Construction and Change of Identity of an In-House Ethnographer: A Case of an Anthropologist Working in Japanese Industrial Laboratory

Tomoko Oto
KDDI Research, Inc.

In recent years, ethnography, which is a concept and methodology grounded in cultural anthropology, has spread in various business fields. However, the practice of ethnography in the business fields often confuses academic trained anthropologists, destabilizes identities and force changes. Japanese companies employ very few anthropologists as "anthropologist", thus the world is unaware of the difficulties faced by anthropologists employed in Japanese business fields. This paper is auto-ethnography of my experience of working at an industrial laboratory in Japan. This paper gives an account of the issues faced by anthropologists working in Japanese companies by the virtue of my experience.

Keywords: autoethnography, in-house ethnographer, intercultural adaptation

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, ethnography, which is a concept and methodology grounded in cultural anthropology, has spread in various academic and business fields (Ito 2016). In business, ethnography is used for the improvement and optimization of business operations and the derivation of concepts of product and service development (Ito 2017). In such situations, ethnography, which has been reconstructed by incorporating the essence of conventional ethnography, is used.

The relationship between anthropology and industry is nothing new. Ito describes relationship between anthropology and business in detail. According to Ito, an early example of the relationship between anthropology and industry in the United States is the Hawthorne research that was conducted in the 1920s and 1930s, in which the anthropologist Warner was also a participant. After that, industrial and business anthropologists and organizational anthropologists emerged in the United States in applied anthropology, with a central focus on Baba, and thus in the 1940s and 1950s, anthropologists were employed in companies. However, in the early 1950s, the relationship between business and anthropology became estranged due to the institutionalization of anthropology and the ethical factors involved in conducting research with the support of the government, and large companies, etc. In the mid-1980s, anthropologists have been reconnected to industry once more due to the anthropological institutionalization and the increase in the number of anthropology degrees holders in the United States. Anthropologists have entered the field of industrial design since the 1980s, as typified by Suchman's research at the Palo Alto Research Center (PARC) (Ito 2017). In addition, Norman advocated the idea of "human centered design" and pointed out the importance of designing mainly for human beings (Norman 1988).

So why has ethnography become popular in the business field in recent years? One of the reasons is that product function and UX (user experience) is becoming more important in service delivery. Companies need to investigate and understand their consumers and users, in more detail. Conventionally, user research was carried out using short-term interviews, and/or large-scale questionnaires. However, both the interview and the questionnaire are limited in that the user can only collect information that can be verbalized and only in fragmentary form. For this reason, ethnography was selected as a more suitable method for collecting in-depth data more closely related to the user's environment and from the user's point of view in terms of their unconscious behaviors, preferences, and potential needs. With this trend, in the United States, the employment of such experienced expert anthropologists is becoming increasingly common in government, businesses, and the non-profit sector, etc. (Jordan 2013). The results obtained by incorporating ethnographic practices in various industries have been reported in the Ethnographic Praxis in Industry Conference (EPIC) and similar events and publications, and many success stories have been noted.

In order to achieve the deep understanding of people, which is the demand of conventional ethnography, it is necessary to introduce some considerations of time-cost into the user research. However, those can be quite difficult to achieve in Japan. This is one of the reasons related to the employment of cultural anthropologists. In Japan while ethnographic methods are attracting attention, companies rarely employ anthropologists and trained experts as ethnographers. While it is standard practice in the United States to hire experts, in Japan, instead of employing an ethnographer, the practice is to hire one employee that "also" performs ethnography as required. Or in very few cases, companies develop ethnographic specialists within the organization with the cooperation of external experts.[1]

Some issues have been raised regarding the introduction of ethnography to corporations, in addition to the issue of "who" implements it as described above. For example, Ohara (2012) pointed out that, various restrictions are often imposed such as to prepare the protocol to be executed by the team in advance, along with the duration and the budget when performing ethnography in business settings. In this regard Jordan (2006) argues that long-term plans to change company culture will be necessary in order for a company's management and ethnographers to establish a good cooperative relationship. In other words, the deep human understanding requires a certain amount of time and money to be invested in the research, but in order to do so in a corporate organization, it is necessary to create an atmosphere in which the high-level with the authority to make decisions can accept the method. However, the current situation in Japan is not well prepared for it. As noted above, the very few instances of cultural anthropologists being employed as cultural anthropologists may also be a factor. Wherefore, anthropologists and trained professionals are required to switch to business-specific ethnography, which is different from conventional academia-specific ethnography, rather than changing an organization's mindset. For these reasons, various conflicts have arisen between companies and specialists trained in anthropology, and they are being forced to change their identities as "scholarly" anthropologists in Japan. However, few studies have focused on their psychological experiences, such as discomfort and conflicts, and the process of adaptation to the business field. Therefore, it is necessary to clarify issues at work faced by anthropologists in Japanese companies.

This paper presents the case of "I" who received research training in cultural anthropology, was hired by a corporate research laboratory (hereafter, Lab), and is conducting ethnography in the business field. This paper also clarifies my identity as an in-house ethnographer.

Autoethnography is the method adopted in this paper. "Autoethnography is one of the approaches that acknowledges and accommodates subjectivity, emotions, and the influence of researcher on research (Ellis et al. 2011, 274)." Autoethnography stands at the intersection of native anthropology, ethnic autobiography, and autobiographical ethnography (Reed and Deborah 1997, 2). As a method, "autoethnography combines the characteristics of autobiography and ethnography (Ellis et al. 2011, 275)," and an autoethnographer writes about and analyzes his/her own experiences recursively (Ellis et al. 2011, 274-276). In other words, autoethnography is not just an autobiography, but also an experimental approach that opens up the investigator's own experiences and feelings to others and actively incorporates them into ethnography. By adopting autoethnography, the visualization of emotions that can be expressed only by the parties is expected. In this paper, I use autoethnography to analyze my personal experience and to clarify the differences between a scholar's ethnography and a Japanese corporation's ethnography.

This paper is comprised of following sections. Section II presents previous studies on how people who come into contact with different cultures adapt to the environment. In Section III, my own autoethnography is written. The "I" depicted in this section is surprised and confused by the difference between conventional ethnography and ethnography in a business setting. In that situation, I identify my role and build my self-identity as an in-house ethnographer in that situation. In Section IV, I examine my experience based on the concept of intercultural adaptation.

ADAPTATION TO DIFFERENT CULTURES

This paper focuses on the field of business. Those who have studied in academia understand that the field of business is a totally different field. It is crucial for those who have entered the business from academia to adapt to this different culture. Adaptation to different cultures is called "intercultural adaptation". Intercultural adaptation "is a process that requires people to change their way of life and communication patterns in order to adjust to a new culture (Sawyer & Chen 2012, 154)." Intercultural adaptation is the process of not only contacting a different culture, but also bringing oneself closer to the modality of the culture. Thus, it is "also a time process (Lysgaard 1955, 49)." It is difficult for a person to quickly adapt to different environments. Therefore, it is considered that a person will gradually adapt to the culture through several stages. By adapting to different cultures, people are relieved of the anxiety, confusion, and irritation created by coming in contact to different cultures, and the stress caused by poor communication. Adler states that contact with different cultures is accompanied by a cultural shock. According to him, "In one sense, cultural shock is a form of alienation and in another sense, it suggests the attempt to comprehend, survive in, and grow through immersion in a second culture (Adler 1975, 14)." Going further, "adaptation" is also an important keyword for overcoming difficulties and individuals growing. Lysgaard interviewed 200 Norwegians who had stayed in the United States to analyze intercultural adaptation (Lysgaard 1955). According to Lysgaard, initially the people who contacted a different culture experience a stage full of 'adventurous' pleasures. Then, the pleasure diminishes and enters the crisis stage. People will hope for more intimate and personal contact and integration into the community. Finally, intimate relationships are formed within the community, and people experience a stage where they feel like a member of the community. Adler explains the process of intercultural adaptation in five stages: contact, disintegration, reintegration, autonomy, and independence (Adler 1975, 15-20). According to Alder (1975, 19), the final stage of Independence is when "Social, psychological, and cultural differences are accepted and enjoyed. The individual is capable of exercising choice and responsibility and able to create meaning for situations". If independence is a situation where people have adapted to different cultures, intercultural adaptation can be a state in which the understanding and acceptance of a different culture is made and one can feel the significance of the situation.

I was hired by an industrial laboratory in the summer of 2015 and experienced the intercultural contact, cultural shock, and adaptation. In the following section, through autoethnography, I will clarify the process of how one anthropological trained Japanese ethnographer ("I") gained the self-identity of an in-house ethnographer.

DISCOMFORT AND CONFUSION OVER DIFFERENCES IN METHODS

Learning Conventional Ethnography

In 2007, I entered graduate school in Ishikawa, Japan and learned the methods of ethnography in the laboratory of cultural anthropology for a period of 10 years. At that time, I was a complete beginner. Of course, the academic supervisor in charge imparted to me sufficient knowledge of anthropology. However, I had to conduct the study required for the ethnography by myself alone from the beginning because the academic supervisor did not accompany me to my field researches or interviews. Similarly, I also never went to the academic supervisor's place of research. As a result, I had to learn to perform ethnography by myself.[2]

In my case, I sought my own method of ethnography in reference to my bookish knowledge and my experience in the laboratory. Later, I found a basic style of ethnography. For example, the ethnographer participates for a long time in the field, builds a rapport with the people living in the field, and records it using media such as IC recorders and cameras, and then writes field notes. However, at the beginning, I didn't know how to write field notes or conduct interviews. I also didn't even know what to observe, or what to look out for. In addition, I was so intent on listening to an interviewee's story that I often forgot to take notes or forgot to ask necessary questions. Through these experiences, I was able to build my own method of performing research. In 2015, when I began to understand cultural anthropological research methods, I joined the KDDI R&D Laboratories, Inc. as a post-doctoral anthropologist.[3]

The place of acquiring expertise through participation is called "the community of practice" (Lave & Wenger 1991), thus the laboratory in graduate school to which I belonged was a community of practice. There, students first begin by reading previous classic studies and learn basic knowledge of anthropology and ethnographic skills. Then, by performing activities, such as writing a dissertation or presenting results of research at an academic conference, the role shifts from that of a newcomer who does not know anything to that of a member of the laboratory and a member of the academic field. I was educated by my academic supervisor, gained research experience, and presented at academic conferences to establish my role and identity as a cultural anthropologist or ethnographer from those who had no experience of cultural anthropology. In other words, my identity as an ethnographer was inseparable from my own research practices in the academic manner.

Crisis Regarding Research in the Lab

My job at the Lab was to understand people (consumers). When I joined the Lab, I was a member of the project of the Lab for understanding consumers. The project consisted of several teams and I belonged to "community team". The team's mission was to clarify how mothers and fathers raising children are building networks with the community and maintaining and expanding that community. I was excited that I could use what I had learned in academia for business. It was a new environment and a new work with new colleagues. How wonderful! On the first-day, my boss explained to me my work profile and then introduced me to a team member. There were five members of the team, including me. The members were experts in psychology or information engineering. We introduced ourselves and talked about what type of research we had conducted so far. After a while, my boss asked me to do research with the project members and to write papers with them. I was confused. What does "with them" mean? Isn't the research usually conducted alone? Isn't the paper usually written alone? Can I write a paper with members from different specialties?

As the research actually began, my confusion and anxiety deepened. In November 2015, the team had a meeting on the research. Two strange women who were not members of the Lab. were present at the meeting. The boss introduced me to them. They were from an external research company. In the meeting, they discussed how to proceed with the research. I was even more confused by their discussion. For example, the following points confused me. (1) A team is created with members of the Lab. and members of external research companies to conduct research. The methods of cultural anthropology that I have learned were based on the premise of conducting research alone. Also, even though a few people have gone into the same field, I have never formed a research team with "outsiders" who have never studied cultural anthropology and have done research and analysis together. (2) They assume a two-hour home visit is one of an ethnographic research. Conventional ethnography involves long-term participant observation, building rapport with people living in the field, and gathering information. However, in business, their research is completed in an extremely short time. And, while empathy for the target audience is considered important, there is less emphasis on rapport. (3) Members of an external research company lead the entire research. In cultural anthropology, the investigators themselves basically lead the investigation. However, in businesses, external research company may decide how many people to interview and even which fields to target. In addition, in order to prevent any trouble between the client and the interviewee, the external research company is in charge of contacting the interviewee. (4) In an actual interview, work is divided (e.g. interviewer, memo, and photographer). On the other hand, in conventional ethnography, a single investigator interviews and audio or video records. (5) The research team will complete all work, including research designing, interviewing, analyzing, and producing the output (report), in a predetermined number of days. In business, the number of interviewees, the time of the interview, the location of the research, and the number of interviews are strictly determined. It is difficult to freely increase or decrease the number of additional researches and interviewees that are not in the plan. This is because the external research company, which manages the entire research, determines the management costs of the research in the contents above and contracts with the client on the basis of that determination. As a result, the research in business is less liberal when compared to research in academia. (6) The output is prepared by an external research company. In academia, the outputs are written by a researcher.

I thought it was very different to my expectations. The approach was very different from the ethnographic method that I used to learn and practice in academia. I conducted the research with the team members. However, at that time I couldn't fulfill my role in the research. One of the team members asked me to share my memos after my first research in the Lab. was completed. I felt anxiety and a sense of crisis. I interpreted memos as field notes; I thought memos (field notes) were extremely personal and not meant to be shared with anyone. However, other members thought it natural to share memos with each other. Eventually, I took out only the good parts of my field notes, made new notes, and shared the data with my team. I later learned that memos did not mean field notes. It was meant to be the paper that wrote down what the interviewee said. Memos can be helpful when transcribing the conversation in interview. In other words, I was mistaken that I thought the memos as field notes. However, in my research so far, I have never shared my written memos (field notes) with anyone. Therefore, I felt a great resistance to hand over my memos to anyone else.

A few days later, a workshop was held to analyze the interview. An external research company provided all the documents required for the analysis. Members asked me to comment on the analysis from the perspective of an anthropologist. What is the perspective of an anthropologist? I didn't understand what was expected from me. One member of the external research company brought me a transcription of the interview. After she read the entire record of the interview, she asked the other members for their opinions. Members remarked on what they had gained from the interview. Surprisingly, there was little discussion about previous research.

The research I have experienced in academia has consisted of first conducting a literature search of prior studies, then setting my own themes, and actually conducting research and analyses. For this reason, my research and analysis in academia emphasized the differences between previous studies and new findings. However, this workshop did not address the academic novelty or uniqueness of the study. This workshop discussed the insights that could lead to the development of products and services. Everything was completely different from my experience so far in academia! I was shocked. Despite my confusion, the workshop ended. A few weeks later, a thick report with over 100 pages was emailed from the external research company and the report was made with the Microsoft PowerPoint.

Understanding the Context of Business

Although I believed that I had been hired as a post-doctoral anthropologist, I could not recognize the ethnography experienced in business as ethnography. I felt that “their ethnography is not right”. At the same time, I felt I was not making useful contributions as an ethnographer for business. I was confused and disgusted. In particular, I was frustrated by the fact that the interviews and the report were mainly prepared by an external research company. I felt as if my important work had been negated. I consulted a female member on the same team. I asked her, “How do other research experts conduct research?” Her answer “You are the only ethnographer at this laboratory” shocked me. She then asked me to teach them the correct method of ethnography. In my opinion, this was impossible because the environment for conducting ethnography was just too different. In academia, researchers go into the field alone, collect data in the field over a long period of time, and value the rapport with the people who live in the field. For me, this was "right" ethnography for me. However, in the Lab, the team conducts research and analysis in a very short period of time and is in contact with the interviewee only for two hours. I thought that the method of ethnography in academia could not be used directly in business because the differences between the ethnography in academia and the ethnography in business were just too vast. Table 1 shows the differences of ethnography between academia and business.

TABLE 1
DIFFERENCES ETHNOGRAPHY BETWEEN ACADEMIC AND BUSINESS

	Academia	Business
Aim	The aim is to obtain an output with new findings that contributes to academia.	The aim is to obtain outputs that contribute to businesses.
Awareness of research period and budget	Researchers are not (ideally) aware of the study period.	Researchers are very conscious of the research period and budget.
The choice of informants and themes	It depends on the researcher.	It depends on what the team agrees and the nature of the business.
Research scope	Conduct holistic research and analysis. Involving not only individuals, but also networks, cultures, and societies surrounded by the individuals.	Conduct research and analysis focusing on the behavior and consciousness of individuals and/or network.

In business, the profit of the company is required. For this reason, research is also required to produce output that can contribute to the company. Ethnographical research in the Lab. is typically carried out over very short time periods, just like the qualitative research conducted in other companies. In conventional ethnographical research, studies are normally long-term (sometimes as long as several years), but in the companies, researches are completed in about three months[4]. The style of short-term research found in such companies is closely related to the corporate culture that requires results at managerial periods, such as every 3 or 6 months. Such temporal constraints can make it difficult to derive in-depth insights; however, it is not always easy to help this situation in the Lab. For example, the Lab. has introduced a target management system. The target is determined in coordination with the leader of the project or team and it must include detailed targets such as how many papers to publish. The degree of achievement of this target is linked with personnel evaluation rating and salary. Furthermore, individual achievements lead to results for the entire group and the entire department. In other words, at the Lab., the deadline within which results have to be produced is always set in advance, and the research plan created is designed to meet the deadline. Therefore, it is necessary for researchers to carefully manage the amount of time and resources allocated for ethnographical research so that everything can be completed within the allocated period. Details will be described below, in these cases, many of them have hired external research company that specializes in qualitative research to manage their research. Then, under the control of external research company, they aim to complete the investigation on time.

Next, it is about cost. Since the budget plan is typically set up in the previous year and the research plan is carried out according to the budget, it is difficult to make a large budget change or increase the budget while conducting the research[5]. As noted above, while it is often impossible to qualitatively address these constraints in the Lab., a company may still be able to carry out their research and analysis obligations efficiently and smoothly by “buying” the required knowledge and experience with methods of qualitative research by employing much external help. This reflects the culture of the Lab. That “If something are missing, we can buy from an external source”. In the Lab., researchers are always conscious of the cost. Therefore, when they compare the time expended and the costs incurred for nurturing ethnography experts internally with the cost of importing ethnography knowledge from the outside, the option of importing ethnography knowledge externally may seem preferable. Academia has been de-temporalized. What is required is an agile response in the field, a rapport-based relationship that is completed between the informants and the investigator. However, in business, an external research company is sandwiched between the subject and the investigator, and any individual behavior that is not written in the researcher’s contract is outside the contract. And the external research company loses control over the entire research. Companies cannot report the results of the research unless they are completed within the period. The company may think that it is better to collaborate with an external research company specializing in qualitative research to ensure that results are produced within the required time period, rather than investigating the topic themselves after spending much time learning about ethnography. Therefore, when planning a qualitative research project at the Lab., it is often assumed that an external research company will also be involved. The process of research adopted in the Lab. is as shown in Table 2. As shown in table 2, many parts of the research process involve external research company.

TABLE 2
THE QUALITATIVE RESEARCH PROCESS IN THE LAB AND THE PARTICIPATION OF AN EXTERNAL RESEARCH COMPANY

Process of the qualitative research	Involvement of research company
Securing research budget	
Determining specifications	
Meeting with an external research company	●
Decision regarding involvement of the research company	
Meeting with an external research company	●
Start recruiting informants	●
Select informants	●
Adjusting research schedule	●
Allocating preliminary tasks	●
Sharing the results of preliminary tasks with members	●
Conducting research	●
Sharing and analyzing data	●
Writing report (completed)	●

Conventional academic ethnographic research is carried out by a single researcher who is familiar with the field under research and gathers diverse and abundant data while building rapport with local informants by means of long-term observation, and then develops a holistic description based on multiple perspectives. However, in the Lab, it is difficult to conduct a single research project for a long period of time due to management constraints and time constraints regarding the progress of the entire project. Furthermore, since not all members have necessarily received training in ethnography, it is difficult to analyze the phenomena from multiple perspectives. Therefore, in the Lab., researchers try to acquire efficient data and share information in a short time by forming a team of several people including members of an external research company. In addition, by having multiple people perform the analysis, it is possible to analyze a phenomenon from multiple perspectives. In this way, events can be analyzed by "multiple eyes" (multiple people), in an attempt to reproduce something closely resembling the expert skills only obtained otherwise through long-term training.

Recognizing the Role

After several researches, I understood the meaning of a short research period and the need for multiple people to investigate. The ethnography in the Lab was created by adjusting research plans between the desire to understand people deeply and the reality of limited time constraints. Therefore, what can I do? What is my role? I was convinced that there was no need for a role that inflicts conventional academic methods on members. I felt that my role was to bring their research closer to anthropology. In other words, I felt it was necessary to bridge anthropology with research in the Lab. For that, I was convinced that I needed to change my identity from that in academia. As seen above, companies have made various efforts to get to know people deeply. In conventional academic ethnography, rapports with informants are formed through long-term participant observation and various and large amounts of data are acquired. On the other hand, in business, it is impossible to continue participating in a single survey for a long period of time. Therefore, roles are assigned among members so that a large amount of data can be obtained in a short time. Moreover, in conventional academic ethnography, a single ethnographer who is familiar with the field of interest analyzes the event from a compound perspective. However, in business, not all members have a background of cultural anthropology. They have not been trained to analyze events with a compound perspective. Therefore, they create a team to analyze events with multiple eyes. This gave me hope for ethnography other than conventional academic ethnography. Also, their analysis was not always related to previous studies, but had a sufficient number of insights to contribute to anthropology.

After a year, the boss said, "We have been conducting various forms of ethnography. But we don't have a place to announce our achievements." I rejoiced as I thought I could now fulfill my role as a "bridge." Immediately, I reported the results of any interesting academic findings at conferences. During that process, I was able to communicate with the members and have a good relationship. I found my role as an in-house ethnographer in connecting team output and anthropology, that is, sharing every data, follow-ups on observations that are likely to be missed by interviews alone, providing a cultural anthropological perspective, and reporting the achievements to the academia. That attempt seems to be working well for now.

I also found my role in their experiment of introducing new technologies into the investigation. Currently, they are trying to bring new technologies such as Virtual Reality technology to ethnography. They are using virtual reality technology to recreate the footage that their members recorded in the field. This is so that members who were not able to go on the research can relive the field as their sense of it. They have asked me for an expert opinion. I gladly accepted the offer. We had many discussions and experiments. We found some technical improvements in current virtual reality technology, such as the inability to replicate the sensations that ethnographers feel in the field, and the inability to record the length of time needed in the field. I have found these jobs to be very valuable. This is because through discussion, I can reflect the academic knowledge of anthropology in ethnographic investigations in business, and moreover, I can try out new technologies being explored in the field of business to conventional ethnography. Even in this work, I felt that I could serve as a bridge between academia and business.

CONCLUSION

As mentioned above, my auto-ethnography on the process of transferring from academia into business and becoming an in-house ethnographer was full of confusion. I was confused that the academic and conventional ethnographic methods I had used so far weren't working in the business field. And I learned new ways of ethnography in business field, and built self-identity as an in-house ethnographer.

In Section III, I was drawn to a research institute, thinking that I could use what I learned in the academic world for business. During this period of 'adventurous' pleasures, everything was interesting. However, this period was very short. At the stage of performing ethnography, I felt a sense of crisis at the discrepancy between the way I learned and the method in the business field. This was a cultural shock that occurred due to the difference from the culture in which I had learned. For academic cultural anthropologists, the method of ethnography is fundamental for shaping the identity of cultural anthropologists. "I" felt as if I had lost position as a cultural anthropologist; I felt a sense of crisis and was confused. According to Malinowski (1922), the conventional ethnography is based on a method that involves long-term participation and observation by a single investigator, and those who study cultural anthropology learn the method and philosophy, which involves going to a research and creating ethnography as output. By repeating that experience, students gain their identity as an ethnographer. I was like that in academia. However, in a business field, these methods cannot be used, and "I" loses confidence as an ethnographer. I had to figure out the status quo and work hard to be part of the team/project member to restore my self-esteem. As a result, by clarifying the reality of ethnography in the Lab, finding the gaps that I needed, and acting as a cultural anthropologist in the limited space, I created meaning for situations in the Lab.

As pointed out by Sawyer and Chen (2012) and Lysgaard (1955), intercultural adaptation is a process and people encounter crisis many times in the process leading up to adaptation. Moreover, by adapting instead of running away from crisis, people can find their position in a different culture and also reflect themselves in their own culture. In the process of building my identity as an in-house ethnographer, I have repeatedly identified the conflict between conventional and ethnographic methods in business setting in long and short term or in single and in team. Is either of these right or wrong? I consider them all ethnographic possibilities. These variations of ethnography are not only found in the business field. Influenced by the writing culture (Clifford and Marcus 1986), in academia there are also moves to collaborate, such as team ethnography and action research. Careful observation and discussion of these events will probably relate the traditional ethnography of cultural anthropology. It can lead to an examination of the variability of anthropology. At the same time, it raises the limits and extensions of conventional ethnography. Considering how anthropologist can contribute to the business field will become even more important in the future.

ENDNOTES

1. For example, at Fujitsu, "cooperation with anthropologists is used to define work procedures and standardize output," and to "introduce engineering ideas" (Kishimoto et al. 2009). This "Engineering of Ethnography" approach has already been applied to more than 50 client companies, and more than 400 people have undergone internal training (Kishimoto et al. 2009, Ikeya et al. 2007).
2. Apparently, this was something that not only I, but also many cultural anthropologists experienced during their student days. One of my anthropologist acquaintances told me: "I understand what you're saying. I never learned ethnography from my academic supervisor too, so I'm not confident that my method of ethnography is right". Another anthropologist said, "That's true. Me too. We don't attend another anthropologist's research and share each other's field notes. Perhaps we all perform ethnography differently".
3. KDDI Research is a research institute mainly engaged in research and development of information and communication technologies. The main business domain is mobile communications. As of April 1, 2019, the company employs 301 employees and its research activities range from fundamental to applied research about telecommunications technology.

4. Kimura et al. (2017, 7) pointed out "Because speed is required as a company, cost and time are often prioritized according to the requirements of the project rather than the need to obtain essential facts".
5. Conversely, it can be said that there is an advantage that a certain amount of budget can be secured systematically.

REFERENCES

Adler, P. S. 1975. "The transitional experience: An alternative view of culture shock." *Journal of Humanistic Psychology* 15 (4):13–23.

Clifford, J. and G.E. Marcus, eds. 1986. *Writing culture: The poetics and politics of ethnography.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Ellis, C., Adams, T.E., and Bochner, A.P. (2011). Autoethnography: An Overview. Special issue: Conventions and Institutions from a Historical Perspective / Konventionen und Institutionen in historischer Perspektive, *Historical Social Research / Historische Sozialforschung*, 36(4), 273 – 290.

Ikeya, N., Vinkhuyzen, E., Whalen, J. and Y. Yamauchi. 2007. "Teaching organizational ethnography." *Ethnographic Praxis in Industry Conference Proceedings* 1: 270–282.

Ito, Y. 2016. " 'Ethnography' in Japanese Corporate Activities: A Meta-anthropological Observation on the Relationship Between Anthropology and the Outside." In *Enterprise as an Instrument of Civilization: An Anthropological Approach to Business Administration*, edited by Nakamaki, H., Hioki, K., Mitsui, I. and Y. Takeuchi, 55–72. Springer. Ito, Y. 2017. "Ethnography wo jissensurukoto no kanousei: bunkajinruigaku no shikaku to houhouron wo jitsumu n iikasu(Exploring the possibilities of 'doing ethnography' in industry: Utilizing anthropological perspectives and methodologies for business purposes in Japan) (in Japanese)." *Organizational science* 51 (1): 30–45.

Jordan, B. and B. Dalal. 2006. "Persuasive Encounters: Ethnography in the Corporation." *Field Methods* 18 (4): 359–381.

Jordan, B. 2013. *Advancing Ethnography in a Company Environment: Challenges and Emerging Opportunities Challenges and Emerging Opportunities*. Walnut Creek, United State: Left Coast Press Inc.

Kimura, A., Akasaka, F., Kusano K., Katagiri, Y. and A. Nakane. 2017. "Seikatsusya to kigyou no servicekyousou ni muketa ichikentou: ethnographic approach kousatu wo fumaeta living lab (A study of service co-creation between citizens and companies: living lab based on discussions of ethnographic approach) (in Japanese)." C*orrespondences on human interface* 19 (9): 7–12.

Kishimoto, K., Terasawa, M. and S. Hirata. 2009. "Innovation of working style through business ethnography and organizational monitor." *Fujitsu Scientific and Technical Journal* 46 (2): 199–208.

Lave, J. and E. Wenger. 1991. *Situated Learning: Legitimate peripheral Participation.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lysgaard, S. 1955. "Adjustment in a foreign society: Norwegian Fulbright grantees visiting the United States." *International Social Science Bulletin* 7: 45–51.

Malinowski, B. 1922. *Argonauts of the Western Pacific.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Norman, D. 1988. *The Psychology Of Everyday Things.* New York, USA: Basic Books Inc.

Ohara, S. 2012. "Kansatsu・ethnography no seihinkaihatsu heno ouyou (Application of observation and ethnography to new product development)(in Japanese)." *The Doshisha Business Review* 63 (5): 879–891.

Reed, D. and E. Deborah. 1997. *Auto/Ethnography: Rewriting the Self and the Social* (pp.1–17) Oxford, BERG.

Sawyer, R. and G.M. Chen. 2012. "The impact of social media on intercultural adaptation." *Intercultural Communication Studies* 21 (2): 151–169.