In The Loop : Rendering Culture and Multi-Targeted Ethnography in Applied Contexts

O'Dell, Thomas; Willim, Robert

2014

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
O'Dell, T., & Willim, R. (2014). *In The Loop : Rendering Culture and Multi-Targeted Ethnography in Applied Contexts.*

Total number of authors:
2

In The Loop:
Rendering Culture and Multi-Targeted Ethnography
in Applied Contexts.

ABSTRACT:

In this article our objective is to discuss the manner in which our engagement with applied cultural analysis has spurred us to reassess a number of fundamental underlying concepts and practices of ethnological and anthropological work. The text opens by briefly explaining the educational program that is offered in Lund, and which is the background against which our understandings of ethnography and cultural analysis have changed. Following this we explain more fully how our engagement with applied research (and education) has changed our conceptual framing of ethnography and inspired us to new theoretical developments. For the purposes of this article we limit the discussion to three themes, *Collaborations, Composing Ethnography* and *Rendering Culture*. In closing, the article urges us to re-frame ethnography as not only a multi-sited practice, but even as a phenomenon that is in need of being understood as *multi-targeted*.

Keywords: Applied Cultural Analysis; Collaboration, Composing Ethnography, Rendering Culture, Multi-Targeted Ethnography

In The Loop:
Rendering Culture and Multi-Targeted Ethnography
in Applied Contexts.

Tom O'Dell, Ph.D. (Should receive correspondences regarding the manuscript)
Professor of Ethnology
Department of Arts and Cultural Sciences
Lund University
Telephone: + 46 46 222 76 87
Thomas.o_dell@kultur.lu.se

Robert Willim Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Ethnology
Department of Arts and Cultural Sciences
Lund University

> The majority of leading ethnologists write well, and happily direct their writing to a larger public than their own scholarly community. However this has academic consequences. Ethnology is not an especially highly ranked discipline in Sweden (Arnstberg 1997: 126).[1]

Scandinavia is an area of the world that many people in Europe associate with functionalist furniture and modern design aesthetics. Ask Swedes what is typically Swedish and you are bound to hear tales about rationality, a presumed reserved mentality, and conflict avoidance. But you will also hear narratives about how this rationality has been spurred on by a belief in the power of science and engineering to solve problems, and find solutions to everything from technical to social problems. Over the course of the 20th century engineers were generally held up as the experts to turn to solve the nation's problems, and to the extent that social scientists were enlisted to alleviate social and urban problems, their work tended to be of a highly positivistic and quantitative nature. In recent decades qualitative culturally oriented research has won a marginal degree of public appreciation, particularly in relation to questions concerning

---

[1] This and all other quotations which originally have appeared in Swedish have been translated by the authors.

class, gender, and ethnicity, but an appreciation of the degree to which cultural research can be used to bring about social and cultural change (or to simply understand a situation better) has been limited. Indeed, cultural theorists in Sweden have become increasingly skeptical of forms of engagement which may be seen as collusive with market forces. Applied cultural analysis has, for this reason, no longer history in Sweden or any of the other Scandinavian countries.

But things are changing. Increasingly students are searching for educations which they will be able to use to gain employment after their educations are complete, and ethnologists in Lund have increasingly come to apply and develop cultural analysis to meet the needs of actors in the public and private sectors in the Öresund Region. As an extension of this process an international Master's program of Applied Cultural Analysis (MACA) was established by Copenhagen and Lund universities in 2008. While MACA is provided by ethnologists, the forms of cultural analysis that are taught are not entirely identical with what is traditionally thought of as anthropological analysis.

In this article we intend to discuss and reflect upon how our engagement with applied cultural analysis has affected the manner in which we think about and conduct ethnography. In what follows our objective is to discuss the manner in which our engagement with applied cultural analysis has spurred us to reassess a number of fundamental underlying concepts and practices of ethnological and anthropological work. In proceeding we begin by briefly explaining the educational program that is offered in Lund, and how working with it has changed the manner in which we view cultural analysis. Following this we explain more fully how our engagement with applied research (and education) has changed our conceptual framing of ethnography and inspired us to new theoretical developments. For the purposes of this article we limit the discussion to three themes, *Collaborations, Composing Ethnography* and *Rendering Culture*. In closing, the article urges us to re-frame ethnography as not only a multi-sited practice, but even as a phenomenon that is in need of being understood as *multi-targeted*.

Moving towards the realm of the applied
The interest in applied cultural research in Scandinavia is a very recent development in ethnology. Throughout much of the early to mid-twentieth century, research emanating from departments of ethnology in Sweden was firmly anchored in the academy focusing upon the

mapping of peasant traditions and the spread of folklore. Influenced by models of knowledge production emanating from biology and the hard sciences, the research conducted in this period had a rather positivistic ambition of charting cultural processes, and pinning them down to demonstrate how the state of "Swedish culture" really appeared (Ehn and Löfgren 1996). A shift, however, occurred in the early seventies as influences from American anthropology and French cultural theory (from scholars such as de Certeau, Bourdieu and Foucault, among others) captured the imagination of a new younger generation of ethnologists. For a growing cadre of ethnologists, this epistemological shift even bore with it a political awakening and sensitivity to issues of power relations in Swedish society which in turn spurred them to work to to provide a voice to weaker groups in society (cf. Arnstberg 1997; Daun 1970). But the interest to engage and participate in the world beyond the academy was by and large limited to efforts to empower the weak or to at least raise an awareness of the conditions of daily life faced by such groups -- all of which usually led to the production of academic monographies. Ethnologists who did not remain in the academy usually found they could apply their knowledge in Swedish museums and cultural institutions. But work in the private sector was viewed with deep skepticism.

This situation was at least partially changed in the years around the new millennium with the advent of two interconnected phenomena. On the one, hand the Swedish government began pressing scholars to explain how their knowledge could be made useful for society. And here it was primarily marketable assets that the government was interested in. And on the other hand, many students increasingly began enrolling in programs that led to clear career paths (O'Dell 2009). Student interest in ethnology rapidly dissipated. Where an introductory course in ethnology could attract close to one hundred students at Lund University in the mid-1990s, teachers found themselves meeting as few as six students in the classroom ten years later.

Where the old motto had been, 'Publish or Perish', ethnologists were increasingly facing a new one of 'Adapt your educational program and change your attitude or perish!' In Umeå, in the far north of Sweden, a program in "Cultural Entrepreneurship" was established. At the other end of the country, in the far south, an international Master's program in Applied Cultural Analysis (MACA) was developed collaboratively by the departments of ethnology at Copenhagen and Lund universities. Organizationally, each department accepted twenty students to their portion of the program. But the two departments had slightly different acceptance

requirements: where the Danes had stricter requirements for students with backgrounds in ethnology and anthropology, the Swedish program recruited a broader student body of people who had had exposure to cultural theory but perhaps majored in subjects as diverse as art history, business administration, journalism, and ethnology.

A number of challenges quickly made themselves felt. The mixture of students with different scholarly as well as national background meant that they brought a wide array of skills, competencies, and experiences with them, but how could one best harness all of this and guide the group down a path that over the course of two years led to the development of a new type of ethnographer: not an anthropologist or an ethnologist, but a cultural analyst specialized in working in applied contexts. Pedagogically, students had to learn a common core of cultural theory to use as a point of departure for their discussions with one another, but they also had to learn a set of practices and inquisitive dispositions that would fit under the banner of 'applied ethnography'. Disciplinarily however, those of us who designed the education and taught it, deeply understood (and still believe) that this necessitated providing them with a different education than they would receive in any other department of anthropology or ethnology in Scandinavia.

Developing a new educational program in applied cultural analysis forced us to face the question of what is *applied* research? Wasn't work intended to provide a voice to the weak a form of applied research intended to develop awareness and produce change? Such work had clear applicable implications, but was never framed or problematized in terms of applied research. To the contrary, it was implicitly understood to be an integrated part of good ethnological scholarly praxis. Very few ethnologists wrote or explicitly spoke about what it meant to work for the public's interest, but from the early 1970s and forward it became part of the ethnological habitus. As ethnologist Karl-Olov Arnstberg has noted:

> The majority of leading ethnologists write well, and happily direct their writing to a
> larger public than their own scholarly community. However this has academic
> consequences. Ethnology is not an especially highly ranked discipline in Sweden
> (Arnstberg 1997: 126).[1]

Writing in an easily accessible vernacular style is not just a choice that ethnologists make today; it is expected of them by their colleagues even while scholars from other disciplines may view it as of lesser 'scientific' rigor. However, the significance of this public orientation is seldom problematized by ethnologists. It is, nonetheless, a disposition which needs to be problematized as we move from the field of ethnology to that of applied cultural analysis. Partaking in the discussions and debates which have been occurring in the United States in and around the field of Applied Anthropology has helped us to do this.

To be sure, there is a rather long history of applied anthropology in the United States. Indeed a great deal of work dating as far back as the last decades of the 19th century and continuing well into the 1930s was based on applied work – not the least of which was focused upon work with/for native Americans. Even other fields such as sociology came, by the 1930s to focus on research areas such urban violence, poverty, and alcoholism with the intent of contributing to and changing society. But the public orientation that has marked the scholarly habitus of Swedish ethnologists since the 1970s has been noticeably scarce amongst American Anthropologists for most of the 20th century. This however, began to change over the course of the 1990s as a new anthropological vocabulary began to take shape in the wake of calls for anthropology to demonstrate a greater engagement with society and the social issues which confronted people in their daily lives. A distinction was made between not only applied and scholarly research but even between applied anthropology and what came to be called public anthropology. Robert Borofsky has summed up the position of applied and public anthropology, as well as the distinction between the two in the following way:

> Reading the Society for Applied Anthropology's mission statement, one is hard pressed to differentiate the two. Theory and application merge in both. But applied anthropology today tends to be depicted—often unfairly—as focusing primarily on concrete, practical problems that others have conceptually defined for them. A public anthropology resists the separation of theory from application (Borofsky 2000: 3).

The art of writing 'good' Swedish ethnology has by and large been implicitly defined by the ability to maintain a close proximity to theory without allowing it to become overbearing. And

along these lines Swedish ethnology has been very closely aligned with that which Americans increasingly refer to as public anthropology. Since Swedish ethnologists have not explicitly framed themselves as public ethnologists, or as engaging in public ethnology, the question of how we can and might reach out to different publics has remained under theorized. But now as we move into the field of applied cultural analysis it becomes impossible not to problematize how knowledge and understanding can be communicated to, and shared with, very different publics in different contexts. Indeed, we find ourselves compelled to reflect upon the question of what types of publics and participants are involved in the production, assembly and development of the ethnographies that are the result of applied cultural analysis.

Collaborations and Entanglements

In relation to the manner in which applied research has spurred theoretical and scholarly developments within the academy, the recognition of the role of 'the informant' in the research process has been greatly facilitated via "applied" work. In an article in *Current Anthropology* Luke Eric Lassiter points to the fact that early in the 20th century there were a number of groundbreaking works, including some of the work of Franz Boas, that acknowledged the role of the key informant as a part of the creative and academic process of writing ethnography. And there were even instances in which "informants" were recognized as co-authors, as in the case with Alice Fletcher who included Francis La Flesche (an Omaha native American whom she eventually adopted as a son) as a co-author to the book *The Omaha Tribe* (Lassiter 2005: 87).

But the recognition of the role of the "informant" was toned down in the 1930s and on. It was just not deemed to be sufficiently scientific. As Lassiter points out, the Feminist Anthropology of the 1970s and 1980s re-centered the informant as part of the ethnographic process as feminist anthropologists aligned their goals and negotiated their texts in conjunction with the women they wrote about. But even here there were voices that argued that this type of alignment of subjects and knowledge was deemed inferior by the larger anthropological community. And it wasn't until the Writing Culture debates of the mid 1980s that messy texts with acknowledged collaborators gained more (if still limited) traction (Lassiter 2005).

George Marcus has been one of the central figures arguing for a shift in perspective from viewing ethnographic subjects as collaborators rather than informants or interviewees. It is a move that is intended to open anthropology for new ways of perceiving itself and its work. Not

as the product of the lone scholar, but as a cooperative labor (Marcus 2009: 29ff.). And it opens for questions such as, for whom is ethnographic work being done? How might it engage society, or even contribute to processes of change. In what ways can academic work be participatory? And it is in this territory of reciprocal contact between the scholar and the world s/he lives and works in that people such as Robert Borofsky have tried to forge a new role for anthropology as a form of public engagement. As he explained:

> Public anthropology seeks to address broad critical concerns in ways that others beyond the discipline are able to understand what anthropologists can offer to the re-framing and easing—if not necessarily always resolving—of present-day dilemmas. The hope is that by invigorating public conversations with anthropological insights, public anthropology can re-frame and reinvigorate the discipline (Borofsky 2000: 1).

From the perspective of Swedish ethnology this argumentation for a public conversation is provocative. As we have argued above, since the early 1970s ethnologists have based their careers on the production of scholarly texts, articles and ethnographies (written in an accessible style), but any Swedish ethnologist of merit has also a presence in both local and national media as well as community debates. Yet, nonetheless, we rarely frame this work in terms of a public conversation or collaborative effort involving a number of interested parties who invest not only their time in our work, but more often than not even a personal (if not political) engagement in it. And as we reflect upon it, it might be interesting to further problematize this notion of collaboration.

In Marcus' writing (2009) the collaboration tends to be a heroic endeavor – one that seems to enshroud the anthropologist in an aura of generosity and openness. But collaborations can take different forms and be based on diverse premises. The work we do in Applied Cultural Analysis is at times very much in the spirit of applied anthropology in which problems are (at least initially) defined by clients, and the agenda of the research is steered by the parameters set by the client. Indeed, it is not uncommon to find research being presented to clients who then make demands that the results be reworked, or that the project be taken in a different direction. Based upon our own research experiences, those of our students, or tales from

the internet, it's apparent that this is an area of research that contains a wide flora of stories about the 'client from hell,' all of which speak to the darker side of ethnographic collaborations. There is a need to more thoroughly problematize the different forms and contexts in which collaborations may take place. To some extent it might be argued that applied cultural analysts who work for paying clients and are required to produce 'invested ethnographies' that are intended to meet clients' needs, are engaged in a special market bound form of collaboration. But invested ethnographies are not a phenomenon unique to market bound applied contexts; collaborations always involve vested interests, and while this might open for heroic ethnographic opportunities, it also beds for complex problems and continuous negotiations between ethnographically involved partners.

However, if we view our work through the prism of collaboration, there is reason for concern. All too often, the work ethnologists do ends and the collaborations we engage in, seem to end with the ethnographic text. A notion and intentional engagement with the spirit of "public anthropology" opens for other possibilities of going beyond the text and creating cultural and political change. But we wonder how this might be pushed further. In what ways can ethnography be invoked to engage with new publics and create new entanglements that challenge taken for granted perceptions of the cultural world around us, and which facilitate critical thinking in the process.

Cultural Analysis and processes of composition

In line with this, an important challenge which we believe applied cultural analysis must meet is one of moving ethnography from the world of text to a more multimodal set of practices. This requires a greater sensitivity to the contexts in which ethnography can be presented, as well as a realization that young scholars coming from diverse academic as well as cultural background bring with them a series of very different skills and experiences that need to be harnessed and steered in a productive direction. In order to facilitate this movement we have developed an approach to ethnography in which we frame it as a compositional practice as much as a scholarly orientation.

What does this mean? At a very trivial level it implies an emphasis on teaching students that methods cannot be separated from theory. They are entwined and must be taught, treated, and used as such. It's also based on a problematization of the processes of "writing". Over the

past four years we have been asking ourselves what ethnography beyond writing might be. It has been over 25 years since the launch of *Writing Culture*, the volume edited by James Clifford and George Marcus (1986), which coupled ethnography to the so called literary turn. In recent years the writing culture debates have been criticized as being too focused on textual analysis, and for having changed far too little in the manner in which ethnography is performed. In addition to this, it has also been argued that those debates did not sufficiently affect the forms through which cultural processes are represented (Zenker & Kumoll 2010; Marcus 2007).

In order to work in this direction and to push the potential ethnography has to touch and affect different audiences, we have argued for a need to approach and understand it as a series of compositional practices. (cf. O'Dell & Willim 2011 & 2013). Our experience is that applied cultural analysis has to engage to convince. It needs to connect to the senses in a very different way than the latest book from a "top university publisher." You cannot ignore the importance of text, or the form it should take in different contexts, but ethnography has to be considered more seriously as a multimodal process. Here, we are partly drawing on George Marcus' thoughts on intellectual montage. A few decades ago he argued for ways of coupling cinematic imaginations to ethnographic writing, and modernist sensibilities in ethnographic writing (1990). By discussing *intellectual montage*, a concept derived from filmmaker Sergei Eisenstein, he discussed experimental ethnography at the end of the 20th century and the uses of polyphony, fragmentation and reflexivity in writing. At the core of these experiments lay combinatory montage practices and creative juxtapositions. But his vision of intellectual montage does not go far enough. We need to jumble our metaphors more to re-imagine how we conceptualize ethnographic work. We think, all too often, of the formation of texts in terms of continuous 'rewriting', while the making of films involves cutting, splicing, and editing, and music may awake association to the layering and remixing of sound or even the looping of sound segments. How might we mix the practices from these different forms of creation and expression in order to think of ethnographies in terms of cutting, editing, mixing and layering as well as re-writing? Rather than viewing the realities that force many of us to conduct short stints of fieldwork to gather ethnographic materials as a weakness, it might be more productive to teach students that they can actually layer different types of materials and theoretical perspective as well as using previous encounters with the field as a point of departure for ongoing projects.

In moving in this direction, our ambition is to push the boundaries of how ethnography is and might be perceived at a time in which new forms of sensory, digital and multimodal ethnography are gaining attention and currency. As such it is a move that intends to push ethnologists and anthropologists from a frame of mind accustomed to regarding the ethnographic process in terms of *writing culture* to one that is prepared to test new avenues of *rendering culture*. Rendering focuses more on ethnography as a creative process than as a representational practice. Rendering also fits well with seeing ethnography as a multimodal practice. Here our thoughts resonate with the approach Phillip Vannini took in his book *Ferry Tales,* where he wrote that:

I am less interested in ethnographic representation than I am in ethnographic creation. (…) because research is more than representation, my writing and analysis aims less at explaining "findings" and more at rendition – aiming to create new stories, rather than replicate old ones (Vannini 2012: 28).

By using the concepts of composing ethnography and rendering culture we also address a number of changes to the micro-practices of ethnographic work. These changes have occurred subtly but surprisingly rapidly, and are the result of the integration of new ethnographic working tools like digital cameras, audio recorders and smart phones (which integrate a number of interfaces for capturing and processing information). These tools are now incorporated into many ethnographer's work practices. Parallel with this the computer has become the major working platform for ethnographic researchers, and a number of software tools and network services (like Google docs, Evernote, Endnote, RSS-readers, Facebook, Twitter, Academia.edu, Adobe's Creative suite and Apple's suite of software integrated through iCloud to just name a few) have been enmeshed in the micro-practices of ethnography. The plethora of tools available to ethnographers is changing rapidly, and as new ones are added to the toolbox, others are abandoned and forgotten. The implications these changes have for the practices of ethnography and cultural analysis is in need of further theoretical development and reflection.

The Loops and Rhythms of Composing Ethnography

Thinking of ethnography as a compositional practice allows us to accept cultural analytic practices as messy, non-linear, performances in which diverse bits and pieces of information are put together and moved around. As we see it, a problem with the traditional anthropological view of ethnographic practice is that it still creates an all too linear impression of how ethnographies are assembled: moving from the planning stages at the desk, to the extended period of fieldwork, and back to the desk for the write up.

As ethnologists, methodologically, our focus has seldom been on the immersive long period of fieldwork, so often evoked within departments of anthropology. Instead our methods have been characterized by a kind of bricolage approach. Where academic anthropologists generally regard ethnography as a means of studying other people over an extended period of time (Moeran 2005: 3), Swedish ethnology has increasingly aligned itself over the years with those who believe ethnography is best defined as a plurality of methods, better understood as "based on fieldwork using a variety of mainly (but not exclusively) qualitative research techniques" (Davies 2008: 5).

We have embraced ethnography through historically anchored fieldwork or serial forms of it rather than long periods of continuous fieldwork (cf. Bergquist and Svensson 1999; Ehn and Löfgren 2010). The shift towards serially organized fieldwork amongst ethnologists was in part facilitated by the fact that the demands placed on scholars studying their own cultural surroundings were different than those faced by scholars entering less familiar contexts (Labaree 2002; Öhlander 1999: 74f.). Where anthropologists worked to understand Others and make sense out of the different ways of life they observed, ethnologists usually engaged the ethnographic process by first attempting to exoticize the segments of Swedish daily life that they observed in order to distance themselves from it so as to then understand the practices they were observing, and the emotional impact it had upon them (Arnstberg 1997: 24; Ehn and Löfgren 2001).

From the perspective of anthropology, questions have arisen about the degree to which ethnography must be closely associated with participant observation (Sillitoe 2007: 156), and how long one actually has to work "in the field" for one's work to qualify as ethnography (Pink 2004:9; see also Coleman & Collins 2006; Faubion & Marcus 2009; Hirvi & Snellman 2012). As Sunderland and Denny have argued, 'We once bristled over short lengths because they conflicted with the assumption in anthropological research that understanding requires considerable time…//…yet we bristle less now… [due to] a realization and appreciation that

sometimes length does not matter' (2007: 267). Many of us working within ethnology were well accustomed to the idea of doing fast and dirty field work. A weekend at a car meet, a day at a boardroom meeting, or an afternoon at a horse race, these were all accepted ways of working. The short duration of the ethnographic fieldwork was not a problem in and of itself since it could be combined with a wider bricolage of materials and theoretical perspectives. In developing MACA the bricolage method of doing cultural analysis which we had developed in ethnology seemed to be not only a natural way of moving, but even a productive and good way of de-dramatizing notions of the exoticism of field encounters, and the appropriate length of fieldwork.

Our practices as ethnologists and our recent work with applied cultural analysis has moved us towards a methodological focus on *looping*. Composing ethnography means working in a manner akin to what Kim Fortun has urged us to engage in, an 'ethnography in late industrialism'. That is an:

> …ethnography that "loops", using ethnographic techniques to discern the discursive risks and gaps of a particular problem domain so that further ethnographic engagement in that domain is responsive and creative, provoking new articulations, attending to emergent realities. Ethnographic findings are thus fed back into ethnographic engagement. This mode of ethnography stages collaboration with interlocutors to activate new idioms and ways of engaging the world. It is activist, in a manner open to futures that cannot yet be imagined (Fortun 2012: 460).

The looping that Fortun mentions can be related to the activist strands she evokes. But it is occurring in a number of contexts. In the world of applied cultural analysis people are often conducting relatively short periods of ethnographic work for clients. They often let previous studies inform current and coming studies. Knowledge, experiences and findings are looped or reiterated between the projects conducted by ethnographic consultants.

Fortun is concerned with the manner in which ethnographic findings are fed back into ethnographic engagement. Through our engagement with applied cultural analysis, we have found numerous examples of similar practices amongst anthropologists and ethnologists working outside of academia. These are people who have often specialized their work in a limited number

of empirical areas. One practitioner, for example, is very adept at conducting cultural analysis of media and the manner in which they are used and perceived by people in the course of their daily lives. Another applied anthropologist emphasizes his skills in both the study of food and cell phones, while a third person is very focused upon issues of sustainability. Within these empirical areas their knowledge and findings were constantly being reiterated and looped.

In order to see this work as a compositional practice, however, we even want to stretch the idea of looping within ethnography to compare it to the practices of other creative work, like music making. When creating music with digital media the sound clip is a piece of sound that can be manipulated, stretched, layered and looped; the looped sound result in a pattern that can be altered through various subtle or more dramatic modulations. The addition of sound effects (like echoes, reverb, filters, etc.) can create surprises or different atmospheres. Here the process is proceeding through a continuous looping or feedback between actions, manipulations, thinking and analysis. This we argue, is essentially what we do as we sift our data through a variety of theoretical perspectives and continually work to help clients understand their products and services in new ways that they can in part recognize, but in part have never seen before. This is a way to look at research as not only a creative practice, but even one that acknowledges the possibility for ethnographic results, texts, and projects to be re-visited, re-worked and altered in form in order to connect with different publics as the material leading to a boardroom presentation might be reworked to fit an academic journal article, a community meeting, or an open public debate.

Tim Ingold has stressed that anthropology is a transformational practice, closely related to eg. art (see also Schneider and Wright 2013), which is a position that falls in line with our understanding of composition and rendition. He advocates practices that '...allow knowledge to grow from the crucible of our practical and observational engagements with the beings and things around us' (Ingold 2013: 6). He calls this an *art of inquiry*, through which '...the conduct of thought goes along with, and continually answers to, the fluxes and flows of the materials with which we work.' (ibid). In the loops of composing ethnography and rendering culture we, to use Ingold's words, do not just collect information about the world, instead we aim to better correspond with it (ibid:7).[2]

---

[2] Ingold has a discussion about the difference between anthropology and ethnography, through which he states that the former is transformational while the latter is documentary and descriptive. Anthropology is then according to

Multi-Targeted Ethnography

The composition of ethnography can lead to very different forms of 'deliverables' depending upon the context. Composing ethnography is not an activity done by academics *or* practitioners; it requires a relational appreciation of ethnography as being something which must take different forms and make use of different utterances in varied contexts. It requires a bricolage approach to the melding of analytical/theoretical perspectives with materials, but it also necessitates the development of performative techniques often not addressed in traditional anthropological courses: including, but not limited to the oral and visual skills needed to engage clients and communicate results, the ability to translate concepts and explanations in ways that make them relevant in different contexts, and a belief in the ability of cultural analysis to provide solutions (and in this way to provide deliverables that are more than just representations).

The movement towards a compositional ethnography is an intentional and explicit attempt to emphasize the manner in which ethnographic representations can be put together in very different ways to produce different understandings depending upon the requirements of the context at hand. Our own work spans the continuum from highly experimental artistic forms of digital representations (such as Willim's video projects *Fieldnotes* and *Imaginary Venues*) to more conventional documentary style ethnographic video, which is becoming an increasingly common mode of representation used by both students and scholars. But it also includes our participation in the production of twenty minute long 'popularly accessible' talks broadcast on national television, and engagement in events like 'Innovation camps' and 'knowledge slams' that throw academics, artists, local politicians and entrepreneurs into cocktail party like workshops and performances to stimulate dialogue and the sharing/development of ideas and innovations around specific themes. These can be encounters in which ethnographic video, sound recordings, slide shows and staged performances provide a backdrop for the conversation that develops. In many of these cases, the ethnographic presentation is part of a process of

---

him more future oriented and ethnography more oriented towards the past (describing what has happened). He build his argument partly on the etymological background of ethno*graphy* as based on the word graphia = 'description' (Ingold: 2013:4). However, when he later advocates a move from anthropology to the concept of anthropo*graphy* the lines become slightly blurred (ibid:129) Even if he refer to another kind of *drawn* writing when he coins the term anthropography the idea about ethnography as being something that is not transformational is not crystal clear. In our practices we consider both composing ethnography as well as applied cultural analysis to be practices which have the power to transform the world through more than description.

stimulating ideas and offering solutions as it moves through (and with the help of) very different aggregations of collaborators and vested interests.

Applied Cultural Analysis is evocative and multi-modal, it engages audiences in ways that go beyond the realm of the cerebral. To be convincing it has to make the self-apparent seem enticingly, or disturbingly new. Compositions have to engage the specific audience they are addressing. We are arguing that applied cultural analysis has to do the same. Where George Marcus helped us to re-think ethnography and fieldwork as a multi-sited practice, we are arguing for the need to even consider it in terms of *multi-targeted* renderings. Thinking in terms of targeted outcomes of ethnographic work is more processual, and as something which can be given, not only multiple forms, but even multiple directions, destinations and engagements. It also forces us to more exploratively consider how different ethnographic collaborations might be aligned as one targeted ethnographic rendition might inform, and shape another based upon the input and reaction, a rendering receives. Ethnography is not just something that takes place, nor is it is something which necessarily ends with the text and the author's voice, it is transformational, and something that has a direction, and thus should be understood as having a velocity. And at a time in which scholars in the humanities and social sciences are being challenged to explain in what ways their research is beneficial to society, a re-thinking of our work in terms of *multi-targeted ethnography,* forces us to actively think how ethnographic renderings can be composed and put together to reach out, challenge, and engage different audience. In so doing it also simultaneously forces us to actively reflect upon the mode(s) through which we choose to engage specific publics. This is not a move that denies the power of the written text, but one that reminds us of the potential for audio, video and other performative renderings of ethnography to affect audiences within academia, but perhaps more importantly, beyond academia.

In this vein, we are arguing that knowledge isn't static but is transformational, or at least should have the potential to be transformational. The role of the ethnographer is, as we see it, one of moving along with the processes of conducting research, in a compositional spirit that actively encourages and seek collaborations with others. But it is also one in which – in the name of collaboration – the ethnographer must be prepared to relinquish the driver's seat at times. The processes of composing ethnography have similarities to a number of other creative practices that can be likened to the making of a 'journey'. In Ingold's words '...knowing is a process of

active following, of *going along'* (Ingold 2013: 1). Within the rhythms and flows of projects knowledge is generated and renditions take form partly according to our scholarly intentions and plans but more often than not, through constant interactions with and adaptations to various changing conditions (cf Willim 2013).

Not all ethnographies are multi-targeted but we believe that we live in a time in which the targets of our ethnographies and the directions we give them will increasingly have to be taken into consideration. The point that we are trying to emphasize here is that composing ethnography requires us, in part, to continue to consciously push our work in different directions, and to different ends in the spirit of ethnology that has developed in Sweden since the 1970s, but it also, in part, challenges us to dare to move in different directions (and modal forms of rendering) than anthropologists and ethnologists have done before. Applied Cultural Analysts have to be highly competent writers. But they also have to train to present their work orally and visually in a manner that speaks to the specific client/audience in question. Thinking in terms of composing ethnography forces us to acknowledge that the 'representation of culture' is an important aspect of what we do, but what we do can be much more than this.

Notes and References

Arnstberg, Karl-Olov

1997 *Fältetnologi*. Stockholm Carlsson.

Bergquist, Magnus – Svensson, Birgitta

1999 *Metod och mine: Etnologiska tolkningar och rekonstruktioner*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Clifford, James – Marcus, George

This is a first draft of this paper which has been submitted to the journal, *Ethnologic Horizons*.

1986 *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*- Berkeley: University of California Press.

Coleman, Simon – Collins, Peter
2006 (Eds.), *Locating The Field. Space, Place and Context in Anthropology*. Oxford: Berg.

Daun, Åke
1970 *Upp till kamp i Bårskärsnäs: Ett etnologiskt studie av ett samhälle inför industrinedläggningen*. Stockholm: Prisma.

Davies, Charlotte
2008 *Reflexive Ethnography*. New York: Routledge.

Ehn, Billy – Löfgren, Orvar
1996 *Vardagslivets etnologi: Reflektioner kring en kulturvetenskap*. Stockholm: Natur och kultur.

2010 *The Secret World of Doing Nothing*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Faubion, James – Marcus, George
2009 *Fieldwork is not what it used to be : learning anthropology's method in a time of transition*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Fortun, Kim
2012 Ethnography in Late industrialism. *Cultural Anthropology, 27*(3), 446- 464.

Hirvi, Laura – Snellman, Hanna
2012 *Where is The Field? The Experience of Migration Viewed through the Prism of Ethnographic Fieldwork*. Helsinki: Studio Fennica Ethnologica.

Ingold, Tim

2013 *Making - Anthropology, Archaeology, Art and Architecture*. Oxon: Routledge.

Labaree, Robert

2002 The risk Of 'Going Observationalist': Negotiating the Hidden Dilemmas of Being an Insider Participant Observer. *Qualitative Research* 2(1):97-122.

Lassiter, Luke Eric

2005 Collaborative Ethnography and Public Anthropology. *Current Anthropology, 46*(1), 83-106.

Marcus, George

2007 Ethnography two Decades After Writing Culture: From the Experimental to the Baroque. *Anthropological Quarterly, 80*(4), 1127-1145.

Moeran, Brian

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

O'Dell, Tom

2009 What's the Use of Culture? *Culture Unbound* 1(1):15-29.

O'Dell, Tom – Willim, Robert

2011 Composing Ethnography. *Ethnologia Europaea, 41*(1), 26-39.

2013 Transcription and the Senses: Cultural Analysis When it Entails More than Words. *The Senses and Society, 8*(3), 314-334.

Pink, Sarah

2004 Applied Visual Anthropology Social Intervention, Visual Methodologies and Anthropology Theory. *Visual Anthropology Review* 20(1): 3-15.

Schneider, Arnd – Wright, Christopher (Eds.)'

This is a first draft of this paper which has been submitted to the journal, *Ethnologic Horizons*.

2013 *Anthropology and Art Practice*. Oxford: Bloomsbury.

Sillitoe, Paul
2007 Anthropologists only need apply: challenges of applied anthropology. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 13, 147-165.

Sunderland, Patricia – Denny, Rita
2007 *Doing Anthropology in Consumer Research*. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press.

Vannini, Phillip
2012 *Ferry Tales. Mobility, Place, and Time on Canada's West Coast*.   Oxon: Routledge.

Willim, Robert
2013 Out of Hand. Reflections on Elsewhereness. In A. Schneider & C. Wright (Eds.), *Anthropology and Art Practice*. Oxford: Bloomsbury.

Zenker, Olaf & Kumoll, Karsten (Eds.)
2010 *Beyond Writing Culture: Current Intersections of Epistemologies and Representational Practices*. Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Öhlander, Magnus
1999 Deltagande observation. In *Etnologiska fältarbete* ed. L. Kaijser & M. Öhlander, Lund: Studentlitteratur.