrepreneurs include Parson’s (1945, p. 9) allusion to a “tight squeeze on Indian lands” and Collier and Buitrón’s distaste for “injustices to the Indian (1949, p. 2; also 196). Similarly, Meisch (2002, p. 90) worked to support for a “strong indigenous rights movement” and Colloredo-Mansfield and Antrosio’s (2009, p. 152) made efforts to develop “a more defensible niche in the global economy” for Andean producers. However, a similar empathy with the people studied can also be found among anthropologists in larger corporations. Moeran studied a major Japanese advertising agency, developing “a fierce loyalty to the Agency in which I was permitted to conduct my research – a loyalty which grew over the months during which I studied there” (1996, p. xi).

Anthropologists often identify with the people being observed and thus they may be reluctant to share potentially sensitive or embarrassing information they have discovered. Businesses are also field sites where those who are studied will read – or perhaps just hear rumors about – what has been written about them (Davis, 1996). As a result, ethnographers become inclined to self-censor any locally sensitive findings (Alvesson, 2013). As Fine and Shulman (2013) argued about organizational ethnography, ethical and methodological compromises are inevitable. Good fieldworkers often uncover everyday practices that firms wish to keep private. But to gain observational access and to deflect any suspicions about partisanship and motivations among the people being studied, ethnographer often poses as sympathetic, friendly and innocuous. Fearing a rupture in the relationships with people in the field,

1
2
3 ethnographers can withhold information from publication or delay publishing results until many
4
5 years have elapsed.
6
7

8 **How intractable an obstacle is this?** Does empathy with the interests of the people they
9
10 study, who include the less wealthy and less powerful, mean that anthropologists are
11
12 ideologically out of step with scholars in management? In our review of journal articles, we
13
14 observed that anthropology articles mentioned “colonialism” nearly 16 times as often as
15
16 management journals and “racism” nearly 5 times as often. We are not surprised, given the self-
17
18 consciousness of the discipline about its ambivalent historical connection with colonial
19
20 administrations (Baba, 2009; Comaroff, 2010; Low & Merry, 2010). Moreover, an anti-business
21
22 bias within academic anthropology has been widely noted (McCracken, 2013; Moeran & Garsten
23
24 2012, 9; Schwartzman, 1993, pp. 28-31; Sunderland & Denny, 2007, pp. 28-32, 322). For
25
26 example, Hickel and Khan (2012, p. 210) criticized “the violent inequalities of neoliberal
27
28 capitalism.” Neoliberalism is widely associated in anthropological writings with baleful effects,
29
30 largely on the poor and the culturally distinctive, but also on ourselves; that is, on scholarly life
31
32 in general and anthropology in particular (Carrier, 2012).
33
34
35
36
37

38 Thus, a left-leaning ideology might stand in the way of greater collaboration with
39
40 anthropologists. However, a similar sentiment can be found among management scholars, such
41
42 as in a paper with the provocative title of “The private military industry and neoliberal
43
44 imperialism: Mapping the terrain” (Godfrey, Brewis, Grady & Grocott, 2014). This article was,
45
46 in fact, authored by *management* scholars, and published in a journal called *Organization*, edited
47
48 by management scholars. The journal is informally linked with the Critical Management Studies
49
50 (CMS) division of the Academy of Management^{iv}, which “serves as a forum for the expression
51
52 of views critical of established management practices and the established social order. Our
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

premise is that structural features of contemporary society, such as the profit imperative, patriarchy, racial inequality, and ecological irresponsibility often turn organizations into instruments of domination and exploitation.” (CMS domain statement, 2014).

Unlike these critical management scholars, much anthropological work that focuses on business, such as the Otavalo studies (Meisch 2002), is favorable towards entrepreneurship, markets, and business. As a result, we see prospects for collaboration, centering on topics of mutual interest for which anthropology has much to offer and that resonate with the more activist management professors. Two such examples are poverty and environmental sustainability. In our examination of journal articles, we observed that the Web of Science topic of “sustainability” is more widespread in management than in anthropology. However, “conservation” and “ecology” (referring to the natural environment) are more widespread in anthropology. Therefore, sustainability may be a fruitful topic for greater integration of anthropological research in management.

Studies of poverty are common in anthropology and are often discussed in both disciplines with reference to “base of the pyramid” entrepreneurs (e.g. Hall, Matos, Sheehan & Silvestre 2012; Dolan, 2012). For example, some management scholars have argued that “weak institutions coupled with alert entrepreneurs encourage destructive outcomes, especially if entrepreneurship policies are based solely on economic indicators” (Hall et al., 2012, p. 785). Management and anthropology are both broadly interested in the topic of “culture,” with anthropology having generated a larger body of work, especially if we include scholarly books. Management has shown much greater interest in “innovation,” a topic of importance for base of the pyramid entrepreneurs (Hall et al. 2012) and for scholars interested in environmental sustainability (Bansal et al. 2012).

Ethnography as a Primary Data Source

Ethnographic fieldwork is the predominant source of anthropological data. The traditional doctoral initiation into professional anthropology was an original ethnographic study of a poorly understood, often far-off, conjunction of “peoples-and-places” (in Marcus’ term, 2009, p. 34; Blomberg & Karasti, 2013). Thrust literally into “the field,” the researcher’s “Malinowskian” solution was long-term participant observation with the solo scholar as the research instrument (Marcus, 2009; Stewart, 1998; Wax, 1972). We observed this in our review of Web of Science topics regarding methodology. The most listed topic in the anthropology journals is “ethnography,” whereas it is “model(s)” followed by “survey(s)” in the management journals. Similarly, “fieldwork” and “participant observation” are much more commonly listed in anthropology than in management journals. “Ethnography” is mentioned eight times more frequently in anthropology than in management journals

How intractable an obstacle is this? Ethnography is a toolbox containing many methods that would be expected, such as oral histories, ethnographic interviews, visual methods, focus groups, and rapid appraisal (Bernard, 2011). In addition, practicing and academic anthropologists have made forays into agent based modeling (Agar, 2004) and have discovered innovative methods for recognizing patterns in Internet “Big Data” (Kozinets, 2013; Maxwell, 2013). For decades, anthropologists have made greater use of visual methods than management scholars (for classic examples, Bateson & Mead, 1942; Doty, Mudge, & Benally, 2002), such as in the Otavalo studies, which include 588 photos or drawings, plus 14 maps and 22 numerical figures. Ethnography also incorporates quantitative methods, such as cross-cultural research using statistical approaches (Ember & Ember, 2009), social network analysis (White and

Johansen, 2006), and surveys (Colloredo-Mansfield, 1999; Colloredo-Mansfield & Antrosio, 2009).

Ethnographies conducted by business anthropologists encompass multiple terrains; not just ceremonies and relationships in companies (Connolly, 2011), but also industry clusters (Yanagisako, 2002), individuals (including auto-ethnography, McClendon, 2011), local-global relationships (Meisch 2002), and material culture (B. Jordan & Lambert, 2009). This variety of methods and of units of observation reflects the flexibility and inventiveness of practicing and other business anthropologists (Marcus, and Morais, both in Arnould et al., 2012). As Agar (2010, p. 288) has observed, business anthropology is a “blurred genre.” We expect to find cross-disciplinary collaboration (Jordan & Caulkins, 2013; Strang, 2009, pp. 37, 126, 158). Moreover, methodological eclecticism, which dates from the earliest anthropological work in business, is widely observed in applied anthropology (Morey & Luthans, 2013; A. Jordan, 2013, Chap. 2; Sunderland & Denny, 2007, Chaps. 9-10; Trotter & Schensul, 1998).

We compared method topics in 17 anthropology journals with those in *Human Organization*, the scholarly journal of the Society for Applied Anthropology (and the only applied journal among the 17).^v *Human Organization* is generally more methodologically sophisticated and more detailed in reporting on research methods than anthropology journals as a whole. Classic anthropological topics such as ethnography, fieldwork, and participant observation were noted about twice to three and a half times more frequently. The “qualitative methods” -- a term scarcely used in anthropology -- that are common in management such as interviews, grounded theory, and qualitative method or research, were much more common in *Human Organization*. Finally, the methods more associated with management -- experiments, models, social networks, and surveys -- were at least three times as likely in *Human*

1
2
3 *Organization* as in the other anthropology journals.^{vi} Surveys were mentioned almost as often as
4
5 in management, and social networks even more so. Given their substantial methodological
6
7 eclecticism, we see great potential for more collaboration between applied and business
8
9 anthropologists and management scholars.
10
11

12 **Problematic Access to Field Sites**

13
14
15 Participant observations in the field are only possible once an ethnographer has gained
16
17 access to field sites. Access to a field site is not a one-time event, but must continually be
18
19 renegotiated, especially in corporate settings (B. Jordan & Lambert, 2009). Only through
20
21 repeated behind-the-scenes observations can anthropologists peer behind the facades that all
22
23 organizations present to the outside world. As Riles (2011, p. 13) noted in her study of financial
24
25 firms, “actors are guarded... and are quite skilled at producing stylized and glossy accounts of
26
27 their activities for outside consumption” (see also Moeran, 2006, pp. 117-118; 2009).
28
29

30
31 Anthropologists are mostly non-participant observers. True participant observation inside
32
33 business firms is rather rare; Moeran (1996), Lépinay (2011), and Zaloom (2006) are among the
34
35 exceptions. Gaining access to relevant field sites is thus a serious issue for contemporary
36
37 practicing anthropologists, but we believe they have developed ways to deal with the issue.
38
39

40
41 **How intractable an obstacle is this?** Opportunities for access differ by industry. Culture
42
43 industries and management consulting both appear difficult to access (Prough, 2011; Smith,
44
45 2013), as are “family firms,” with their dual facades of firm and kin group (Stewart, 2014). By
46
47 contrast, the Chinese fashion industry proved receptive for Zhou (2013), as did the Shanghai
48
49 stock market in its early days for Hertz (1998). Most cases of successful and lasting access stem
50
51 from opportunism, luck, and pre-existing networks, whether personal or professional (Maurer &
52
53 Mainwaring, 2012; Smith, 2013; Zaloom, 2006). Business anthropologists have had great
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 success in conducting observations at the level of industry clusters and networks, as Ho (2009)
4
5 did with Wall Street traders, Prough (2011) did with the shōjo manga industry, and Yanagisako
6
7 (2002) did with the Italian silk industry. We think that management scholars could learn a great
8
9 deal by studying how these ethnographers obtained access to field sites.
10
11

12
13 **The Lengthy Duration of Ethnographic Research**
14

15 Norms for ethnographic fieldwork in anthropology are set at the Ph.D. dissertation stage.
16
17 According to Howell (2011) and Marcus (2009), within the last generation the expected duration
18
19 of field studies has declined from about 18 to 12 months. Despite this decline, anthropologists
20
21 face a daunting challenge, considering that they will have amassed large amounts of data that
22
23 need to be analyzed. In management journals, each informant has often been interviewed only
24
25 once in a “semi-structured” exchange lasting about an hour. By contrast, ethnographic interviews
26
27 are “open-ended” and longer lasting, with ethnographers returning to the same informants again
28
29 and again (Spradley, 1979; an exemplar of this approach is Lane, 2011).
30
31
32
33

34 Norms in anthropology dictate that ethnographers spend a great deal of time in their
35
36 ethnographic work, which Stewart (1998, p. 57) described as “a dogged quest” for insights. In
37
38 this effort, fieldworkers pursue an often-bewildering set of clues, often finding that early
39
40 interpretations were premature and possibly misguided (Butler, 2013, Moeran, 2009).
41
42
43 Anthropologists believe that the process of discovery cannot be rushed (Stewart, 1998, pp. 20-
44
45 21). Thus, many anthropologists spend exceptionally long periods in the same site over their
46
47 careers. Among the Otavalo studies, Meisch (2002) spent over three decades on site; Colloredo-
48
49 Mansfield spent 15 years by the time of his 2009 book, and 17 months over six years in his
50
51 (2009) article with Antrosio. Among the social studies of finance scholars, the times spent are
52
53 shorter but still rather intimidating by management standards. Lépinay (2011) spent 18 months;
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Riles (2010; 2011) spent 17 months in a legal back office, with other visits over seven years;
4
5 Miyazaki (2013) was in the field for 13 years. Clearly, anthropologists are taking a risk that their
6
7 substantial investments of time may lead to only inconsequential discoveries. However, such
8
9 investments are obligatory in research that is truly ethnographic.
10
11

12 **How intractable an obstacle is this?** Scholars doing ethnographic work confront more
13
14 daunting issues of access to field sites than many management researchers. Although not
15
16 insurmountable, the requirement that fieldworkers spend many years in the field, observing
17
18 ongoing processes while collecting massive amounts of field data, limits the number of studies
19
20 anthropologists may do in their lifetime. It also means that anthropologists, after completing their
21
22 dissertation fieldwork, can often be reluctant to do fieldwork “in its traditional form” at the same
23
24 scale and complexity, after they take a regular job (Marcus, 2009, p. 8). In addition, practicing
25
26 anthropologists often find that managers are reluctant to accommodate projects lasting more than
27
28 two to four weeks (Mitchell, 1998, Chap. 2; Moeran, 2009; Sunderland & Denny, 2007, p. 33).
29
30
31

32 Faced with these temporal constraints, field workers have at their disposal two solutions.
33
34 The first is to conduct ethnographic fieldwork for only a few months. Compared with the
35
36 “Malinowskian” anthropologist faced with an unfamiliar language and culture (Marcus, 2009),
37
38 those doing research in business firms can start to make sense of their surroundings sooner. This
39
40 solution is especially likely to be fruitful in cases of “insider-outsider” research of the sort
41
42 proposed by Louis and Bartunek (1992). For example research for the classic organizational
43
44 ethnography, *Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy*, included collaboration between Gouldner, a
45
46 sociologist, and a student who had worked for a summer at the site (Gouldner, 1954). In a
47
48 management example, Salvato and Corbetta (2013) utilized the second author’s prior consulting
49
50 work with two of the four firms that they studied.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

The second solution is to use shorter-term field methods known as either “rapid appraisal” or “rapid assessment” (“RA” for short). As the range of names suggests, RA is a “diverse set of practices” (Cornwall & Pratt, 2011, p. 264). RA follows broad principles, such as an iterative process with close attention to the native’s point of view (in Geertz’s 1974 and Malinowski’s 1922 term; R. Chambers, 1994; Mueller et al., 2010). Anthropology was only one of several disciplinary influences in RA (R. Chambers, 1994), but core anthropological values are central to its practice. These include the recognition that even “rapid” research can be sped up only so much (Carruthers & Chambers, 1981; Beebe, 1995). Although anthropology’s impact has declined in RA, it continues to play a role in anthropological method (as in the fifth edition of *Research Methods in Anthropology* (Bernard, 2011, pp. 57, 264-265). Currently, RA is virtually absent in management but used fairly frequently in anthropology. It is more widespread in practice than its representation in journal articles would lead one to expect, according to Rowa-Dewar et al., 2008). Presumably this is because it remains much more common in applied than in academic anthropology.

As evidence accumulates for the value of extended ethnographic investigations, we believe the prospects for greater collaboration between business anthropologists and management scholars will increase. We note, for example, that Rynes, McNatt and Bretz (1999), in their analysis of management and psychology articles, offered empirical support for the benefits of extensive time in the field. They found a significant positive relationship between time spent in the research site and the implementation of the researchers’ recommendations by the “nonacademic” organizations they studied. They also found a significant positive relationship between citations to articles and the authors’ time spent at the site. Therefore, the seeds planted by long-term research may be reaped in the form of impact on practice and recognition by other

management scholars. Examples of long-term ethnographies in business corporations include Moeran (1996), who was accepted for a year in a major Japanese firm, and Intel's acceptance of visiting researchers for a yearlong project (Maurer & Mainwaring, 2012).

A Tendency to Solo Authorship

Management scholars increasingly tend to conduct their research in teams (Aldrich, 2012), paralleling a trend in other disciplines (Wuchty, Jones & Uzzi, 2007). Co-authored works are increasingly the norm in the social sciences and garner a disproportionate share of all citations in the literature. By contrast, anthropologists have tended to conduct research on their own. For example, if we compare the two most cited empirically oriented management and cultural anthropology journals (*Journal of Management* and *Academy of Management Journal*; *Cultural Anthropology* and *American Ethnologist*) for 2013, the mean number of authors per paper is 2.96 in management and 1.03 in anthropology. Academic anthropologists also tend to publish sole-authored books; over 80% of the ethnographic monographs in our references are sole-authored. As graduate students, anthropologists absorb the lesson that working solo is the most effective way to do their research. Their dissertations are almost always original ethnographies, rather than based on secondary data collected by others (Marcus, 2009). For these works, solo authorship is almost inevitable. Having even one fieldworker function as a long-term participant observer is difficult and intrusive enough for the people studied; having teams of anthropologists is generally infeasible.

How intractable an obstacle is this? After graduate school, applied anthropologists are more inclined to undertake co-authorships as they encounter the multiple demands of managing their careers. In 2013 the mean number of authors per article is 2.41 for *Annals of Anthropological Practice*, *Human Organization* (the journal of the Society for Applied

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Anthropology), and *Journal of Business Anthropology*. Some anthropologists also are adept at publishing works that Van Maanen (2011, pp. 136-138) called “jointly told tales,” referring to academics who write with their informants. Two such expressly co-authored examples are the books by Moisés (a Yaqui Indian), Kelley and Holden (1971) and by Bernard and Salinas Pedraza (a “Mexican Indian”) (1989). Another example, from the Otavalo studies, is Collier and Buitrón (1949), as Buitrón was “an Ecuadorian anthropologist” (D’Amico 2011, p. 62). More common than co-authorships, however, are implicit collaborations between scholars and their “key informants” (Spradley 1979), with ethnographies written in a spirit of teamwork with informants (Marcus, 2009).

When clients hire practicing anthropologists, they often demand collaboration with practitioners (A. Jordan, 2013), which can lead to more pragmatically useful outcomes (Down & Hughes, 2009; Graffam, 2010). Collaboration is extensive, often extending throughout the research process, from the “intellectual impetus” through joint field observations to interpreting the data (Sunderland & Denny 2007, p. 139). It incorporates not only managers but also specialists from other disciplines in team-based research (E. Chambers 2009; Clarke 2013). Such cross-disciplinary collaboration is well suited to applied research, because business dilemmas are seldom resolvable based on only one method. The issues that managers face end to be multidimensional, often calling for multiple modes of specific expertise, such as ethno-pharmaceuticals and functional food (Sankaran & Mouly, 2007), which are types of service innovations (Rubalcaba et al., 2012).

Too Much Complexity and Too Many Contextual Details

Anthropologists write reports of their research that are complex, laden with context – specific details, and potentially difficult for non-specialists to understand. Accordingly, we are

led to ask, how amenable are fieldwork findings for use by management scholars? For example, Riles's (2011) "placeholder" concept -- the idea of accepting a proffered bit of knowledge as simply a tentative conclusion until more research has been conducted -- has been well received and provides an orienting point from which further research can be explored. However, anthropologists often have difficulty expressing their findings in simple terms or unpretentious language (Eriksen, 2006). Ethnographic work often provides the basic parameters for modelers, such as Joy's (1967) matrix model of Barth's (1967) work on entrepreneurship. Nonetheless, compared to standard empirical work by economists, anthropologists shy away from model building. Anthropologists prefer depictions of idiosyncratic social processes to models of predicted or indeed predictable outcomes (Ray, 2006; Buckley & Chapman, 1996). Their taste for the complex often renders their work unappealing to decision makers looking for timely advice (Clarke, 2013).

For anthropologists, any delineation of a "context" is inherently comparative, and they tend to use points of comparison that are empirically and historically grounded. Anthropologists make claims such as "to understand this situation you have to see that it is an example of X," where "X" can be an industry, a technical problem in operations, a form of social network, or any of a great many other possibilities. The comparison cases are chosen based upon theories that a researcher thinks are most theoretically appropriate, as Comaroff (2010) has argued, choosing either a *cross cultural* or *holistic* framework within which to make the comparison. Richards (1950) provided a classic cross-cultural example in her presentation of the "matrilineal puzzle" in kinship theory. Richards began by making contrasts between her fieldwork setting, the "Central Bantu," and nearby "Bantu peoples" and by also making comparisons with "types" of family structure. The other mode of comparison is to take a "holistic" approach (A. Jordan, 2013,

Chap. 9), paying attention to myriad sectors or structures in social life and the connections among them. For example, an anthropologist might examine the relationships among cultural norms regarding appropriate marital partners, post-marital residence, descent, and political authority (Richards, 1950).^{vii}

How intractable an obstacle is this? In writing for management scholars, anthropologists face the challenge of showing that their comparisons are appropriate and revealing. For example, Strang (2009, p. 114) reports on a business anthropologist who was better prepared to understand “people’s difficulties in dealing with incomprehensible technology systems” in a high-tech firm based on his prior work with Ecuadoran shrimpers’ puzzlement with “top-down regulations.” By convincing management researchers to take a second look at something that at first glance seems self-evident, anthropologists call attention to a wider range of potential interpretations of a phenomenon. For example, Moeran (1996) was able to explain key dilemmas in Japanese advertising firms by comparing those firms with other business models.

Many anthropological comparisons are of this sort: they compare across countries or geographic areas (e.g. Colloredo-Mansfield 1999). If the authors are practicing anthropologists, they are able to make meaningful comparisons across industries and sectors (Malefyt & Morais, 2012). The business anthropologists’ challenge, then, is to draw upon their repertoire of context-specifying comparisons so as to generate insights that resonate with managers. In Geertz’s terms, the challenge is to move beyond experience near and (seemingly esoteric) experience far comparisons to a statement about “social life” that makes sense to non-anthropologists.

Articles or Scholarly Books as a Preferred Mode of Publication?

Anthropologists are inclined to report their research in books, rather than journal articles,

1
2
3 because complex and contextualized findings are most aptly conveyed with book length
4
5 publications (Rosen, 1991; Ward et al., 2009). In the humanities and cultural anthropology,
6
7 scholarly books have been a requirement for tenure within research universities (Cronin & La
8
9 Barre, 2004; Estabrook & Warner, 2003). Book publication has also been a requirement for a
10
11 good tenure-track position following post-doctoral research (Marcus, 2009). To demonstrate, we
12
13 compared the records of 24 management and 26 anthropology scholars in Duke University and
14
15 the University of Oxford, two universities with top-ranked anthropology and business school
16
17 faculties.^{viii} As fractions of their scholarly output, these anthropologists produced half (0.51) as
18
19 many journal articles as business school professors. They produced only one third (1.33) more
20
21 book chapters, but four times (4.26) as many scholarly books. They also produced nearly three
22
23 times (2.69) as many varied other works, ranging from book reviews and commentaries to
24
25 curated exhibits and ethnographic films.
26
27
28
29
30

31
32 With the trend toward increasing quantification of scholarly production in management
33
34 departments, scholarly books are rarely considered (Cotton & Stewart, 2013). Because
35
36 ethnographic monographs are less valued but take longer to produce than most management
37
38 articles, anthropologists are at a disadvantage. Thus, if management departments are to recruit,
39
40 promote and tenure anthropologists within their ranks, they will need to change their routines.
41
42 For example, job postings in management typically demand publication in the leading journals.
43
44 We cannot recall expectations for publishing scholarly books, let alone ethnographic films!
45
46
47

48 **How intractable an obstacle is this?** Should a management department wish to hire an
49
50 anthropologist, it would confront the problem of assessing “merit” for promotion and tenure. A
51
52 possible solution could be for anthropologists to focus on publishing a series of journal articles,
53
54 rather than a single monograph reporting the research findings. Disciplinary traditions die hard,
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

however, and it is difficult to imagine papers by anthropologists receiving the same reception in management journals as they do in anthropology journals. As Mudambi, Hannigan and Kline (2012) have observed, journal reviewers perceive manuscripts through the lenses of their doctoral disciplines and clearly there are few anthropologists among the editorial boards in management. The tradition of publishing research in monographs rather than journal articles works against anthropologists gaining a stronger hearing in management and organization theory departments.

There are grounds for optimism. Peer-reviewed publications can generate credibility for practicing anthropologists in some firms, particularly in high technology (Metcalf, 2013). Furthermore, Grant McCracken (2013), a practicing anthropologist, has published widely in the scholarly literature. He explains his success by arguing that his fieldwork uncovers much more data than his clients care about. For other sanguine views, see Morais (2012) and Sherry (1995). Anthropologists certainly do publish articles. In fact, some of their articles (and book chapters) are widely cited. Moreover, changes may be afoot, with a decreasing emphasis on books and growing stress on articles.^{ix}

POINTS OF TANGENCY BETWEEN ANTHROPOLOGY AND MANAGEMENT

In this concluding section, we offer some thoughts on recent developments in graduate education in anthropology, consider what anthropology might gain from closer collaboration with management scholars, and finally, speculate on what management scholars might gain from closer collaboration with anthropologists.

An Infrastructure for Education in Business Anthropology

We have reviewed eight properties of anthropological research that pose potential problems for anthropologists wishing to work with management scholars and make greater

1
2
3 contributions to management studies. Although some practices and traditions do pose problems
4
5 for collaborative work between anthropologists and management scholars, we found many
6
7 reasons to be optimistic. For example, we have been encouraged by indications of receptivity to
8
9 anthropological work in business schools. We can point to the field of marketing, in which
10
11 scholars such as Eric Arnould, Russ Belk, and John Sherry have made prominent contributions.
12
13 In a few major management departments, we find thriving ethnographers, trained in business
14
15 schools, such as John Van Maanen and his former Ph.D. students Steve Barley, Deborah
16
17 Dougherty and Leslie Perlow. Moreover, several ethnographies on management have been
18
19 widely cited. Examples include Kunda (2006), with 690 Web of Science citations, Barley (1986),
20
21 with 699, and Dougherty (1992), with 685.
22
23
24
25
26

27 Within anthropology departments, we see other hopeful signs. Within anthropology's
28
29 scholarly associations, "attention to practice" is on the upswing (L. A. Bennett & Fiske, 2013, p.
30
31 314). Anthropology departments, too, increasingly recognize the need to prepare their graduates
32
33 for careers outside the academy. External threats to the funding of anthropology departments, as
34
35 reflected in "prioritization exercises" (Dehaas, 2014; Dickeson, 2010) might also prompt
36
37 accommodations with the labor market prospects of their graduates. Moreover, incoming
38
39 doctoral students increasingly tend to have practitioner backgrounds, often in NGOs, and they
40
41 expect to have engaged careers (Marcus, 2009). Not surprisingly, then, another hopeful sign is
42
43 the growth of graduate programs in applied anthropology (L. A. Bennett & Fiske, 2013).
44
45 Programs with a track specifically in *business* anthropology include the University of Aberdeen,
46
47 the University of Colorado at Boulder, the University of Copenhagen, the University of
48
49 Memphis, the University of North Texas, Northern Arizona University, Oregon State University,
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

San Jose State University, Swinburne University of Technology, University College London, and Wayne State University.

Equally encouraging is the recent spate of works on practicing and business anthropology (Caulkins & Jordan, 2013; Cefkin, 2009; Denny & Sunderland, 2014; Field & Fox, 2007; A. Jordan, 2013; B. Jordan, 2013; Ladner, 2014; Malefyt & Morais, 2012; Moeran, 1996; 2006; Nolan, 2013a, b; Sunderland & Denny, 2007; Tian, Zhou, & van Marrewijk, A., 2011; Ybema, Yanow, Wels & Kamsteeg, 2009). These books provide materials for graduate study. Many provide insights and advice based on practice in the private sector, such as Ladner’s chapter on “managing a private-sector ethnography project” (2014, Chap. 3).

Anthropology has a need of greater knowhow in business fields, such as product development (Graffman in Briody, 2013) and management clearly needs field-based studies of how things work in organizations (Watson 2011). We therefore concur with Malefyt and Morais (2012) in their suggestion for establishing joint MA/MBA and Ph.D./MBA degrees for training future business anthropologists. At present, many anthropologists of business developed their business or legal proficiency prior to becoming anthropologists (e.g. Collins (2009), Lépinay (2011), Riles (2010), Rencher, 2014), van Marrewijk (2011) and presumably others). However, the field cannot count on such serendipity. Most anthropologists would need further training in a specifically *business* anthropology (L. A. Bennett & Fiske, 2013).

Moreover, unlike joint scholarly associations, which have proven fragile, joint graduate programs across the university have many precedents, and are administratively feasible. However, these programs would be better supported with an infrastructure beyond the business school and the anthropology departments. At the university level, “institutes” or “centers” (depending on the local terminology for cross-campus initiatives) could coordinate regarding

1
2
3 student advising, grant and other fund raising, visiting scholars, small conferences, and so on.
4
5
6 Institutes could enable linkages with other departments with expertise complementing that in
7
8 business anthropology, such as product and industrial design (Baird, Moore, & Jagodzinski,
9
10 2000; Graffam, 2010; Metcalf, 2013).
11

12
13 Beyond the university level, further support could be derived from consortia of institutes.
14
15 These could parallel or partner with “the Consortium of Practicing and Applied Anthropology
16
17 Programs” (COPAP). The current roster of departmental members is 31, all in the United States:
18
19 http://www.copaa.info/programs_in_aa/list.htm). These programs have developed shared
20
21 expertise in, for example, “internships [and] class projects... integrating theory with problem-
22
23 solving... [with mentoring] by professors, adjuncts, alumni, practitioners [and other] students”
24
25 (Briody & Nolan, 2013, p. 374). Cross-campus collaborations and the broader infrastructure can
26
27 only be created and sustained with the efforts of organizational entrepreneurs in each of the
28
29 disciplines. This in turn could only come about when champions in each field foresee important
30
31 opportunities.
32
33
34
35

36 37 **What Can Anthropology Gain from Management?**

38
39 Negotiating continuing access and lengthy participation is a learned skill, but we suspect
40
41 that management scholars may well have an advantage because of their business school training
42
43 and capacity to fulfill clearly productive roles. Students in business anthropology can also benefit
44
45 from the expertise found uniquely in business schools, ranging from the simple, such as
46
47 deciphering jargon, to the complex, such as interpreting financial statements. Creating
48
49 connections with business schools could open the door to more ready access to business field
50
51 sites for business anthropologists. With business expertise, true participant observation in
52
53 management becomes much more feasible, as participation makes possible a deep understanding
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

that uses all of one’s senses (Moeran, 2014). Ethnographers might also seek to gain “clinical” skills commensurate with the unpredictable effects of their fieldwork-as-intervention, as Schein has argued (in Luthans et al., 2013, p. 100). Further, anthropologists might learn from business schools how better to sell their ideas to wider publics (Rencher, 2014).

Coordination between academic and practicing anthropology. For the future of anthropology itself, another benefit that could follow is a realignment in favor of the “scientific” and applied fields and away from the “humanistic” and the cloistered. Although the tide may be turning, for much of the later twentieth century anthropology had been moving in the opposite direction of universities overall: towards the humanities and away from application. For this reason and others, Frank and Gabler (2006, p. 136) argued, anthropology “is among the weakest of the social science fields... [and] marginal in the university.” We suggest that one reason for this perilous state is an attitude of skepticism about the application of scholarship. For example, Nolan (2013a, p. 5), a senior anthropologist, wrote that much of what practicing anthropology has learned “has been studiously ignored by the academy.” Even within the field of applied anthropology, Morais (2012, p. 276) claims that business anthropology is “marginalized” on account of its “engage[ment with] commerce” and apparent failure to help “to repair the world” as compared with most efforts at engagement (summarized by Low & Merry, 2010).

If applied and business anthropology are to make further inroads in academic anthropology, they would help their cause if they increased their scholarly credibility. Such precisely is the prescription offered by Moeran and Garsten in their editors’ introduction to the inaugural issue of the *Journal of Business Anthropology*. They called for “the development of theory” by business anthropologists, for “more, not less, intellectual rigor than academic anthropology” (2012, p. 9). As Denny (2013) and Sunderland (2013) have explained, theory is

1
2
3 needed in the negotiation with managers about the agreed upon frame of reference of applied
4
5 research; “theory... establish[es] participants as a community” (Denny, 2013, p. 140). Business
6
7 anthropologists need to continue to draw upon the intellectual repertoire of anthropological
8
9 scholarship just as they need to contribute to the wider disciplines (Moeran in Arnould et al.,
10
11 2012; Stewart, 2014). In short, academic and business anthropology need one another in a
12
13 productive scholarly dialogue.
14
15

16 17 18 **What Can Management Gain from Anthropology?**

19
20 We call on our colleagues in the management academy to find ways to collaborate with
21
22 anthropologists. Our natural tendency is to collaborate with others with training and instincts like
23
24 our own. Yet important advances in applied research are found in new combinations of
25
26 approaches and disciplines (Derry & Schunn, 2005), a pattern observable in the management
27
28 field (Bedeian, 2005; van Baalen & Karsten, 2012). Admittedly, for many research projects the
29
30 colleagues in our own fields may prove to be the most helpful. But this is not always the case.
31
32 “The most likely [disciplinary] suspects for collaboration might not be the most fruitful; the most
33
34 unlikely might be the best” (Stewart, 2008, p. 290). As one example, in management studies on
35
36 succession and family ownership or management, the disciplines that are “the most attentive” to
37
38 relevant topics include anthropology, history, and law (as above). We concur with the thesis of
39
40 Luthans and Milosevic (2013, p. 96), who urged us to realize the potential for anthropology in
41
42 management research: “true progress may only be made by embracing diverse perspectives,
43
44 approaches, and assumptions and cooperating across them.” As we have seen, anthropology does
45
46 have properties that present challenges for scholars trained in other fields, but all eight that we
47
48 identified have a flip side of promise.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Anthropology’s taste for studying very different cultures, the source of its apparent lack of relevance for business, has resulted in a “knack for defamiliarization” (Maurer & Mainwaring, 2012, p. 179): the ability to shed taken-for-granted views of our world (Arnould in Arnould et al., 2012). This ability to see the world differently has fostered a bias towards doggedly uncovering the hidden and non-obvious (Butler, 2013; Morais, 2010); towards what Locke (2011) calls a tradition of “discovery.” For example, “a common finding [is that] ethnographic research identifies surprising, often counter-intuitive observations about how individuals use artifacts to conduct technically complicated activities” (Collins 2009, p. 202). Businesses that place value on such skills as observing and listening are eager to engage the services of anthropologists (Butler 2013; Crain & Tashima 2013). As noted, such engagements tend to be cross-disciplinary, due to the multi-faceted nature of topics in business.

In calling for cross-disciplinary collaboration that includes anthropologists, we are calling for academic researchers to adopt practices currently in use in the private sector. If private sector research finds opportunities in this fashion, so can management departments. They could borrow from business anthropology in incremental steps. For example, departments with doctoral programs could ensure that dissertation studies begin with observations of one week or so in a relevant field site. This would sensitize students to the contexts and experiences of managers in their areas of interest. It could help to generate findings that speak to the needs of practitioners. It could also encourage the faculty to develop and maintain relationships with gatekeepers to field sites.

Management departments could also choose to incorporate business anthropology just as thoroughly as they have economics, psychology and sociology. But if this ambitious agenda is to succeed, some of us in management will need to take the role of champion, as former

1
2
3 Academy of Management President Fred Luthans has done (Morey & Luthans, 2013; Luthans et
4 al., 2013). We will need to think strategically and set aside our prevailing habits of mind on
5
6 scholarly work and its assessment (Cohen, 2003). We will need to practice what we preach, and
7
8 mindfully manage the design and infrastructure for our scholarly activities. This will not be easy.
9
10 However, business schools that have differentiated their strategies, in contrast to most of their
11
12 peers, have experienced improvements in their ratings and resources (Martinez & Wolverton,
13
14 2009; Thomas, 2007; Triana, 2011). One promising way to differentiate our departments is to
15
16 nurture collaboration with that useful yet under-utilized discipline: social and cultural
17
18 anthropology.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

REFERENCES

Agar, M. (2004). An anthropological problem, a complex solution. *Human Organization*, 63, 411-418.

Agar, M. (2010). On the ethnographic part of the mix: A multi-genre tale of the field. *Organizational Research Methods*, 13, 286-303.

Aldrich, H. E. (2012). The emergence of entrepreneurship as an academic field: A personal essay on institutional entrepreneurship. *Research Policy*, 41, 1240-1248.

Alvesson, M. (2009). At-home ethnography: Struggling with closeness and closure. In S. Ybema, D. Yanow, H. Wels, & F. Kamsteeg (Eds.), *Organizational ethnography: Studying the complexities of everyday life* (pp. 156-174). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Arnould, E. J., Becker, H. S., Boyer, D., Hannerz, U., Lien, M., Löfgren, O., Marcus, G. E., Morais, R. J., Nakamaki, H., Smart, A., Smart, J., Swedberg, R., Wilk, R., & a coda by Moeran, B. (2012). Opinions: What business anthropology is, what it might become... and what, perhaps, it should not be. *Journal of Business Anthropology*, 1, 240-297.

Baba, M. L. (2005). Anthropological practice in business and industry. In S. Kedia & J. van Willigen (Eds.), *Applied anthropology: Domains of application* (pp. 221-262). Westport, CT: Praeger.

Baba, M. L. (2009). Disciplinary-professional relations in an era of anthropological engagement. *Human Organization*, 6, 380-391.

Baird, F., Moore, C. J. & Jagodzinski, A. P. (2000). An ethnographic study of engineering design teams at Rolls Royce Aerospace. *Design Studies*, 21, 333-355.

Bansal, P., Bertels, S., Ewart, T., MacConnachie, P. & O'Brien, J. (2012). Bridging the research-practice gap. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 26, 73-92.

Barley, S. R. (1986). Technology as an occasion for structuring: Evidence from observations of CT scanners and the social order of radiology departments. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 31, 78-108.

Barth, F. (1967). Economic spheres in Darfur. In R. Firth (Ed.), *Themes in economic anthropology* (pp. 149-174). London: Tavistock.

Bateson, G., & Mead, M. (1942). *Balinese character: A photographic analysis*. New York: New York Academy of Sciences.

Batteau, A. W. & Psenka, C. E. (2012). Horizons of business anthropology in a world of flexible accumulation. *Journal of Business Anthropology*, 1, 72-90.

- 1
2
3 Bedeian, A. G. (2005). Crossing disciplinary boundaries A epilegomenon for Lockett and
4 McWilliams. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 14, 151-155.
5
6
7 Beebe, J. (1995). Basic concepts and techniques of rapid appraisal. *Human Organization*, 54, 42-
8 51.
9
10 Behar, R. (2003). *Translated woman: Crossing the border with Esperanza*. Boston: Beacon.
11
12 Bell, G. (2011). Life, death, and the iPad: Cultural symbols and Steve Jobs. *Communications of*
13 *the ACM*, 54(12), 24-25.
14
15 Bennett, J. W. (1996). Applied and action anthropology: Ideological and conceptual aspects.
16 *Current Anthropology*, 37(1S), S23-S53.
17
18
19 Bennett, L. A. & Fiske, S. J. (2013). The academic-practitioner relationship. In Nolan, R. W.
20 (Ed.), *A handbook of practicing anthropology* (pp. 303-316). Chichester, UK: Wiley-
21 Blackwell.
22
23
24 Bernard, H. R. & Salinas Pedraza, J. (1989). *Native ethnography: A Mexican Indian describes*
25 *his culture*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
26
27
28 Bernard, H. R. (2011). *Research methods in anthropology: Qualitative and quantitative*
29 *approaches*, 5th Ed. Lanham, MD: AltaMira.
30
31
32 Blomberg, J., & Karasti, H. (2013). Reflections on 25 years of ethnography in CSCW. *Computer*
33 *Supported Cooperative Work*, 22, 373-423.
34
35 Briody, E. K., Cavusgil, S. T. & Miller, S. R. (2004). Turning three sides into a Delta at General
36 Motors: Enhancing partnership integration on corporate ventures. *Long Range Planning*,
37 37(5), 421-434.
38
39 Briody, E. K., Fine, G. A., Graffman, K., Krawinkler, S. A., McCabe, M., Sunderland, P., &
40 Denny, R. (2013). Opinions: Ethnographic methods in the study of business. *Journal of*
41 *Business Anthropology*, 2, 133-167.
42
43 Briody, E. K., & Nolan, R. W. (2013). High-performing applied programs. In Nolan, R. W.
44 (Ed.), *A handbook of practicing anthropology* (pp. 372-387). Chichester, UK: Wiley-
45 Blackwell.
46
47
48 Buckley, P. J. & Chapman, M. (1996). Economics and social anthropology: Reconciling
49 differences. *Human Relations*, 49, 1123-1150.
50
51
52 Butler, M. O. (2013). Methods and approaches. In Nolan, R. W. (Ed), *A handbook of practicing*
53 *anthropology* (pp. 199-209). Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
54
55
56 Campbell, D. T. (2009) Ethnocentrism of disciplines and the fish-scale model of omniscience. In
57 Sherif, M., & Sherif, C. W. (Eds.), *Interdisciplinary relationships in the social sciences*
58 (pp. 328-348). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
59
60

Carrier, J. G. (2012). Anthropology after the crisis. *Focaal: Journal of Global and Historical Anthropology*, 64, 115-128.

Carruthers, I., & Chambers, R. (Eds.) (1981). Rapid appraisal for rural development. *Agricultural Administration*, 8, 407-422.

Caulkins, D. D. & Jordan A. T. (Eds.), *A companion to organizational anthropology*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Cefkin, M. (Ed.) (2013). *Ethnography and the corporate encounter*. New York: Berghahn Books.

Chambers, E. (2009). In both our possibilities: Anthropology on the margins. *Human Organization*, 68, 374-379.

Chambers, R. (1994). The origins and practice of participatory rural appraisal. *World Development*, 22, 953-969.

Clarke, M. H. (2013). Working on cross-disciplinary teams. In Nolan, R. W. (Ed.), *A handbook of practicing anthropology* (pp. 330-343). Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

CMS domain statement. (2014). <http://aom.org/Divisions-and-Interest-Groups/Academy-of-Management-Division---Interest-Group-Domain-Statements.aspx - cms>, accessed September 10, 2014.

Cohen, A. R. (2003). Transformational change at Babson College. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 2(2), 155-166.

Collier, J. Jr., & Buitrón, A. (1949). *The awakening valley*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Collins, S. T. (2009). Wading and jumping into a new job: Exploring dynamics of knowledge flow for systems engineers. *Human Organization*, 68, 194-205.

Colloredo-Mansfeld, R. (1999). *The native leisure class: Consumption and cultural creativity in the Andes*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Colloredo-Mansfeld, R. (2009). *Fighting like a community: Andean civil society in an era of Indian uprisings*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Colloredo-Mansfeld, R., & Antrosio, J. (2009). Economic clusters or cultural commons: The limits of competition-driven development in the Ecuadorian Andes. *Latin American Research Review*, 44(1), 132-157.

Comaroff, J. (2010). The end of anthropology, again: On the future of an in/discipline. *American Anthropologist*, 112, 524-538.

- Connolly, T. H. (2011). Business ritual studies: Corporate ceremony and sacred space. In R. G. Tian, D. Zhou & A. van Marrewijk (Eds.), *Advanced readings in business anthropology* (pp. 120-133). Toronto: North American Business Press.
- Cornwall, A., & Pratt, G. (2011). The use and abuse of participatory rural appraisal: Reflections from practice. *Agriculture and Human Values*, 28, 263-272.
- Cotton, J. L., & Stewart, A. (2013). Evaluate your business school's writings as if your strategy matters. *Business Horizons*, 56(3), 323-331.
- Crain, C., & Tashima, N. (2013). An anthropologically based consulting firm. In Nolan, R. W. (Ed), *A handbook of practicing anthropology* (pp. 125-136). Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Cronin, B., & La Barre, K. (2004). Mickey Mouse and Milton: Book publishing in the humanities. *Learned Publishing*, 17(2), 85-98.
- D'Amico, L. (2011). *Otavalan women, ethnicity, and globalization*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Davis, D. L. (1996). Unintended consequences: The myth of "the return" in anthropological fieldwork. In C. B. Brettell (Ed.), *When they read what we write: The politics of ethnography* (pp. 27-35). Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Dehaas, J. (2014). Saskatchewan isn't the only school doing "program prioritization": Canadian schools spend big bucks on controversial budgeting exercise. *Maclean's*, May 22. <http://www.macleans.ca/education/university/saskatchewan-isnt-only-school-doing-program-prioritization/> (Accessed May 23, 2014).
- Denny, R. (2013). The cry of practicality. In B. Jordan (Ed.), *Advancing ethnography in corporate environments: Challenges and emerging opportunities* (pp. 136-150). Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Denny, R., & Sunderland, P. (Eds.) (2014). *Handbook of anthropology in business*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Derry, S. J., & Schunn, C. D. (2005). Interdisciplinarity: A beautiful but dangerous beast. In S. J. Derry, C. D. Schunn, & M. A. Gernsbacher (Eds.), *Interdisciplinary collaboration: An emerging cognitive science* (pp. xiii-xx). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Dickeson, R. C. (2010). *Prioritizing academic programs and services: Reallocating resources to achieve strategic balance, revised and updated*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Dolan, C. (2012). The new face of development: The "bottom of the pyramid" entrepreneurs. *Anthropology Today*, 28(4), 3-7.
- Doty, C. S., Mudge, D. S., & Benally, H. J. (2002). *Photographing Navajos: John Collier Jr. on the reservation, 1948-1953*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Dougherty, D. (1992). Interpretive barriers to successful product innovation in large firms. *Organization Science*, 3, 179-202.

Down, S., & Hughes, M. (2009). When the “subject” and the “researcher” speak together: Co-producing organizational ethnography. In Ybema, S., Yanow, D., Wels, H. & Kamsteeg, F. (Eds), *Organizational ethnography: Studying the complexities of everyday life* (pp. 83-98). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Ember, C. R., & Ember, M. (2009). *Cross-cultural research methods*, 2nd Ed. Lanham, MD: AltaMira.

Eriksen, T. H. (2006). *Engaging anthropology: The case for a public presence*. New York: Berg.

Estabrook, L., & Warner, B. (2003). *The book as the gold standard for tenure and promotion in the humanistic disciplines*. Urbana-Champaign, IL: Committee on Institutional Cooperation, University of Illinois. Available at http://lrc.lis.illinois.edu/web/ScholarlyCommunicationsSummitReport_Dec03.pdf. (Accessed May 22, 2014).

Fardon, R., Harris, O., Marchand, T., Nuttal, M., Shore, C., Strang, V., & Wilson, R. A. (2012) (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Social Anthropology*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.

Fine, G. A., & Shulman, D. (2009). Lies from the field: Ethical issues in organizational ethnography. In Ybema, S., Yanow, D., Wels, H. & Kamsteeg, F. (Eds), *Organizational ethnography: Studying the complexities of everyday life* (pp. 178-195). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Frank, D. J., & Gabler, J. (2006). *Reconstructing the university: Worldwide shifts in academia in the 20th century*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Geertz, C. (1974). “From the native’s point of view”: On the nature of anthropological understanding. *Bulletin of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, 28(1), 26-45.

Gluckman, M., & Eggan, F. (1965). Introduction. In M. Banton (Ed.), *The relevance of models in social anthropology* (pp. ix-xxxix). London: Tavistock.

Godfrey, R., Brewis, J., Grady, J. & Grocott, C. (2014). The private military industry and neoliberal imperialism: Mapping the terrain. *Organization*, 21, 106-125.

Gouldner, A. W. (1954). *Patterns of industrial bureaucracy: A case study of modern factory administration*. New York: Free Press.

Graffam, G. (2010). Design anthropology meets marketing. *Anthropologica*, 52, 155-164.

Hackenberg, R. A. (2002). Closing the gap between anthropology and public policy: The route through cultural heritage development. *Human Organization*, 61, 288-298.

- 1
2
3 Hall, J., Matos, S., Sheehan, L. & Silvestre, B. (2012). Entrepreneurship and innovation at the
4 base of the pyramid: A recipe for inclusive growth or social exclusion? *Journal of*
5 *Management Studies*, 49, 785-812.
6
7
8 Hertz, E. (1998). *The trading crowd: An ethnography of the Shanghai stock market*. New York:
9 Cambridge University Press.
10
11 Hickel, J. & Khan, A. (2012). The culture of capitalism and the crisis of critique.
12 *Anthropological Quarterly*, 85, 203-228.
13
14 Ho, K. (2009). *Liquidated: An ethnography of Wall Street*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
15
16
17 Hodson, R. (2002). Worker participation and teams: New evidence from analyzing
18 organizational ethnographies. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 23, 491-528.
19
20
21 Hodson, R. (2004a). A meta-analysis of workplace ethnographies. *Journal of Contemporary*
22 *Ethnography*, 33, 4-38.
23
24
25 Hodson, R. (2004b). Organizational trustworthiness: Findings from the population of
26 organizational ethnographies. *Organization Science*, 15, 432-445.
27
28
29 Hodson, R. (2005). Management behaviour as social capital: A systematic analysis of
30 organizational ethnographies. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 43, 41-65.
31
32
33 Howell, S. (2011). Whatever happened to the spirit of adventure? In H. Jebens & K.-H. Kohl
34 (Eds), *The end of anthropology?* (pp. 139-154). Oxford, UK: Sean Kingston Publishing.
35
36
37
38 Hughes, H. (2012). Review of *Collateral knowledge: Legal reasoning in the global financial*
39 *markets* by A. Riles. *Journal of Law and Commerce*, 30, 203-220.
40
41
42
43 Johannsen, A. (1992). Applied anthropology and post-modernist ethnography. *Human*
44 *Organization*, 51, 71-81.
45
46
47 Johns, F. (2012). Review of *Collateral knowledge: Legal reasoning in the global financial*
48 *markets* by A. Riles. *European Journal of International Law*, 23, 1194-1199.
49
50
51
52 Jordan, A. T. (2013). *Business anthropology, 2nd Ed*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.
53
54
55
56 Jordan, A. T., & Caulkins, D. D. (2013). Expanding the field of organizational ethnography for
57 the twenty-first century. In D. D. Caulkins & A. T. Jordan (Eds.), *A companion to*
58 *organizational anthropology* (pp. 1-24). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

Joy, L. (1967). An economic homologue of Barth's presentation of economic spheres in Darfur. In R. Firth (Ed.), *Themes in economic anthropology* (pp. 175-189). London: Tavistock.

Khurana, R. (2007). *From higher aims to hired hands: The social transformation of American business schools and the unfulfilled promise of management as a profession*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Kozinets, R. V. (2013). Netnography and the digital consumer: The quest for cultural insights. In R. Belk & R. Llamas (Eds.), *The Routledge companion to digital consumption* (pp. pp. 93-101). London: Routledge.

Kunda, G. (2009). *Engineering culture: Control and commitment in a high-tech corporation, Rev. Ed.* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Ladner, S. (2014). *Practical ethnography: A guide to doing ethnography in the public sector*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Landström, H., Harirchi, G., & Åström, F. (2012). Entrepreneurship: Exploring the knowledge base. *Research Policy*, 41, 1154-1181.

Lane, C. M. (2011). *A company of one: Insecurity, independence, and the new world of white-collar unemployment*. Ithaca, NY: ILR Press.

Lépinay, V. A. (2011). *Codes of finance: Engineering derivatives in a global bank*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Lien, M. E. (1997). *Marketing and modernity*. Oxford, UK: Berg.

Locke, K. (2011). Field research practices in management and organization studies: Reclaiming its tradition of discovery. *Academy of Management Annals*, 5, 613-652.

Lockett, A., & McWilliams, A. (2005). The balance of trade between disciplines: Do we effectively manage knowledge? *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 14, 139-150.

Low, S. M., & Merry, S. E. (2010). Engaged anthropology: Diversity and dilemmas: An introduction to Supplement 2. *Current Anthropology*, 51(S2), S203-S226.

Luthans, F., Milosevic, I., Bechky, B. A., Schein, E. H., Wright, S., Van Maanen, J., & Greenwood, D. J. (2013). Reclaiming "Anthropology: The forgotten behavioral science in management history" - Commentaries. *Journal of Organizational Ethnography*, 2, 92-116.

Malefyt, T. de Waal (2009). Understanding the rise of consumer ethnography: Branding technomethodologies in the new economy. *American Anthropologist*, 111, 201-210.

Malefyt, T. de Waal & Morais, R. J. (2012). *Advertising and anthropology: Ethnographic practice and cultural perspectives*. London: Berg.

- Marcus, G. E. (2009). Introduction: Notes toward an ethnographic memoir of supervising graduate research through anthropology's decades of transformation. In J. D. Faubion & G. E. Marcus (Eds.), *Fieldwork is not what it used to be: Learning anthropology's method in a time of transition* (pp. 1-31). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Martinez, M. C., & Wolverton, M. (2009). *Innovative strategy making in higher education*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Maurer, B., & Mainwaring, S. D. (2012). Anthropology and business: Plural programs and future financial worlds. *Journal of Business Anthropology*, 1, 177-196.
- Maxwell, C. R. (2013). Accelerated pattern recognition, ethnography, and the era of Big Data. In B. Jordan (Ed.), *Advancing ethnography in corporate environments: Challenges and emerging opportunities* (pp. 175-192). Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- McClendon, D. E. Sr. (2011). The role of anthropology in retailing: An autoethnographic case study. In R. G. Tian, D. Zhou & A. van Marrewijk (Eds.), *Advanced readings in business anthropology* (pp. 206-212). Toronto: North American Business Press.
- McCracken, G. (2013). How to be a self-supporting anthropologist. In Nolan, R. W. (Ed), *A handbook of practicing anthropology* (pp. 103-113). Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell, 103-113.
- Meisch, L. A. (2002). *Andean entrepreneurs: Otavalo merchants and musicians in the global arena*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Metcalf, C. (2013). Anthropology in design and product development. In Nolan, R. W. (Ed), *A handbook of practicing anthropology* (pp. 2548-265). Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Mitchell, M. L. (1998). *Employing qualitative methods in the private sector*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Miyazaki, H. (2013). *Arbitraging Japan: Dreams of capitalism and the end of finance*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Moeran, B. (1996). *A Japanese advertising agency: An anthropology of media and markets*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Moeran, B. (2006). *Ethnography at work*. Oxford, UK: Berg.
- Moeran, B. (2014). Theorizing business and anthropology. In R. Denny & P. Sunderland (Eds.), *Handbook of anthropology in business* (pp. 69-82). Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Moeran, B. & Garsten, C. (2012). What's in a name? Editors' introduction to the *Journal of Business Anthropology*. *Journal of Business Anthropology*, 1, 1-19.
- Moisés, R., Kelley, J. H. & Holden, W. C. (1971). *A Yaqui life: The personal chronicle of a Yaqui Indian*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

- Morais, R. J. (2010). Anthropologists and business: Through the looking glass. *News: A Publication of the Society for Applied Anthropology*, 21(3), 5-8.
- Morey, N.C., & Luthans, F. (2013, orig. 1987). Anthropology: The forgotten behavioral science in management history. *Journal of Organizational Ethnography*, 2(1), 82-91.
- Mudambi, R., Hannigan, T. J., & Kline, W. (2012). Advancing science on the knife's edge: Integration and specialization in management Ph.D. programs. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 26(3), 83-105.
- Mueller, J. G., Assanou, I. H. B., Dan Guimbo, I. R. O., & Almedom, A. M. (2010). Evaluating rapid participatory rural appraisal as an assessment of ethnoecological knowledge and local biodiversity patterns. *Conservation Biology*, 24, 140-150.
- Nolan, R. W. (2013a). Introduction. In Nolan, R. W. (Ed), *A handbook of practicing anthropology* (pp. 1-8). Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Nolan, R. W. (2013b). The future of practice: Anthropology and the grand challenges. In Nolan, R. W. (Ed), *A handbook of practicing anthropology* (pp. 391-396). Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Parsons, E. C. (1945). *Peguche: A study of Andean Indians*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Pearce, J. L. (2007). We are who we teach: How teaching experienced managers fractures our scholarship. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 16, 104-110.
- Pfeffer, J. & Fong, C. T. (2002). The end of business schools: Less success than meets the eye. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 1, 78-95.
- Preda, A. (2012). Review of *Collateral knowledge: Legal reasoning in the global financial markets* by A. Riles. *Law & Society Review*, 46, 445-447.
- Prough, J. S. (2011). *Straight from the heart: Gender, intimacy, and the cultural production of shōjo manga*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Ray, I. (2006). Outcomes and processes in economics and anthropology. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 54, 677-694.
- Rencher, M. (2014). Value and the valley of death: Opportunities for anthropologists to create and demonstrate value in entrepreneurial contexts. *Practicing Anthropology*, 36(2), 52-56.
- Richards, A. I. (1950). Some types of family structure among the Central Bantu. In A.R. Radcliffe-Brown (Ed.), *African systems of kinship and marriage* (pp. 207-251). London: Oxford University Press.

- 1
2
3 Riles, A. (2010). Collateral expertise: Legal knowledge in the global financial markets. *Current*
4 *Anthropology* 51, 795-818.
5
6
7 Riles, A. (2011). *Collateral knowledge: Legal reasoning in the global financial markets*.
8 Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
9
10 Riles, A. (2013). Market collaboration: Finance, culture, and ethnography after neoliberalism.
11 *American Anthropologist*, 115, 555-569.
12
13 Rosa, P. & Caulkins, D. D. (2013). Entrepreneurship studies. In D. D. Caulkins & A. T. Jordan
14 (Eds.), *A companion to organizational anthropology* (pp. 98-121). Malden, MA:
15 Blackwell.
16
17
18 Rosen, M. (1991). Coming to terms with the field: Understanding and doing organizational
19 ethnography. *Journal of Management Studies*, 28, 1-24.
20
21
22 Rowa-Dewar, N., Ager, W., Ryan, K., Hargan, I., Hubbard, G., & Kearney, N. (2008). Using a
23 rapid appraisal approach in a nationwide, multisite public involvement study in Scotland.
24 *Qualitative Health Research*, 18, 863-869.
25
26
27 Rowe, A. P., Miller, L. M., & Meisch, L. A. (2007). *Weaving and dyeing in highland Ecuador*.
28 Austin: University of Texas Press.
29
30 Rubalcaba, L., Michel, S., Sundbo, J., Brown, S. W., & Reynoso, J. (2012). Shaping, organizing,
31 and rethinking service innovation: A multidimensional framework. *Journal of Service*
32 *Management*, 23, 696-715.
33
34 Rynes, S. L., McNatt, D. B., & Bretz, R. D. (1999). Academic research inside organizations:
35 Inputs, processes, and outcomes. *Personnel Psychology*, 52, 869-898.
36
37
38 Salvato, C., & Corbetta, G. (2013). Transitional leadership as a facilitator of successors'
39 leadership construction. *Family Business Review*, 26, 235-255.
40
41 Sankaran, J. K., & Mouly, V. S. (2007). Managing innovation in an emerging sector: The case of
42 marine-based nutraceuticals. *R&D Management*, 37, 329-344.
43
44 Schwartzman, H. B. (1993). *Ethnography in organizations*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage
45 Publications.
46
47 Sherry, J. E. (1995). Marketing and consumer behavior: Into the field. In Sherry, J. E. (Ed),
48 *Contemporary marketing and consumer behavior: An anthropological sourcebook* (pp. 3-
49 44). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
50
51
52 Simon, S. (2003). *Sweet and sour: Life-worlds of Taipei women entrepreneurs*. Lanham, MD:
53 Rowman & Littlefield.
54
55
56 Singer, M. (1994). Community-centered praxis: Toward an alternative non-dominative applied
57 anthropology. *Human Organization*, 53, 336-344.
58
59
60

- Smith, I. S. (2013). Management consultants at work with clients: Maintenance and contestation of elite status. In Abbink, J. & Salverda, T. (Eds), *The anthropology of elites: Power, culture, and the complexities of distinction* (pp. 207-226). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Spradley, J. P. (1979). *The ethnographic interview*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Stewart, A. 1991. A prospectus on the anthropology of entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 16(2), 71-91.
- Stewart, A. (1998). *The ethnographer's method*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Stewart, A. (2008). Who could best complement a team of family business researchers: Scholars down the hall or in another building? *Family Business Review*, 31, 279-293.
- Stewart, A. (2010). Sources of entrepreneurial discretion in kinship systems. In Stewart, A., Lumpkin, G. T. & Katz, J. A. (Eds.), *Entrepreneurship and family business* (pp. 291-313). Bingley, UK: Emerald Group.
- Stewart, A. (2014). The anthropology of family business: An imagined ideal. In Melin, L., Nordqvist, M. & Sharma, P. (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of family business* (pp. 66-82). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Story, J. S. P., Barbuto, J. E. Jr., Luthans, F., & Bovaird, J. A. (2014). Meeting the challenges of effective international HRM: Analysis of the antecedents of global mindset. *Human Resource Management*, 53, 131-155.
- Strang, V. (2009). *What anthropologists do*. Oxford, UK: Berg.
- Sunderland, P. (2013). The cry for more theory. In B. Jordan (Ed.), *Advancing ethnography in corporate environments: Challenges and emerging opportunities* (pp. 121-135). Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Sunderland, P., & Denny, R. M. (2007). *Doing anthropology in consumer research*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Thomas, H. (2007). Business school strategy and the metrics for success. *Journal of Management Development*, 26(1), 33-42.
- Tian, R. G. Zhou, D. & van Marrewijk, A. (Eds.) (2011). *Advanced readings in business anthropology*. Toronto: North American Business Press.
- Triana, P. (2011). Business education: Is U.S. still number one? *Corporate Finance Review*, 16(1), 45-48.
- Trotter, R. T., & Schensul, J. J. (1998). Methods in applied anthropology. In H. R. Bernard (Ed.), *Handbook of methods in cultural anthropology* (pp. 691-735). Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira.

- 1
2
3 van Baalen, P., & Karsten, L. (2012). The evolution of management as an interdisciplinary field.
4 *Journal of Management History*, 18, 219-237.
5
6
7 Van Maanen, J. (2011). *Tales of the field: On writing ethnography*, 2nd Ed. Chicago: University
8 of Chicago Press.
9
10 van Marrewijk, A. (2011). Cross cultural management: Hybridization of Dutch-Indian work
11 practices in geographically distributed IT projects. *International Journal of Business*
12 *Anthropology*, 2(2), 15-35.
13
14 Ward, K., Johnston, R., Richards, K., Gandy, M., Taylor, Z., Paasi, A., Fox, R., Serje, M.,
15 Yeung, W.-C. H., Barnes, T., Blunt, A., & McDowell, L. (2009). The future of research
16 monographs: An international set of perspectives. *Progress in Human Geography*, 31(1),
17 101-126.
18
19
20 Watson, T. J. (2011). Ethnography, reality and truth: The vital need for studies of “how things
21 work” in organizations and management. *Journal of Management Studies*, 48, 202-217.
22
23 Wax, M. L. (1972). Tenting with Malinowski. *American Sociological Review*, 37, 1 (February): -
24 1-13.
25
26
27 Welker, M., Partridge, D. J. & Hardin, R. (2011). Corporate lives: New perspectives on the
28 social life of the corporate form. *Current Anthropology*, 52, S3, S3-S16.
29
30 White, D. R. & Johansen, U. C. (2006). *Network analysis and ethnographic problems: Process*
31 *models of a Turkish nomadic clan*. New York: Lexington.
32
33
34 Whyte, William Foote. (1993). *Street corner society: The social structure of an Italian slum*.
35 Chicago: University of Chicago press.
36
37 Wuchty, S., Jones, B. F., & Uzzi, B. (2007). The increasing dominance of teams in the
38 production of knowledge. *Science*, 316(5827), 1036-1039.
39
40 Wylie, L. W. (1974). *Village in the Vauchuse*, 3rd Ed. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University
41 Press.
42
43 Yan, E., Ding, Y., Cronin, B., & Leydesdorff, L. (2013). A bird's-eye view of scientific trading:
44 Dependency relations among fields of science. *Journal of Informetrics*, 7, 249-264.
45
46 Yanagisako, S. J. (2002). *Producing culture and capital: Family firms in Italy*. Princeton, NJ:
47 Princeton University Press.
48
49 Ybema, S., Yanow, D., Wels, H. & Kamsteeg, F. (2009). *Organizational ethnography: Studying*
50 *the complexities of everyday life*. London: Sage.
51
52 Zaloom, C. (2006). *Out of the pits: Traders and technology from Chicago to London*. Chicago:
53 University of Chicago Press.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ⁱ These disciplinary journals are the *Journal of Economic Literature*, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, *Econometrica*, *Annual Review of Psychology*, *Psychological Bulletin*, *Psychological Review*, *Annual Review of Sociology*, *American Journal of Sociology*, *American Sociological Review*, *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *Cultural Anthropology*, and *Current Anthropology*.

Complete details on our methods and tables are available from the first author, upon request.

ⁱⁱ Web of Science “topics” are coded from the articles’ titles, abstracts, and keywords; they are terms that have been foregrounded by the authors. Psychology journals are listed in the Web of Science with subcategories. We used the “psychology, applied” journals, passing over five journals that are identified with and housed in management: *Journal of Management*, *Organizational Research Methods*, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *Group & Organization Management*, and *Leadership Quarterly*. We did not use “management” as a topic as it is ambiguous, including such matters as natural resource management. For example, in the anthropology journal *Human Ecology* it is flagged in 372 articles, whereas “business” is flagged only seven times in that journal.

ⁱⁱⁱ Scholars debate the meaning of these terms (e.g. Moeran & Garsten, 2012). For our purposes, “applied” anthropology is contrasted with “non-applied” anthropology in its efforts to resolve practical problems, and “business anthropology” is a topical specialty that, like (e.g. medical anthropology) can be applied or non-applied. “Practicing” anthropologists are employed outside of universities, whether in the private, government or NGO sectors.

^{iv} Past and present chairs of the CMS division serve as co-editor (Craig Prichard) and editorial board members (Raza Mir and Emma Bell) of *Organization*.

^v The 17 journals are the same as those mentioned in footnote 1.

^{vi} From the results in our tables, available on request, it would appear that even applied anthropology has been prey to postmodernist doubt. In *Human Organization*, the incidence of postmodernism as a Web of Science topic is modest but relatively larger than in management or anthropology overall. However, in the context of applied anthropology, postmodernism does not refer to skepticism about science, or to self-conscious, “reflexive” styles of presentation (“confessional tales” in Van Maanen’s expression, 2011, Chap. 4), but to a mode of bottom-up engagement in collaboration with studied populations, from the outset of a project (Johannsen, 1992; Hackenberg, 2002; Singer, 1994). An engaged scholarship is consistent with the practice we have noted in business anthropology.

^{vii} The holistic approach is most apparent in traditional ethnographies, such as Collier and Buitrón (1949) and Parsons (1945) with their chapters on such topics as religion, lore, family life, marriage, technology, production and markets. Even more current ethnographies tend to include a chapter on the historical (and sometimes geographical) background (for Otavalo examples, Collaredo-Mansfield, 1999; D’Amico, 2011; Meisch, 2002). However, rather than attempting to cover all aspects of life within the field site, these recent works attend more to local-global relationships (e.g. D’Amico, 2011; Meisch, 2002).

^{viii} Duke has the highest ranked anthropology department in the most recent National Research Council ratings of Ph.D. programs. Oxford, along with Cambridge, remains a major influence in social anthropology, in the top ranks according to multiple sources, such as *The Guardian*. Oxford, unlike Cambridge, posts the full publication records of its faculty on its website. We counted only Associate or Full Professors or their UK equivalents, and only cultural or social anthropologists.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

^{ix} Discussion in the Society for Applied Anthropology annual meeting S64, March 22, 2014. The apparent number of articles in anthropology journals is higher than in management journals, but this is a function of book reviews. Core journals such as *American Anthropologist*, *American Ethnologist*, and the *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* publish many more book reviews than articles.