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Collaboration between Management and Anthropology Researchers: Obstacles and Opportunities
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 hodgepods 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,
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. 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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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
studying. For example, Moeran contributed to advertising campaigns in a Japanese agency, even to the extent of creating new tag lines for their clients (2006, pp. 7, 38, 117). Collins (2009) was able to help a small engineering firm save on training costs.

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

As examples of relevant anthropological studies, we examined two different sets of scholarly books. The first book series is the decades-long study of the Otavalo entrepreneurs of Ecuador and their involvement in the global economy (Collier & Buitrón, 1949; Colloredo-Mansfield, 1999; 2009; Colloredo-Mansfield & Antrosio, 2009; D’Amico, 2011; 2012; Meisch, 2002; Parsons, 1945; Rowe, Miller & Meisch, 2007). In the Otavalo case, Meisch (2002, p. 15)
taught “textile techniques”; Colloredo-Mansfield and Antrosio (2009, p. 155) developed “constructive ways of defending cultural-economic boundaries” and protecting indigenous intellectual property and livelihoods. In another Otavalo example, Rowe (2007) included a 97-item glossary on textiles, with seven distinct variants of the root term “warp.”

The second book series comprises ten anthropological studies of management in financial service organizations (Hertz, 1998; Ho, 2009; Hughes, 2012; Johns, 2012; Lépinay, 2011; Miyazaki, 2013; Preda, 2012; Riles, 2010; 2011; Zaloom, 2006). In the study of modern global enterprise, some anthropologists gained genuine expertise. For example, Riles (2011) made subtle legal arguments about Japanese civil law regarding swap collateral in global financial markets. Other legal and financial experts have endorsed her “interesting and difficult interpretation[s]” (Hughes 2012, p. 205). Preda (2012, p. 447) referred to her “deep knowledge of both the theoretical legal issues and her particular field (see also Johns 2012). In another example, Lépinay’s study of a major French bank demonstrated how the bank’s “financial practices,” new products, organizational design, and tension between exploration and exploitation, led to “a self-defeating form of innovation whereby a bank’s organization undermines its financial practices…” and vice versa (2011, p. ix). Moreover, as Riles (2013, p. 558) observed, the 2008 financial crisis precipitated “a new market for sociological and anthropological techniques for making sense of markets as cultural spaces.” On balance, then, a perception of anthropology as relevant only for explaining the exotic and remote is a problem of perceptions, not reflecting the current state of the field or its history (Greenwood in Luthans et al., 2013).

**Sympathy for the Less Wealthy and Powerful**
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 defendable 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,
ethnographers can withhold information from publication or delay publishing results until many years have elapsed.

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

Thus, a left-leaning ideology might stand in the way of greater collaboration with anthropologists. However, a similar sentiment can be found among management scholars, such as in a paper with the provocative title of “The private military industry and neoliberal imperialism: Mapping the terrain” (Godfrey, Brewis, Grady & Grocott, 2014). This article was, in fact, authored by management scholars, and published in a journal called Organization, edited by management scholars. The journal is informally linked with the Critical Management Studies (CMS) division of the Academy of Management, which “serves as a forum for the expression of views critical of established management practices and the established social order. Our
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...
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). 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 Organization.
Organization as in the other anthropology journals. vi Surveys were mentioned almost as often as in management, and social networks even more so. Given their substantial methodological eclecticism, we see great potential for more collaboration between applied and business anthropologists and management scholars.

Problematic Access to Field Sites

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

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

How intractable an obstacle is this? Opportunities for access differ by industry. Culture industries and management consulting both appear difficult to access (Prough, 2011; Smith, 2013), as are “family firms,” with their dual facades of firm and kin group (Stewart, 2014). By contrast, the Chinese fashion industry proved receptive for Zhou (2013), as did the Shanghai stock market in its early days for Hertz (1998). Most cases of successful and lasting access stem from opportunism, luck, and pre-existing networks, whether personal or professional (Maurer & Mainwaring, 2012; Smith, 2013; Zaloom, 2006). Business anthropologists have had great
success in conducting observations at the level of industry clusters and networks, as Ho (2009) did with Wall Street traders, Prough (2011) did with the shōjo manga industry, and Yanagisako (2002) did with the Italian silk industry. We think that management scholars could learn a great deal by studying how these ethnographers obtained access to field sites.

The Lengthy Duration of Ethnographic Research

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

Norms in anthropology dictate that ethnographers spend a great deal of time in their ethnographic work, which Stewart (1998, p. 57) described as “a dogged quest” for insights. In this effort, fieldworkers pursue an often-bewildering set of clues, often finding that early interpretations were premature and possibly misguided (Butler, 2013, Moeran, 2009). Anthropologists believe that the process of discovery cannot be rushed (Stewart, 1998, pp. 20-21). Thus, many anthropologists spend exceptionally long periods in the same site over their careers. Among the Otavalo studies, Meisch (2002) spent over three decades on site; Colloredo-Mansfield spent 15 years by the time of his 2009 book, and 17 months over six years in his (2009) article with Antrosio. Among the social studies of finance scholars, the times spent are shorter but still rather intimidating by management standards. Lépinay (2011) spent 18 months;
Riles (2010; 2011) spent 17 months in a legal back office, with other visits over seven years; Miyazaki (2013) was in the field for 13 years. Clearly, anthropologists are taking a risk that their substantial investments of time may lead to only inconsequential discoveries. However, such investments are obligatory in research that is truly ethnographic.

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

Faced with these temporal constraints, fieldworkers have at their disposal two solutions. The first is to conduct ethnographic fieldwork for only a few months. Compared with the “Malinowskian” anthropologist faced with an unfamiliar language and culture (Marcus, 2009), those doing research in business firms can start to make sense of their surroundings sooner. This solution is especially likely to be fruitful in cases of “insider-outsider” research of the sort proposed by Louis and Bartunek (1992). For example, research for the classic organizational ethnography, *Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy*, included collaboration between Gouldner, a sociologist, and a student who had worked for a summer at the site (Gouldner, 1954). In a management example, Salvato and Corbetta (2013) utilized the second author’s prior consulting work with two of the four firms that they studied.
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
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).

**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,
because complex and contextualized findings are most aptly conveyed with book length publications (Rosen, 1991; Ward et al., 2009). In the humanities and cultural anthropology, scholarly books have been a requirement for tenure within research universities (Cronin & La Barre, 2004; Estabrook & Warner, 2003). Book publication has also been a requirement for a good tenure-track position following post-doctoral research (Marcus, 2009). To demonstrate, we compared the records of 24 management and 26 anthropology scholars in Duke University and the University of Oxford, two universities with top-ranked anthropology and business school faculties. As fractions of their scholarly output, these anthropologists produced half (0.51) as many journal articles as business school professors. They produced only one third (1.33) more book chapters, but four times (4.26) as many scholarly books. They also produced nearly three times (2.69) as many varied other works, ranging from book reviews and commentaries to curated exhibits and ethnographic films.

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

How intractable an obstacle is this? Should a management department wish to hire an anthropologist, it would confront the problem of assessing “merit” for promotion and tenure. A possible solution could be for anthropologists to focus on publishing a series of journal articles, rather than a single monograph reporting the research findings. Disciplinary traditions die hard,
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
contributions to management studies. Although some practices and traditions do pose problems for collaborative work between anthropologists and management scholars, we found many reasons to be optimistic. For example, we have been encouraged by indications of receptivity to anthropological work in business schools. We can point to the field of marketing, in which scholars such as Eric Arnould, Russ Belk, and John Sherry have made prominent contributions. In a few major management departments, we find thriving ethnographers, trained in business schools, such as John Van Maanen and his former Ph.D. students Steve Barley, Deborah Dougherty and Leslie Perlow. Moreover, several ethnographies on management have been widely cited. Examples include Kunda (2006), with 690 Web of Science citations, Barley (1986), with 699, and Dougherty (1992), with 685.

Within anthropology departments, we see other hopeful signs. Within anthropology’s scholarly associations, “attention to practice” is on the upswing (L. A. Bennett & Fiske, 2013, p. 314). Anthropology departments, too, increasingly recognize the need to prepare their graduates for careers outside the academy. External threats to the funding of anthropology departments, as reflected in “prioritization exercises” (Dehaas, 2014; Dickeson, 2010) might also prompt accommodations with the labor market prospects of their graduates. Moreover, incoming doctoral students increasingly tend to have practitioner backgrounds, often in NGOs, and they expect to have engaged careers (Marcus, 2009). Not surprisingly, then, another hopeful sign is the growth of graduate programs in applied anthropology (L. A. Bennett & Fiske, 2013). Programs with a track specifically in business anthropology include the University of Aberdeen, the University of Colorado at Boulder, the University of Copenhagen, the University of Memphis, the University of North Texas, Northern Arizona University, Oregon State University,
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
student advising, grant and other fund raising, visiting scholars, small conferences, and so on. Institutes could enable linkages with other departments with expertise complementing that in business anthropology, such as product and industrial design (Baird, Moore, & Jagodzinski, 2000; Graffam, 2010; Metcalf, 2013).

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

What Can Anthropology Gain from Management?

Negotiating continuing access and lengthy participation is a learned skill, but we suspect that management scholars may well have an advantage because of their business school training and capacity to fulfill clearly productive roles. Students in business anthropology can also benefit from the expertise found uniquely in business schools, ranging from the simple, such as deciphering jargon, to the complex, such as interpreting financial statements. Creating connections with business schools could open the door to more ready access to business field sites for business anthropologists. With business expertise, true participant observation in management becomes much more feasible, as participation makes possible a deep understanding
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
needed in the negotiation with managers about the agreed upon frame of reference of applied research; “theory… establish[es] participants as a community” (Denny, 2013, p. 140). Business anthropologists need to continue to draw upon the intellectual repertoire of anthropological scholarship just as they need to contribute to the wider disciplines (Moeran in Arnould et al., 2012; Stewart, 2014). In short, academic and business anthropology need one another in a productive scholarly dialogue.

**What Can Management Gain from Anthropology?**

We call on our colleagues in the management academy to find ways to collaborate with anthropologists. Our natural tendency is to collaborate with others with training and instincts like our own. Yet important advances in applied research are found in new combinations of approaches and disciplines (Derry & Schunn, 2005), a pattern observable in the management field (Bedeian, 2005; van Baalen & Karsten, 2012). Admittedly, for many research projects the colleagues in our own fields may prove to be the most helpful. But this is not always the case. “The most likely [disciplinary] suspects for collaboration might not be the most fruitful; the most unlikely might be the best” (Stewart, 2008, p. 290). As one example, in management studies on succession and family ownership or management, the disciplines that are “the most attentive” to relevant topics include anthropology, history, and law (as above). We concur with the thesis of Luthans and Milosevic (2013, p. 96), who urged us to realize the potential for anthropology in management research: “true progress may only be made by embracing diverse perspectives, approaches, and assumptions and cooperating across them.” As we have seen, anthropology does have properties that present challenges for scholars trained in other fields, but all eight that we identified have a flip side of promise.
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
Academy of Management President Fred Luthans has done (Morey & Luthans, 2013; Luthans et al., 2013). We will need to think strategically and set aside our prevailing habits of mind on scholarly work and its assessment (Cohen, 2003). We will need to practice what we preach, and mindfully manage the design and infrastructure for our scholarly activities. This will not be easy. However, business schools that have differentiated their strategies, in contrast to most of their peers, have experienced improvements in their ratings and resources (Martinez & Wolverton, 2009; Thomas, 2007; Triana, 2011). One promising way to differentiate our departments is to nurture collaboration with that useful yet under-utilized discipline: social and cultural anthropology.
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