ETHNOGRAPHY MANUAL FOR LEADERSHIP STUDY

Michael Agar
Ethknoworks
Box 5408
Takoma Park MD 20913
Phone 301-270-4849
Fax 301-270-1438
email magar@bss1.umd.edu

NOTE TO THE READER: This manual is written to guide CCI's in a focused ethnographic inquiry into the concepts of "leader" and "leadership" in their home territory. We are distributing it now so that CCI's have a chance to look it over, try it out, and raise questions about it when we all meet in Calgary. (I would also be delighted to hear from any CCI before then, if he/she has comments). It is, at this stage, an advanced draft copy--I expect some changes will be made after we discuss it. Jeff Thomas, a graduate student in Business and Management at the University of Maryland, is now working on a pilot study to test out the design. Both Jeff and Bob House have helped me out with the manual, and I thank them for their good comments and advice. In a couple of places I use some material from a new book, Language Shock: Understanding the Culture of Conversation, published by Wm. Morrow, but even that material has been reworked for our purposes.

In any study that crosses national and cultural boundaries, a classic problem always occurs. It occurs because a particular community is to some extent always unique, but also, to some extent, comparable to others. On the one hand, researchers want definitions and questions so that different communities can be compared with each other. On the other hand, each community, each language, each culture, carries with it a particular way of seeing and doing things, a way that may not fit with those definitions and questions. Usually a researcher either chooses standardization and neglects local differences, or celebrates the unique features of a particular group without worrying much about comparison and generalization.

In this study, we're going to try for the best of both worlds. At the end of the study, we want to be able to talk, <u>in general</u>, about leadership, about what it is that makes for good leaders, wherever they might be. At the same time, we want to be able to talk about how leaders develop and work in particular circumstances, to show how leaders cast general principles creatively into local cultural shape.

The major part of the leadership study, the part that CCI's have spent most of their time on so far, builds on traditional methods of deductive, quantitative research, the kind of research that the CCI was probably trained to do. However, we're going to add some <u>ethnographic methods</u> into the research recipe so that issues of <u>local context</u> and <u>meaning</u> will add spice to the study as well. The purpose of this manual, then, is to introduce some ethnographic methods that will be suitable to the task.

More than this, though, the manual aims to show the CCI how to <u>think</u> ethnographically. Ethnography is a different kind of research process with a different kind of research logic. It is bottom-up rather than top-down. It emphasizes discovery of a different point of view rather than a structured test of some aspect of a general hypothesis. The two kinds of research--ethnography and hypothesis-testing--are often at odds with each other because of such differences.

We want to use the differences to create interesting and challenging issues in the cross-cultural study of leadership. We want the general theoretical categories to be challenged by local contexts and meanings in which leadership takes shape, and we want the local contexts and meanings to be challenged by the need to compare leadership in different countries, to generalize to what holds true about leadership wherever it is practiced. As a group we will work out and discuss and fine tune this strategy as the study progresses. In this sense, the study will make a significant methodological contribution as well as a substantive one. It won't always be easy, but it will always be interesting.

I'm asking a lot of the CCI's. Combining the two methods isn't so easy. Ethnography asks you to shift gears, to think differently about collecting and analyzing data. When you interview, you care less about asking a list of specific questions. Instead, you invite the interviewee to talk about the topic in whatever way he/she chooses and then mostly listen. The more the interviewee talks, the better the interview. And when you analyze the data, you worry less about how the interviewee's discussion maps onto the study variables; instead, you worry more about what concepts the interviewee used--whether they resemble the study variables or not--to present what it is he/she had to say. The ethnographic approach, in short, sets out to learn how the interviewee thinks about leadership. Only later does it ask how the interviewee's natural way of thinking and talking about leadership relates to the study variables.

The Study Variables

The leadership study rests on several key "dimensions of cultural values." They are: Individualism vs. Collectivism, Masculinity vs. Femininity, Tolerance vs. Intolerance of Uncertainty, Power Stratification vs. Power Equalization, Humanistic vs. Impersonal Orientation, Achievement Orientation, and Future vs. Present Orientation.

The main part of the leadership study uses the tools of hypothesis-testing methodologies. Questions are constructed that operationalize the dimensions. Questions go into questionnaires that will in turn be administered to a sample of managers, so that leaders can be characterized in terms of their scores on the different dimensions.

The ethnographic data will make use of the dimensions as well, but in this case their use will be different. Ethnographic data, of the sort to be described in the manual, are <u>not</u> structured by the dimensions <u>before the fact</u>. Actually, it's the other way around. Ethnographic methods are designed to obtain data that have been produced for reasons <u>unrelated</u> to the variables a researcher might have in mind. As you will see later in the manual, the methods ask people to talk about what the word "leader" means, to tell stories about what leaders do, and to describe the industries in which they work.

The difference here is essential to an understanding of the role the two kinds of data will play in the study. In the hypothesis-testing part, the <u>dimensions</u>, like individual vs. collective and the rest, <u>shape the questions we ask</u>. In the ethnography part, the <u>data</u>, like how people define leadership and what stories they tell about leaders, <u>shape the questions we will ask</u>. The interesting challenge for this study, for this group, is, at what point do the two sets of questions come together? Sometimes they will come together quite easily; sometimes there will be problems; sometimes differences between the two sets of questions will open up into a grand difference that will show us where the theory needs modification.

This is such an important difference that it is worth saying it another way. The study variables are where the two kinds of data, questionnaire and ethnographic, will meet. But the roads to the meeting place are very different. With the questionnaire, the study variables are the guide to the territory. They shape how we investigate leadership, right from the start. But with the ethnographic data, the study variables are the destination, not the guide to start us on our journey. Instead, we start the journey on a road we don't know, one for which we don't have a map, and we do it by asking a "local guide" to show us the way. Even if we think we know the road, we suspend our judgement and put ourselves in the role of student or apprentice traveler. Once we've learned the road, <u>then</u> we step back and look at the study variables. We say, "here's a <u>general</u> guide to the territory, and here's what we've learned about this <u>particular</u> territory. Now what do the general guide and our newly won local knowledge have to do with each other?"

Here's the general strategy we'll use to push the ethnographic data in the direction of the study variables, once those data have been gathered and analyzed. As you analyze the data, as described later in the manual, the first and most important question to ask is, <u>what sort of concepts are necessary to understand leadership as people have presented it to you?</u> Our working assumption is that the concepts to handle leadership in that language will be unique, to some extent. If that's true, then we want the ethnographic data to show that uniqueness.

But once you've done that, the ethnographic results will be connected to the study variables. The assumption here is that the variables are relevant to leadership everywhere, so they should help us understand leadership wherever we look. If that's true, then <u>the dimensions should be related to the local concepts that result from the ethnographic analysis</u>. In other words, after you analyze the way people define leadership, and the stories they tell about leaders, the dimensions should be relevant. You should be able to point to some part of the analysis and show, for example, how leadership involves more of an individualistic, or masculine, or uncertainty tolerant, or power stratified, or humanistic, or high achievement, or future orientation. We expect the dimensions to work on ethnographic data relevant to leadership that was produced <u>without</u> those dimensions guiding the question.

The purpose of the ethnographic data, then, is to test the study variables against local context and meaning. Where the variables apply, we'll have a powerful demonstration of their general validity. Where they don't apply, we want to figure out why and think about how a general theory of leadership might change to accomodate the context and meaning in the country that produced the complications.

Any number of potential problems might be produced, and here the emphasis is on "might." The purpose of the ethnography is to evaluate the dimensions against local situations that didn't come about in terms of the dimensions in the first place. Sometimes the evaluations will go rather well; sometimes there will be some minor problems that are easy to repair; sometimes problems may be more intellectually challenging, indicating a poor fit between a country and the dimensions, something that might pose major questions that the theory must address. Only time will tell.

This way of thinking about general variables, I should tell you, is typical of how ethnographers handle theory. An ethnographer always starts with some categories, but then he/she challenges them against his/her understanding of what people are doing in specific situations. Typically the categories are revised and reorganized by the end of an ethnographic study. One parable we use to show how this works is a world-wide cruise in a wood sailboat. One leaves to sail around the world in a wooden boat. As any of you know who are familiar with wooden vessels, different parts of the boat will deteriorate under harsh sea conditions so that one will have to replace things continuously. By the end of two years, when our sailors return to home port, they've repaired and replaced a number of things, but they're <u>still</u> in a wood boat, and they're <u>still</u> sailing. That's how ethnographic research works.

What we're trying to do here is really innovative. In the literature of American anthropology, the problem of <u>comparison</u> and <u>description</u> is frequently discussed. Anthropologists want a language that lets them <u>describe</u> the unique characteristics of a particular situation, while at the same time <u>comparing</u> different situations so that more general theoretical statements can be derived. Within anthropology, we talk about how we're good at description, but weak at comparison. On the other hand, hypothesis- testing research is good at comparison, but weak on description.

If our use of the two kinds of data works out, we may figure out how to use both kinds of data, in the same study, to set up a kind of conversation, a dialectic, between them. The ethnographic data should challenge, complicate, and enrich the quantitative data, and ultimately challenge, complicate, and enrich the general theory of leadership that we are developing as an international team. The end result should be some new ways of thinking about leadership in international perspective that simply didn't exist when the study began.

Ethnography

Now I want to offer a sketch of ethnography that elaborates on the wood boat story I just told. Ethnography, the former province of anthropologists and sociologists, is now discussed and used in several fields. The reasons for the shift are numerous, but many of them boil down to a simple pair of questions--"Who are these people and what are they doing?" My guess is that in a time of dramatic and continual change, a time when organizations and institutions become unsure of the nature of the world and their role in it, ethnography looks like a useful way to find some answers, because it features discovery and learning of other human perspectives and ways of living.

In this section I'd like to introduce ethnography as a research mode, one that differs from, but does not substitute for, the tradition of quantitative hypothesis testing. The introduction will leave you with a sense of ethnographic research, its unique strengths and weaknesses, and the kinds of questions it is best designed to answer.

This manual will not turn the reader into an ethnographer. Alternative research implies alternative epistemology and methodology. For that, as for any research expertise, one needs some training, some apprenticeship, and some experience. (James Spradley's two books, Participant Observation (1980) and The Ethnographic Interview (1979), are good introductions to the method.) But, if I do my job, this manual will turn the reader into a member of the growing interdisciplinary group who work to integrate qualitative and quantitative methods to create a study that is greater than the sum of its methodological parts.

First of all, I'll tell a story about an ethnographic study in a South Indian village, a story that exemplifies old style cultural anthropology. Sometimes people who work in modern societies ask why a story from an "exotic" setting should be used for the purpose. The reason is that an account from a society "distant" from that of the writer will make the fundamentals clearer, fundamentals that will then be seen to apply in one's home society as well. The story will develop into a parable of several key characteristics of ethnography, characteristics that will be contrasted with the "received view," the deductive, quantitative test of hypotheses that is the normal model of social research.

So bear with me. You may wonder why you're hearing about an event in a traditional village rather than the life of a modern manager, but experience has taught me that this particular story, with its focus on a particular incident that looks trivial at first glance, serves as a powerful introduction to those new to ethnography. Besides, my guess is that this voyage into what for most CCI's is new territory will go more smoothly if we step--for awhile, anyway--outside the topics that they concern themselves with every day.

The Old Days

Years ago I lived in a South Indian village as a student, learning old fashioned anthropology, by which I mean that an ethnographer--usually from America or Europe--lived in an isolated third-world community with the goal of learning how people talk, what they believe, and what they do all day.

I was about to leave the village at midday and walk to another village about three miles away. The cook packed a lunch for me to take on the road. He stacked a few flat breads on a cloth that looked like a red bandana, with some spinach-like vegetable spread in between. Just before he tied the cloth closed to make a package I could carry, he placed a small lump of charcoal on top.

Many readers would have had the same reaction I did, a massive "huh?"--

a reaction born of witnessing something that simply made no sense. Charcoal on top of lunch? Whatever for? I knew what charcoal was, but nothing in my ideas about how the world worked could explain what had just happened. Was it for cooking? Ridiculous, one lump does not a barbecue make, and hibachis were a little heavy to lug on the trail. Was it for flavoring? Not on a short hike. The charcoal just didn't make any sense.

I asked the cook why he'd put the charcoal on top of the food, and he muttered a single word--"spirits." I left on my journey, but later, in conversations with him and other people, I finally learned what any child in the village already knew. Spirits were particularly active around the middle of the day, the time when I was walking from one village to another. People travelling alone were vulnerable to spirit attack. Charcoal, on the other hand, was a known spirit repellent. The cook, when he set the lump of charcoal on top of the food, was protecting me against spirit possession.

Now, this story--or rather the experience that it represents--is only one fragment of the overall ethnographic picture, but it contains several key characteristics of the way ethnography works. First, I was there. When an ethnographer takes an interest in some corner of the world, he or she goes out and encounters it first hand. In the jargon this is called participant observation, an awkward term that simply codes the assumption that the raw material of ethnographic research lies out there in the daily activities of the people you are interested in, and the only way to access those activities is to establish relationships with people, participate with them in what they do, and observe what is going on.

A second key characteristic is that something happened I didn't understand. I would never have predicted that the cook would put charcoal on my lunch before it happened, and that's the point. Participant observation makes it possible for surprises to happen, for the unexpected to occur. These problems in understanding are called <u>rich points</u>. When a rich point occurs, an ethnographer learns that his or her assumptions about how the world works, usually implicit and out of awareness, are inadequate to understand something that happened. A gap, a distance, between two worlds has just surfaced in the details of human activity. Rich points, the words or actions that signal those gaps, are the unit of data for ethnographers, for it is this distance between two worlds of experience that is exactly the problem that ethnographic research is designed to locate and resolve.

A third characteristic: Once a rich point occurs, another working assumption sets up what an ethnographer does next. That assumption is one of <u>coherence</u>. The rich point, you assume, isn't <u>their</u> problem; it's <u>your</u> problem. The rich point doesn't mean that <u>they're</u> irrational or disorganized; it means that <u>you're</u> not yet competent to understand it. There is, you assume, a point of view, a way of thinking and acting, a <u>context</u> for the action, in terms of which the rich point makes sense. Your job, as an ethnographer, is to find out what it is, make it explicit in some way, and check it out in the subsequent words and actions of the group.

The charcoal story contains within it, then, three important pieces of ethnography. You do participant observation to esablish the situations where rich points can occur, and, when they do occur, you assume coherence on the part of those who produced it and set out to reconstruct it. <u>Participant observation</u> makes the research possible; <u>rich points</u> are the data you focus on; and <u>coherence</u> is the guiding assumption to start you off on the research that those rich points inspired.

But I'm not done with charcoal or ethnography yet. Once you've talked and observed and figured out the rich point, like I did in the South Indian village, you've only begun the job. Once you've marshalled a host of ethnographic methods--and here the entire literature on methodology becomes relevant--and figured out the frame that shows how charcoal, food, spirits, and isolation from the village are related, you take that frame forward into encounters and conversations and try it out.

"Frame" is a term borrowed from both artificial intelligence research as well as the sociology of Erving Goffman. In the words of the AI researchers, it simply means a "knowledge structure" that a programmer builds and gives to a computer to enable it to make sense out of things. It's used here to mean the knowledge that an ethnographer builds up to understand a rich point, "constructed knowledge," if you like. When I talked to people and found out about the relationships among spirits, food, charcoal, and isolation, I built a frame to understand the rich point.

In the case of that little lump of charcoal, subsequent use of the frame led me down some interesting trails, not just because of charcoal, but because of the understanding it inspired. As you use the frame, you not only work to validate it, but you also work to modify it through use. And, in this case, the modifications teach you that spirits are a key to understanding other rich points as well.

It turns out that two kinds of people are particularly vulnerable to spirit attack. The first kind are new wives. Imagine that you are a young girl, fourteen to sixteen. You live with your relatives in a village you grew up in. Now you're being led on the back of a bullock off to the village of your new husband, a young man your elder male relatives have arranged for you to marry. You move into a new village and live in a house with a bossy mother-in-law who rules the house, not to mention older wives of your new husband's brothers.

This is probably the most traumatic event that routinely occurs in village life. New wives, more often than most, are attacked by spirits. The cure, an exorcism by the local "god-man," requires the young woman to return to the village. Only in the village, surrounded by relatives and the exorcist who knows the young woman and her family well, can the spirit be removed and the woman be returned to her normal self.

The second kind of person: Imagine you're a man in the village whose family desparately needs some cash. You pack up and head the fifteen miles to Yadgiri, where the train stops, and crowd into a third class compartment for the trip to Bombay. You take a labor job in a factory and live in crowded quarters with a group of other men from the area. These migrants often have a problem, more than most. They are attacked by spirits, and the cure--you guessed it--requires them to return to the village.

The lump of charcoal has faded into the distance, but the frame that it inspired has grown richer, more pervasive and basic to an understanding of village life. The key to spirits--one key at least--is that they threaten most significantly when you are separated from the village--on a trip, after a marriage, because of the need for city work. Spirits symbolize the dangers of separation from the group and, should they strike, the remedy calls for a return. Spirits come into play at the edges of the community and sanction a return back inside.

The charcoal was a rich point, a surprising occurrence that an outsider to village life would never have anticipated. By asking questions and observing, one learns that spirits are an important part of village life, that one must understand them and their role to understand the villagers. We have uncovered a frame, a knowledge schema that opens up previouly hidden aspects of the villagers' world.

The original frame, tied to charcoal, has carried you well beyond it. As you validate and modify the frame through use, you enrich its content and learn more about its scope of application. The frame fills in the original distance between you and the village, lets you see and understand and act in ways that now make sense, from the villagers' point of view. What you've done is to assemble a fragment of culture, for that's what culture is, knowledge you construct to show how acts in the context of one world can be understood as coherent from the point of view of another world.

The story of charcoal and spirits contains within it some of the key elements of ethnographic research. A full study, of course, is more complicated than this. The business of finding rich points and building frames, in actual ethnographic work, goes on at different levels in different ways, all the time, and one continually works to weave the frames into ever grander systems of understanding. And I haven't touched the appropriate methods to systematically organize and represent what you've done--that's a field in itself.

But the charcoal story does sketch the contours of the research territory. The example is an old fashioned one, an example from the anthropological tradition of Western researchers studying isolated third world communities. I've used it because strong differences and cultural distance bring the outlines of the method into sharp relief. But the method is used, all the time, to research within the researcher's society, even to research the group of which the researcher is a member. There are differences when one works closer to home, to be sure. But the general process, in its fundamentals, remains the same.

Ethnography and the Received View

In the rhetoric of American social research, ethnography has long been considered somewhat marginal. Such evaluations are a product of comparison with the "received view," a traditional notion of what social research is that is highly valued, not without reason, for it embodies powerful methods worked out over centuries in the development of traditional science. When ethnography is measured against this tradition, the results generate a long list of deficits. The problem is that the evaluation is a bit like measuring computer capacity in cubic feet--you can do it, but it somehow misses the point. (For discussions of ethnography that develop this comparison, I'll shamelessly plug my own introductory <u>The Professional Stranger</u> (1980) and the more technical <u>Speaking of Ethnography</u> (1985). Mischler (1986) discusses ethnographic interviews in the same comparative frame of reference).

Ethnography is an alternative, something distinct from the received view, not a polluted form of it, as I hope the charcoal story showed. When a research question pertains to the distribution of some measurable variables, or to the test of a prior hypothesis, then the received view is the obvious way to go. When the research question is who are these people and what are they doing, then ethnography is the more appropriate choice, because <u>you don't yet know what the variables are</u>.

The differences between the two approaches appear at several levels. For example, in the received view "data collection" is one stage in a linear process, something that happens after the variables in the hypothesis have been operationalized and before the analysis gets done. In ethnography, in contrast, data collection and analysis are continual and dialectic. Data from participant observation or interview are analyzed, then, based on that analysis, more data is collected, which leads to more analysis, and so on throughout the research process.

A second example that follows from the first: In the received view, a "hypothesis" is a clearly stated relationship among two or more variables. In ethnography--if we extend the definition of "hypothesis" to mean "an idea to check out"--one tests multiple linked hypotheses continually. At any particular moment during the research, several questions based on previous work are on the front burner, and relevant data--intentionally sought or unexpectedly encountered--are watched for to test them out.

As another example, consider the issue of sampling. In received view research, the sample is typically specified before the fact. In ethnographic research, two considerations guide sampling. First, because of the emphasis on ongoing high rapport relationships, random sampling makes no sense at all. One has to work with people who are willing to spend the time. Second, significant dimensions of population variation are learned only after the research has started. For these reasons, ethnographic samples are _emergent_. They are constructed as the research develops, with choices of what kinds of people to work with made as the variation becomes clear. And ethnographic samples are known _after_ rather than _before_ the fact. One keeps a record of the sample as it develops, so that comparison of the ethnographic sample with already available population descriptions can be made later to gauge the ethnographic sample's representativeness.

Yet another difference: The received view emphasizes the _quantitative measurement of variables_; ethnography is after the _description of a system_. In ethnography, the units and relationships that make up the system are learned rather than being known _a priori_, and they involve the presence or absence of _qualities_--hence "qualitative"--that may not lend themselves to measurement in terms of quantity.

As a final example, "theory" in the received view refers to a literature about some domain of human life, a literature that consists of concepts and the propositions that link them. Theory, in fact, is the source of the hypotheses that the received view sets out to test. Ethnography is often associated with "description" rather than "theory," but that is an error. Theory in ethnography grows out of the data in an emergent way, since it organizes the concepts and relationships uncovered during ethnographic research. In the now famous phrase introduced by Glaser and Strauss (1967), ethnography produces "grounded theory," whereas the received view derives a hypothesis from an a priori theory. "The culture of group X" isn't description; rather, it is a theory of the group grown from the ethnographic data gathered during a study of X.

There is a fundamental switch that gets thrown when one moves from the received view to ethnography, a switch that each of the preceeding examples suggest, and that switch goes by the name of control. The power of the received view rests on control, all the way through the research process, the control of the researcher. With ethnography, control is handed back over to the persons and situations you are interested in, and the job involves locating concepts to account for the ethnographic data that the world produces.

In this study of leadership, we mean to do both kinds of research. We want to draw on the power of the received view to test some hypotheses derived from the dimensions of cultural variation. We also want to draw on the power of ethnography to learn about how leadership is conceptualized and implemented in a particular place. The question of interest, as discussed earlier in the manual, is the goodness of fit between theoretical categories and local situation. Where the fit is good, we want to show how and why; where the fit is bad, we want to figure out what is missing in the theoretical categories and work to change them.

What does the discussion of rich points and coherence and frames, the concepts used in the sketch of ethnography presented above, what does all this have to do with the leadership study? Just to begin, I'll bet a large amount of money that the concept of "leader" is a rich point in virtually every country where a CCI is working. And the CCI is already a participant observer, whether he/she knew it or not, because he/she is living and working in the same society where the concept appears. In short, a CCI is already in the middle of ethnographic fieldwork that is critical and relevant for an understanding of leadership.

How can he/she take the next step, take this ideal ethnographic situation and years of experience and knowledge and begin to shape some ethnographic data? I am going to present three specific methodological approaches as guidelines. These approaches will set the CCI up, for the most part, to do some focused ethnographic interviews on the topic of leadership. But the important thing, something I'll develop in the conclusion, is to remember that everything that is going on as a CCI does the study is fuel for the ethnographic engine. Depending on how well this first manual works, we may want to develop more methods later in the study to help the CCI gather even more information in their participant-observer role.

Ethnographic Interviewing

So far this manual has dragged you through a general discussion of ethnography, its relationship to our study variables in particular and received view research in general, and by now you know more than you ever wanted to about what charcoal means in a South Indian village. There's been lots of talk and not much in the way of action, but there's a method to my madness. I've spent time on this general level for a reason. A lot of what goes into good ethnography is an <u>attitude</u>, a <u>way of seeing the human situation</u>, a <u>way of thinking about how to learn about a different point of view</u>.

When I train budding ethnographers, either in classrooms or by writing things like this manual, I spend more time on this diffuse epistemological issue than I do on any specific cookbook-like technique. The power of the methodology is more in the attitude, the way of seeing, than it is in any specific methodological trick. One thing that makes people like me nervous is that the untrained will get interested in ethnography, then assume that all there is to it is a particular methodology. What they're doing is staying within the traditional received view way of looking at things when they think that. The problem is that they first have to <u>unlearn</u> the received view epistemology, to give up the idea of control over the data, and then start in as a naive student open to new concepts that they didn't know were there before.

But now it's time to talk about what it is that the CCI's might actually <u>do</u> with this ethnographic business. What we're going to do is to focus some methodological lights on the topic of <u>leader</u>, and use the focus to learn something about how people in a particular country talk about the concept of leader in general, and what kinds of stories they tell about leaders in particular. To do this, we're going to limit the research that each CCI will do to just a few <u>ethnographic interviews</u>.

What is an ethnographic interview? Good question. After all that you've read so far, you now know that it won't look like a questionnaire or a survey, or even like the kind of interview that journalists do. To start off, imagine a social event, a dinner or a party that you've attended recently. Imagine that you meet someone who is an expert at something you've always wondered about, someone who knows how to do something you've always been curious about. You ask some questions, true enough, but their purpose is to invite the other person to talk, at length, <u>about</u> their expertise so you can learn something new. As you listen to the person talk, you of course signal your interest, show that you are part of the conversation and are paying attention. You might ask for more detail in something that the other person mentions, or you might ask a question when he/she says something you don't understand. But, by and large, you are the fascinated listener rather than the directive interrogator. You hear the person introduce new concepts you'd never heard before. You hear him or her make connections among concepts to show you aspects of person and situation, cause and effect, history and culture, that you'd never known existed. You begin, as you listen, to comprehend a different view of how the world works, a <u>different point of view</u>.

That, in a nutshell, is how ethnographic interviews work. It sounds simple. But I can't tell you how difficult it is to get students in training to do them. They first of all have a feeling that they "aren't getting it right," that they aren't <u>controlling</u> the interview well enough. They wonder how to "keep the interviewee on the topic." They generally talk too much. If you look at a beginner's transcript, the interviewer frequently appears, and the interviewee gives short answers. If you look at an experienced transcript, you'll see little islands of interviewer followed by long stretches of interviewee.

There is no single "right" way to do such interviews, so don't try to find it. If you don't understand the connection between different things the interviewee is saying, it's <u>your</u> problem, not the interviewee's. The more the interviewee is talking, the better the interview is going. Analysis, to be discussed in a moment, will bring out the connections. In contrast to the kinds of interviews you are probably used to, the point of ethnographic interviews is to get the interviewee to talk, in whatever way he/she chooses, and then just sit back and listen and learn.

However, this brings us to the first lesson of ethnographic interviewing. <u>Not everyone will be a good interviewee</u>. Remember the example I used above, the example of the social event? We've all had the experience of meeting someone interesting, trying to start up a conversation to learn about them, and finding out that they aren't the talkative types. Furthermore, and here life gets complicated in an interesting way, in <u>this</u> study we're dealing with different national/cultural contexts, where styles of talking themselves will be different. It's going to be up to the CCI, who is the expert in the local language and the appropriate ways to use it, to do the ethnographic interviews in the locally appropriate style.

But--the moral of the story again--if someone you consider using for an interview turns out to be one of those people who, for whatever reasons, just aren't good at talking, then that person isn't the right one to interview. Now, at this point, you are probably raising an eyebrow with a skeptical question about sampling, so let's talk about that issue for a moment.

<u>Who</u> should you interview? In ethnography sampling is a different breed of cat. First and foremost, an interviewee has to be willing to sit with you for awhile and talk about what they know. (In this study you will be asked to interview each person twice.) The interviews and the analysis of transcripts take a good deal of time for just a few people, so a large number of interviews is out of the question. You're after <u>quality</u>, not <u>quantity</u>. If you

recall the discussion of ethnography earlier in this manual, recall that we're after <u>rich points</u> and <u>frames</u>. Even a single transcript is loaded with them.

The ethnographic part of the leadership study focuses on common patterns among a few cases. In order to find and document and justify those patterns, you'll spend a lot of time with just a few transcripts. The potential payoff is something new about leadership as it is discussed in that community. An interviewee is taken as a representative of his/her group, because what we're after are patterns <u>common</u> to members of that group. Don't worry, at this stage, whether or not the frames that come out of the analysis generalize or not. That problem comes later. First one has to unearth patterns; later their distribution can be checked.

However, there are <u>some</u> sampling guidelines. Say you try for three interviews in each of the two industries, for a total of six interviewees. Should you just pick anybody who's willing to talk? Well, no. First of all, you should avoid people whom everyone knows are peculiar, unusual, way out in the tails of the distribution. Second, it would be good to pick interviewees who are different from each other in some important ways, a strategy known as <u>maximizing differences</u>. For example, the three managers might be selected from a small, a medium, and a large sized firm. If there's substantial variation among managers along a particular variable, it would be good to include examples of more than just one value. If there are both men and women, include both among the three you pick. If there are members of different ethnic categories, try to include interviees from more than one category.

The strategy here isn't about representativeness; it couldn't be, with so few people. Rather, it is meant to help make differences appear in the interviews if any exist. By maximizing differences, you try to force differences to show up; if they don't, then you know that the patterns that are common across all interviewees are more likely to be common to managers, however else they might differ from each other. Once again, establishing representativeness isn't the point here; trying to complicate the frames that you build during the analysis is.

When you actually do the interviews, it is essential that you <u>tape record</u> them and <u>transcribe</u> them later. I know this won't be a popular suggestion, but I strongly recommend that you transcribe at least the first interview <u>yourself</u>. Every student I've ever had complains about the task; but every one also says, at the end, that they learned a great deal that helped them analyze by doing their own transcription. Much of ethnographic interviewing is an exercise in careful listening. When you transcribe, you are forced to listen to the details, hear the music of the intonation, feel the subtle changes in the way things are phrased. Transcription makes you aware of rich points in a way that simple reading of a prepared transcript does not. Later, if you choose to have subsequent transcriptions prepared for you, be sure and check them, "proof-listen" to them, before you go any further. The "proof-listening" will also help you become aware of the details in how the interviewee thinks about leadership.

The second interview should be done <u>after</u> you have analyzed the first. The purpose of the second interview is to let you follow up on the patterns uncovered in the first. You might test them out by actually presenting them to the interviewee to check his/her reaction. You might request more detail in an interesting area that you noticed, or that you noticed is missing, in the first interview. You might ask for more stories about leaders, or discuss the concept of "leadership" again to see if there are variations on what you learned in the first interview. In a word, the shape of the second interview will be up to you, and it will depend on the results of the first.

Now two questions remain. First, what kind of guidelines can I give you about how to frame questions in the first interview. Second, how do you analyze such uncontrolled material? I'll deal with the first question first.

Stories

When people tell each other about their experiences, they often tell each other a story. Stories, or anecdotes, are often viewed as unsystematic data in the received view tradition of research. For an ethnographer, they are golden, and the purpose of this section of the manual is to learn how to deal with them more systematically.

One way to look at stories comes from the well known work of Dell Hymes, one of the leaders (you should excuse the expression) of linguistic anthropology. A story is one kind of speech act, the sort of phenomenon that Hymes looked at. Hymes' approach to speech acts is usually called Ethnography of Speaking, and he proposed it, in part, to counter what Noam Chomsky's revolution in linguistics was doing to the study of language. Let me spend a couple of pages telling you the "story" behind all of this.

I remember, during my graduate days, reading Chomsky's Aspects of the Theory of Syntax. What a beautiful book, what elegant arguments and intricate models. Chomsky is a genius, and the linguistics he invented is much more interesting than the old chop-'em-up and sort-'em-out kind of grammar that existed before him.

But he limited the study of language. Here's a quote from the first page of that famous book:

Linguistic theory is concerned primarily with an ideal speaker-listener,

> in a completely homogenous speech-community, who knows its language perfectly and is unaffected by such grammatically irrelevant conditions as memory limitations, distractions, shifts of attention and interest, and errors (random or characteristic) in applying his knowledge of the language to actual performance.

As an ethnographer, I suffered the classic case of mixed emotions when I read this. Chomsky's beautiful, elegant book had little to do with what I, as an ethnographer, wanted to do with language. Hymes couldn't stand it either, and he set out to define another kind of linguistics, one that filled in the gap between what Chomsky did and what ethnographers did when they moved in with a group of people and started to learn their language and culture.

The idea of <u>speech acts</u> served as the bridge. Hymes distinguished between several different levels of them, but the general truth remained the same. Language is more than words and sentences. Understanding language involves more than what the words alone carry. You have to understand the <u>acts</u> of which language is a part. You have to understand what the language <u>counts as</u>. And once you know that language <u>counts as</u> telling a story, you have to figure out if telling a story is the same kind of <u>act</u> as it is everywhere else, because chances are it's not.

Chomsky spoke of <u>competence</u>, the ability of speakers to produce grammatical sentences in their native language. Hymes took the term and extended it to show the difference between what Chomsky was doing and what he wanted to do--he wrote of <u>communicative competence</u>. Consider the example of a child learning its language:

> Linguistic theory treats of competence in terms of the child's

> acquisition of the ability to produce, understand, and discriminate any and all of the grammatical sentences of a language. A child from whom any and all of the grammatical sentences of a language might come with equal likelihood would be of course a social monster. Within the social matrix in which it acquires a system of grammar a child acquires also a system of its use, regarding persons, places, purposes, other modes of communication, etc.--all the components of communicative events, together with attitudes and beliefs regarding them. There also develop patterns of the sequential use of language in conversation, address, standard routines, and the like. In such acquisition resides the child's sociolinguistic competence (or more broadly, communicative competence), its ability to participate in its society as not only a speaking, but also a communicating member.

Hymes' ethnography of speaking and his concept of communicative competence are banners under which those of us trying to deal with how people naturally talk still work. Communicative competence is the difference between the master of grammar and dictionary and the person who has built the <u>frames</u> necessary to communicate.

Hymes built a <u>general</u> frame, a model to help understand speech acts, be they stories or any others. He summarized the general frame with the acronym, <u>SPEAKING</u>.

Say you walk into a situation where people are talking. People, by definition, are wrapped up in a speech act. SPEAKING alerts you to characteristics of the situation that might be important. <u>S</u> stands for the setting, <u>P</u> for the participants, <u>E</u> for the ends they strive for, <u>A</u> for the sequence of acts engaged in, <u>K</u> for the key or tone in which the talking is done, I for the instrumentalities or tools to get the job done, N for the norms that apply, and G for the genre of talk they're engaged in.

Here's an example of how SPEAKING might work: The other day I drove to the University of Maryland gym for a game of racquetball. I arrived at 3:45. The parking regulations change at 4:00, but I needed time to get ready before the game. When I came out, my car had a $20.00 ticket, issued at 3:55. Since faculty at Maryland haven't had a pay raise for years, and since budgets are so tight we can't do most of the things we're supposed to without using our own money, faculty morale is somewhere near the ninth circle of hell.

So, when I slid the parking ticket out from under the windshield wiper, let's say I focus all my aggravation on the overzealous ticket-writers who tear around campus, and I head for the traffic office.

With SPEAKING as my guideline, I would describe the setting-- the reception desk, the tacky carpet, and all that. I could describe the participants, me and the receptionist, the ends--fix the ticket, the acts--walk in, wait my turn, go up to the desk, etc., the key--formal understated outrage, the instrumentalities-- the ticket itself, the norms--a greeting, a statement of the problem, etc., the genre--kind of a mini-courtroom argument.

SPEAKING helps me figure out what questions to ask, helps me start into a speech act to figure out what frames I need to build to understand it. But I wouldn't necessarily want to follow up on everything that SPEAKING called for. Instead, I want to focus on the rich points. And the frames those rich points call for might have to do with the SPEAKING model, but then again they might not.

SPEAKING helps you see some of the potential things that might help create frames, but it's not the whole answer. Dell Hymes never suggested that it was. On the contrary. In the parking ticket example I gave you, SPEAKING would miss one important piece of a frame, actually, the key to what the speech act was all about in its heart and soul.

If you were after the language and culture of the University of Maryland, the story I told about <u>why</u> the ticket made me angry would be the most important clue, a clue to a thread that runs through how faculty feel about the institution they work for, one that would help understand--not just the ticket incident--but also what people do when they talk in a variety of situations all over campus. Maryland, like all universities at which I've ever been, frustrates action with bureaucratic ritual, and the frustration explodes in a time of severe budget reductions. That's a piece of a frame that would gain you a lot of understanding around campus. Unfortunately, nothing in SPEAKING would direct you to it.

So, we'll use SPEAKING to help with the ethnographic interviews for the leadership study, but SPEAKING won't answer all the questions we might have.

Stories as Speech Acts

What do speech acts and SPEAKING have to do with leadership? First of all, we are interested in a particular kind of speech act when we do ethnographic interviews, <u>stories</u> about leadership. We want to gather such stories from interviewees, for the stories will tell us about the <u>contexts</u> in which leadership is practiced. (Stories can come from numerous other sources as well; conversations that a CCI has with another person in the course of daily life, stories that are reported in newspapers, magazines, and business journals, as well as the interviews that the CCI conducts, tape records, and transcribes. More on this in a moment.)

Remember that the interviewee has to be a person who is able and willing to tell such stories. As the CCI begins the study, he/she will meet articulate, experienced people who work in and know about the industries we are interested in. Such people are candidates to tell "leadership stories," stories about leaders in that industry who have done well and who have done poorly. And, once again, remember that this kind of interviewing is different from survey research, if you recall the importance of the "control" switch described at the beginning of this manual. In ethnographic interviewing, the interviewer turns control over to the interviewee. The interviewer is more like a fascinated listener than an active interrogator.

The interviewer's role is simply to set the frame for the interviewee by asking something simple and direct, like "can you tell me a story/give me an example of how a good/bad leader works?" This question can be repeated throughout the interview to get additional stories. Once the interviewee launches off into a story, the interviewer's job is to stay out of the way until the interviewee is finished.

When the interviewee is finished, the time to ask questions has arrived. Before you ask for another story, now is the time to use Hymes' Ethnography of Speaking questions. SPEAKING. S--Is it clear what the setting was, where the story took place and why? P-- Do you understand who the key players in the story were? E--From the story can you tell what it is the players were trying to accomplish? A--Are the key actions that people took understandable within the story? K--does the particular tone of how the different players acted come through, humorous, irreverant, by the book, arrogant, and so on? I--Do the objects that the players used to accomplish actions play a role in the story? N--Are the various critical norms for behavior spelled out so that you understand when people behaved according to expectations and when they didn't? G-- Is the overall genre of the story clear, a formal meeting, a casual conversation, or what have you.

Hymes' SPEAKING questions offer a way to fill in the blanks, to request more detail in the story that the interviewee has already told you. Once you finish discussing <u>that</u> story with the interviewee, then it is time to ask for a <u>new</u> one, and the cycle starts anew. The cycle runs REQUEST A STORY, LISTEN, then DISCUSS STORY IN TERMS OF SPEAKING, then REQUEST A STORY again.

Notice that you can use SPEAKING to <u>describe doing the interview</u> as well as describing what is <u>in</u> the interview. After you do an interview, or, for that matter, whenever you note down a story from a casual conversation or the media, use SPEAKING to describe the material itself as well as what is in it. SPEAKING for an interview, for example, would lead you to make a note as to where the interview took place, who you and the interviewee were, and so on through the same list of speech act components.

And notice that you can use SPEAKING to generate <u>your own stories</u> as well. Since you are a <u>participant observer</u>, a person active in situations where you yourself will see leadership in action, you may witness or even be part of a story yourself. These stories, like all the others, should enter the ethnographic database, and SPEAKING is a guide you can can use to write up notes that record the experience you had.

What you will gradually accumulate, in addition to transcripts of ethnographic interviews, are notes on other stories you've seen or heard about leadership, as well as clips from such sources as the media. You will have used SPEAKING both to get a handle on the stories themselves as well as to describe the situation where they came about. Now, what do you do with them? What is the point of gathering them for purposes of the leadership study?

The point is, at its heart, the same as the general discussion of ethnographic method presented earlier. The point is to look for how leadership is perceived, from a different point of view, in a different national/cultural setting. The stories, viewed through the SPEAKING frame, lay out what leaders are and how they work, in that place.

Once again, recall the study variables: Individualism vs. Collectivism, Masculinity vs. Femininity, Tolerance vs. Intolerance of Uncertainty, Power Stratification vs. Power Equalization, Humanistic vs. Impersonal Orientation, Achievement Orientation, and Future vs. Present Orientation.

We want to take the results from the stories, the patterns that show what is important about leaders as revealed by those stories, and ask--in what ways do the study variables map onto the analysis, and in what ways do they not? Did the analysis show that the variables reflect the way that people tell stories about leaders, good and bad, or did other things come up, things that complicate, contradict, or add to the original variables?

We'll talk about analysis later in this manual. For the moment, consider SPEAKING as a guide to the interview, a way to ask <u>for</u> and then ask questions <u>about</u> the stories that people tell about leadership. Next, I'd like to introduce one more frame from ethnography, one that will shift the focus from stories to the actual concept "leader" and other concepts it might be related to.

Taxonomies

This second method I'll introduce has to do with the systematic study of local language concepts. In contrast with the SPEAKING idea, it has more to do with asking specific questions about the concept of "leader" rather than asking for stories about actual examples of leaders. It is a method that can be applied to the local term(s) for "leader" as well as to other relevant vocabularies in the design of survey instruments. This method is usually called <u>ethnographic semantics.</u> I'd like to give you a little background on this approach, just like I did when I first introduced SPEAKING.

The method derived from an argument about how to understand "culture." Culture, said the founders of the field, wasn't what people actually made or actually did. It was what they <u>knew</u>. What they know, continues the argument, is a system of concepts and the links that tie them together. Concepts, goes the next step, are expressed in language in one way or another. Many of the concepts that are important, that are frequently talked about, acquire nice, neat linguistic labels. Think of the straightforward idea of "words" for now.

Words label concepts, and concepts are what you're after so that you can describe culture. Words aren't just things you memorize whose meanings fit neatly into a dictionary. Words go well beyond that. They channel you into a way of seeing, of thinking, of acting. Words are the surface of culture.

Culture is a conceptual system whose surface appears in the words of people's language. Cultures are different, no question about it. But if you can just get a handle on a few of the problematic words out there in the space between you, the <u>rich points</u>, you can start learning the concepts that travel with them. You can build frames to show how those concepts are related to each other.

Here's how ethnographic semantics works in practice. Say a Martian lands in an American town and notices that people talk a lot about primitive objects that move up and down strips of concrete. These funny-looking things are obviously means of transport. Why they bother staying on the ground is beyond him.

Let's say the Martian knows enough American English to get started. He hears words that are used to label the moving objects. The list includes words like "vehicle," "truck," "car," and "station wagon." He's got words that label concepts, but he's not done yet. He doesn't know how they hook up together into a system, nor does he know what pieces might be missing.

Different kinds of relationships might hold the concepts together, and the relationships, like the concepts, will be expressed in the language. But instead of just words, they will be simple sentences that show how the concepts are hooked together. The primary link that the founders of the field used was the "kind of" link. A "car" is a kind of "vehicle." A "station wagon" is a kind of "car."

This link has a name. It is called the <u>taxonomic</u> relationship. X is a kind of Y. It's the same relationship you study when you learn taxonomies in biology. A dog is a kind of animal. A tree is a kind of plant. I can't do any better than that. I live in a city.

Why the obsession with taxonomies? Many of the people who founded this approach to ethnography were interested in how traditional peoples conceptualized their natural environment. Traditional peoples, in general, live in a much more intimate and dependent way with nature than do those of us who live in apartment 321 at 1850 33rd Street. If you want to understand the "traditional" world, the world they see through their language, then the natural environment will be an important part of the picture.

<u>Ethnographic semantics</u> is semantics because it deals with word meanings, and ethnographic because the point of studying meaning isn't to write a dictionary for second language learners, but rather to create and resolve rich points, to learn about the view of the world that some group of people have. Ethnographic semantics was also an attempt to solve the problem of comparison and description that I mentioned earlier. Taxonomy, argued the founders, was a way of organizing concepts that you could find anywhere in the world. It was a way to learn something anywhere you went that you could compare with what you

learned in other places. At the same time, the way the taxonomy was filled in would be different and therefore reflect local cultural differences.

The method worked by using the concepts and relationships to get even more concepts. Consdier the taxonomy link, "X is a kind of Y." Say the Martian, the one we left standing on the streetcorner a few pages ago, gets lucky and starts with the word "vehicle." He asks, "are there different kinds of vehicles?"

The person he's interviewing looks at him and says, "what are you, from Mars or something? There's millions of kinds of vehicles."

An ethnographer will tolerate most anything to get data. So he asks, "What are they?"

The person he's interviewing, it turns out, is waiting for a bus, so he notes that term down. Since in most American cities public transportation is terrible, the interviewee has an hour or so to kill. So he rattles off a list of words for different <u>kinds of</u> vehicles.

Once he's got his list, our Martian starts with the "is X a kind of Y" routine. "Is a police car a kind of truck?"

The interviewee turns to another person at the bus stop. "You hear that? This guy thinks a police car is a truck." He turns back to the Martian. "No, a police car is a kind of <u>car</u>." That, in simple outline, is how ethnographic semantics works. You use questions that represent relationships, words that represent concepts, and try to build a picture of a particular part of someone's conceptual system.

Besides, once the Martian has a set of terms and their relationships, he can ask <u>contrast</u> questions to learn how one concept differs from another. Once he knows that "car" and "truck" are kinds of vehicle, he can ask what the difference is between the two. His interviewee, assuming he is still waiting for that bus, will talk about size, price, function, carrying capacity, and other things that will teach the Martian something about what those concepts are all about. Once he knows that "station wagon" and "sports car" are kinds of "car," he can ask the same contrast questions and hear a discussion of similar things, and perhaps learn about the difference between single people and families as well.

The study of folk taxonomies has a long and noble history that continues to this day. Since a lot of the anthropologists who used the approach were interested in how traditional peoples saw their natural environment, a taxonomy wasn't a bad way to proceed. It turned out that ordinary folks, just like biologists, used taxonomies to organize their experience, that taxonomies were apparently a structure that was wired into humans, ready to go. Taxonomies, like stories, are everywhere, though the way they are filled in will differ from place to place.

Sentences

Humans all have words that express concepts and sentences that express links among them. Humans all organize some of their concepts into taxonomies. But what about words that are linked up in ways other than the taxonomic ones? What about concepts that didn't fit into a word? As a student of some of the founders of ethnographic semantics, I was one of the critics. I lifted up a piece of the world, held it up against the taxonomy I'd learned, and noticed that it just couldn't handle the entire job. That's how it works with graduate students. They turn on you, sort of an intellectual Oedipus complex.

Some of my complaints started when I worked at what was then the main U.S. facility for the treatment of heroin addicts in Lexington, Kentucky. I started a collection of junkie terms, "junkie" being the term heroin addicts used to refer to themselves, aggressively so in the face of non-addicts with a preference for euphemisms. I'd hear something that I didn't understand, get a paraphrase from someone, and put it on a note card. After awhile I had maybe 300 terms, words that weren't standard English that the junkies used a lot. I'd lay out the cards and look at them. The problem I had was that most of them weren't related to each other in any kind of taxonomic way.

Well, there were a few. One word, for instance, was "tie." A tie was anything you used to wrap around your arm like a tourniquet to get the veins to stand out so you could inject heroin. There were different kinds of tie, like a nylon, or a belt, or a string, so taxonomy worked for that corner of the vocabulary. But most of the time, taxonomy just didn't apply.

On the other hand, the words obviously belonged together in some way. They were related to each other somehow. There had to be a more interesting thing to do than just alphabetize them into a list. So I figured it out a different way, a way that I borrowed from numerous others in anthropology and linguistics.

The trick was that most of the terms clustered around a situation, one that was unique to junkies, one they didn't share with the rest of us, the situation where they injected the heroin into their veins.

How would you explain injecting heroin? "Well, I took this hypodermic syringe..." Except it's not really a hypodermic syringe; it's the top of a baby pacifier fastened onto an eyedropper with a needle slipped over its narrow end and a gasket of thread or paper to hold it tight. Wouldn't it be easier to say "I took the works," because "works" is what that assembly is called.

Then maybe you'd say, "The heroin was so good, I decided to inject a little bit, then let some blood back up into the works, then inject a little more, and I repeated that for awhile." Wouldn't it be easier said you decided to "boot," because that's what that process is called.

The junkies' language and their world grew up together in the same experiential space. Many of their unique words handled aspects of their unique situation. But how do you organize words around a situation? Taxonomy is one frame that helps understand differences, but it's reach was too narrow to handle the junkie words. The solution to the problem is simply to add more links--new relationships, new links that tie together the concepts labelled by the words we're trying to understand.

One set of new links came from the grammar of Charles Fillmore. Fillmore argued that the way you figure out a sentence is you grab the verb first. The verb tells you what kinds of relationships different nouns might have to it. "John opens the door with a key." "Opens" is the heart of the beast, and "open" can take an agent who performs the action, a patient that is the recipient of the action, and an instrument by which the action is accomplished.

Here's how that all works out to make sense out of the junkie words. The general situation, the one within which the different terms play a role, is called, among other things, "get off." I'll ignore the problem of synonyms here. I'll also ignore that the term has other meanings in ordinary American English as well that you, the reader, may be enjoying. In the junkie world, though, it labels the situation where a junkie injects the heroin into his veins.

The ideas in Fillmore's grammar set up a new frame to add to taxonomy, so that some of the other words fell into line. The agent, the one who does the action, is a junkie. The object on which the action is done is stuff--the heroin. The <u>instrument</u> by which the action is accomplished are the works. The <u>locations</u> in which the action can occur are a shooting gallery (a place you go to get off), a crib (someone's residence), or maybe just the streets. The <u>results</u> are numerous. You might OD or overdose, nod, get high, or just get straight, or maybe even get sick if the stuff is no good.

Laid out in a neat picture, Fillmore's grammar gives us this:

Get off	Junkie	Stuff	Works	Shooting gallery	OD
				Crib	Nod
				Streets	High
					Straight
					Sick
(verb)	(agent)	(object)	(instr)	(location)	(result)

The words fall into line when they're organized as sort of a large-scale, high-level sentence that covers possible things that might occur in the situation.

I owed that one to Fillmore's grammar. Now, back to ethnographic semantics, where a few relationships besides taxonomy had been proposed. One of the neglected relationships was <u>stage- process</u>. One word labels a process, and other words label the stages that you go through to accomplish it.

When you cook, you buy the ingredients, organize the utensils, cut up the onions, brown the meat, and like that. When you go to work, you first wake up, throw the alarm clock against the wall, get dressed, drink coffee, get in the car, and like that. Cooking and going to work are processes that have different stages.

Getting off is a process that has stages as well. You cook the heroin powder in water, draw the mixture up into the works, tie off to get a vein to stand out, get a hit when the needle enters the vein, shoot the stuff into the vein, and maybe boot the mixture in and out a few times.

And since each of these stages is also a verb, they have instruments, locations, and the like that go with them. So we get this picture of the stages in the process of getting off.

Cook	Draw	Tie	Hit	Shoot	Boot
stuff (obj)	fix (obj)	tie (obj)	rope (obj)	fix (obj)	gravy (obj)
cooker (loc)	works (loc)		flag (res)	rush (res)	rush (res)
	filter (inst)		works (inst)	works (inst)	works (inst)

There's a couple of new words in there, "rope" for vein, "flag" for the blood that backs up when the needle hits the vein, and "gravy" for the blood-heroin mixture you get if you boot the stuff in and out.

A few words are still missing, some of which are in the taxonomy I mentioned earlier--there are different kinds of ties, like belts and nylons and strings. And a few other words are tied together by another neglected relationship from cognitive anthropology, part-whole. The works are a whole, as described earlier, that consists of the parts of a bulb, a dropper, a needle or spike, and a collar to fasten the spike to the end of the dropper.

The Method's Use in the Leadership Study

This style of handling words isn't everyone's cup of tea, or cooker full of stuff, but the mix of Fillmore's sentence grammar and the neglected stage-process and part-whole relationships from anthropology tied together the list of junkie words I started with.

It's another example of using universal frames--relationships among concepts that all humans have--to make sense out of rich points, in this case, the difference between a junkie world where injecting heroin is the point of it all, and a straight world where no such situation exists.

We're studying leaders, not junkies, but the same methodological principles apply. The general idea of "leader" in the CCI's home language is the initial focus, the rich point. Ethnographic semantics asks for a particular kind of frame to understand it, namely, "What other terms or phrases is "leader" associated with, and how are they related?"

The first question to ask is the taxonomic one. What are the different kinds of leader? What is leader a kind of? What is the taxonomy in which "leader" finds a place? How does one kind of leader differ from another kind of leader?

Practically speaking, this means a CCI simply sits down with an interviewee and asks "kind of" questions about "leader," and then continues by asking "kind of" questions about the terms that the first question elicits. Then, once a CCI has some related terms, he/she can ask how one kind of leader is different from another kind of leader and discuss those differences.

The answers may not always be packaged in nice, neat words, and the structure that results may not be as clean a taxonomy as one would like. For our purposes, it doesn't matter. The point is to get a picture of what "leader" means by exploring how it is situated among other concepts in the language. By exploring these relationships, by comparing "leader" to the other related concepts, a CCI can show how "leader" means something in their language that is both related to and different from what it means in other languages.

The second question to ask is the one exemplifed in the study of junkie vocabulary. "Leader" is obviously an agent, a person who does things. Using the model of Fillmore's sentence grammar, a CCI can explore what it is a leader typically does (verbs), to or for whom it is done (patient), by what means (instrumentalities), in what characteristic places (locations), with what typical outcomes (results), and so on. In fact, you've probably noticed that, roughly speaking, ethnographic semantics looks at sentences much like SPEAKING looks at stories. Furthermore, a CCI can use relationships like part-whole and stage-process to further explore characteristic leader activities.

Practically, this means that a CCI explores with an interviewee some of the typical or characteristic sentences that might be constructed in the language about leaders. The purpose of the exercise, just as with taxonomies, is to explore the meaning of "leader" by exploring the term's relationships with other terms in the language. Once again, the method may not always elicit neat words, and the results may not be as pretty as the picture I drew earlier with the junkie example. And once again, it doesn't matter, as long as the data that result show how "leader" is positioned conceptually in the local language.

After a CCI has worked with a few different interviewees, the common patterns among them should become clear. "Leader" will be seen as a kind of person with semantic relationships to other kinds of persons, as shown by the taxonomic questions, and "leader" will be shown to engage in characteristic kinds of actions, as shown by relations between the term and different verbs, patients, instruments, results and so on. At the end of the exercise, the different CCI's will have documented a picture of what "leader" means in the local language by showing its relationships to other concepts in that language.

Think of the exercise as sitting down with someone, keeping the term for "leader" as the focus you continually return to, and having a conversation about the term. The discussion of <u>taxonomy</u> and <u>sentence grammar</u> presented in this manual are simply meant to suggest interesting questions to pose as you have that conversation. Since you will <u>tape-record</u> the interviews, you will want to listen to them a few times to pick up details that you miss when the conversation is actually taking place. Besides, after you listen you'll see additional questions you want to ask later to fill in a promising detail that went by too quickly.

By the time two or three people have been interviewed, a CCI will be in a position to make a powerful contribution to the study. He/she will be able to show how the local concept of "leader" is <u>defined</u>, in several different ways, by showing what concepts local people connect "leader" with. As different CCI's compare what they've learned, the general concept of "leader" will be enrichened and complicated beyond anything that is currently available in the literature. Just this one result will be a significant contribution of the research.

Two Methods Combined

The two guides to interviews that I've described are quite different from each other. The first guide, SPEAKING, fits the usual way of thinking about ethnographic interviews. The interviewer is interested in stories, in listening to the interviewee talk about leadership by reporting actual examples. By paying attention to the way the interviewee builds the story, by focusing on what it is that the interviewee chooses to tell, one learns what the interviewee thinks is significant about leadership. But the second guide, ethnographic semantics, isn't about stories at all. Instead, it guides the interviewer to ask specific questions about a specific concept, to elicit in detail what concepts are linked to "leader" in what specific ways.

Think of the first interviewing strategy as eliciting a <u>narrative</u> model of leadership, while the second interviewing strategy develops a <u>conceptual</u> model of leadership. Both are important, as we'll see in the analysis section in a moment. But for now, a CCI might ask a reasonable question--which one do I do first, narratives or concepts?

The answer, you'll be either delighted or horrified to hear, is, <u>it doesn't matter</u>. The only iron-clad rule of the ethnographic interview is, <u>when the interviewee is in the middle of a story, don't interrupt</u>. But except for that rule, you can mix and match the two strategies as it seems appropriate during the interview. For example, some interviewees are more comfortable with specific questions at the beginning of an interview. If that's the case, then begin with the conceptual material. An interviewee might begin an interview with something like, "...that reminds me of the time when..." If he/she does, then you know that a story is coming, so you should get out of the way and listen. At the end of a story, your mind might be full of questions about a <u>kind of</u> leader you've just learned about, and you want to ask some conceptual questions. Since you're between stories, go right ahead.

Ethnographic interviewing is more like jazz than classical music; the interviewer and interviewee take a few chords--the topic of leadership, the conceptual and narrative models--and sit down together to make some music. No one knows exactly what notes they will play, how well they will play together, or how creative the set will be. Seldom is the performance horrible; normally it is quite creative; once in a while it is a memorable event. For ethnographic interviewing, one has to turn up the volume on his/her tolerance of uncertainty and collective orientation. Once you get the hang of listening instead of asking, of basing questions on things the interviewee has already said, you'll see that ethnographic interviewing opens up spaces for new information to appear.

Analysis

Once an interview is transcribed, you have before you a classic piece of the data of ethnographic research. Transcripts are the coin of the realm, the raw material out of which patterns are built and conclusions are reached. There are several ways to deal with such data. I should tell you that we are at the point in this manual that represents the most challenging part. Transcript analysis is unlike anything that a traditional social research background trains you for. The analyst engages in a conversation with the transcripts, starts in to find patterns, makes a first tentative effort to make them explicit, then goes back to the transcripts to falsify or complicate those patterns. Several iterations of this process take place and, even at the end, the analyst still can't account for everything.

First of all, one listens to the tape, either when one actually transcribes it the first time or, later, when one "proof listens" to check the work of the transcriber. Second, one reads the transcript, several times, to get familiar with the overall story that is told and with the details of interesting passages. It's important to understand that, even as one does these tasks of preparation, one is already engaged in analysis.

What are you listening and reading for? You are listening and reading for connections, connections among the topic of "leader" and "leadership" and other things that the interviewee has said. You are listening and reading to learn connections among different types of leader, the qualities by which they are described, how they are evaluated, what characteristic actions they engage in, what situations they operate in, and who the followers are and how they react. All of this is available in the language by which the interviewee tells stories about leaders or talks about how the term "leader" is related to other terms in their language.

A key problem for ethnographic method has always been, and continues to be, how to get from the original transcript to the patterns that one eventually makes explicit, how to show samples of data, reasoning from that data to conclusions, in a way that also shows how one tried to falsify the pattern against the data as well. It's a formidable task, one that I spend an entire seminar on when I teach graduate students.

The problem for this manual is, how much can I show CCI's in writing, from a distance? The best training model is an apprenticeship, where one works with an experienced person over time. That is not feasible, though if you have ethnographic colleagues available where you work it would be good to get to know them and talk with them occasionally as you do this part of the project.

On the other hand, just the experience of doing the interviews and then pondering the transcripts will be interesting. If nothing else, one can lift out passages that show how "leader" is connected to other concepts in ways that confirm the relevance of the study variables, or complicate them, or raise new issues that the variables have missed. The minimal level of transcript use, then, asks the CCI to treat the transcripts as a "study variable test." The CCI, after listening/reading a few times, goes through the transcripts and lifts out sections that show where the study variables come to life, as well as sections where important variables are present that aren't among the study variables. Then he/she can use that material to both support and challenge the theory with which the study began.

But I'd like to show you how to go further than that. The next, tried and true approach to this kind of data, an approach that ethnographers have used since the beginning of ethnographic time, is the old "cut and sort" model. This sounds simple, and it is. One goes through the transcript and marks off topically coherent passages. Those passages are given one or more names to indicate their content, codes, if you like. Like everything else in ethnography, you do this a few times, because the code names will change and shift as you go. The codes, like the process of doing the interview itself, like the conclusions you come up with, are emergent.

Once you have the transcript coded, you simply pull out all the transcript segments with the same code, put them in a pile, and go through them. As you do so, you ask two primary questions--1. What is constant across the segments, what things are routinely associated with leaders; and, 2. what varies across the segments, how do descriptions of leaders and leadership vary from time to time, or from person to person. As you begin to tease out what stays constant and what varies, you are actually preparing a section of a document that will summarize the results. In ethnographic reports, sections of documents that analyze the data follow the contours of how the data were described by the interviewee when he/she gave them to you.

Most ethnographic software was designed to help with this kind of analysis. But you don't need special software. Most word processors have capabilities that will let you insert codes into a transcript and then search for them later. Or, you might like to work like we did in the old days, where we'd just make a xerox copy of the transcript, mark sections in different colored pens, and then cut them up with scissors. In those olden days, ethnographers used to joke about how, during the middle of a study, their floor was covered with piles of transcript segments. The French anthropologist

Levi-Strauss once said that if he had a card table big enough, he could figure out all of France.

Since those old days, however, we have made some progress. Now, thanks to advances in linguistics, we have a wide array of detailed approaches to transcript analysis. It is these that require more time and training than this manual provides. However, even as I write this draft, Jeff Thomas, a graduate student at the University of Maryland College of Business and Management, is pilot testing the approach outlined in this manual.

In this draft, I can't report the results. Those will come later, in an addendum to this manual, that will be distributed to CCI's before the Calgary meeting. The concept of the pilot test is this: Like most CCI's, Jeff is not a trained ethnographer. He and I meet and talk about ways to handle the transcripts in detail, and then he goes off and tries it on his own. We meet again to see what worked and what didn't. Our goal is to come up with some ideas on more fine grained analyses that are clear and straightforward that CCI's might try out on their own.

As I mentioned, we're not done with the experiment yet. When we are, about mid-June or so, an analysis section will be mailed to you, and Jeff will present the results of his efforts at our meeting in Calgary. Let me preview our approach, though. Recall the SPEAKING and ethnographic semantic discussion earlier, the discussion where those frameworks were suggested as guides to doing the interview. The trick Jeff and I are trying to develop is this: One can use those frameworks not only to guide doing the interview; one can use them to guide different kinds of analysis as well.

Another method of analysis we are trying is more straightforward with reference to the study variables. In this approach, one simply goes through the transcript and codes statements that are instances of one or more of the study variables. This approach shows the role "study variable type" utterances play in describing leaders. We'll show how this works as well once we finish the pilot.

Notice that these two types of analysis mirror many of the differences between ethnography and received view research that have been a theme of this manual. In the first case, the analysis follows the transcript to make explicit its implicit structure. In the second case, the analysis fragments the interview into pieces relevant to the study variables. Both kinds of analysis are revealing and interesting. By doing both and comparing them, we'll learn something about the key question that motivates this manual--how do local ways of thinking and talking about leadership <u>connect</u>, or <u>not</u> connect, with the study variable framework?

That's all on analysis for the moment. This section will be expanded and distributed mid-summer, and Jeff Thomas will show you how it works in Calgary. But I did want to write something at this point to start you thinking about how to handle rich and interesting data that were under the interviewee's control.

Food and Money

Now for something a little different. Until now, this manual helps a CCI to sit down with a <u>person</u> and learn what leadership is all about. Another source of information, a critical one to understand how leadership operates in the different countries, is the <u>history</u> of the industries that we are focusing on. The context of the industries is the background knowledge against which statements in the interview are formulated, so it is important for those outside a particular country to know something about that as well.

A full history of the financial services or food production industries in any country would obviously lead to an independent study in its own right. There's no doubt that such studies are useful. Several years ago, I did some work on the American trucking industry. I found out that a few business schools had encouraged their students to do case studies. Such studies were valuable resources for my ethnographic work, because they showed how the industry had started and then developed in coordination with broader historical, political, and social trends in the U.S.

A complete study is not what we have in mind. Rather, what we are after is a broad brush-stroke picture of the industries of interest. Unfortunately, there are no ethnographic precedents to draw from. Ethnographic semantics and SPEAKING have been around for years, because they fit the traditional research approach, outlined in the beginning of this manual, where an ethnographer tries to learn the perspective of some group of people. A sketch of an industry didn't play any role in such studies.

Still, the ethnographic approach that underlies the manual can guide the development of the sketch. What we are after, as always, are rich points, interesting differences between the industry in the CCI's country and what the rest of the CCI's would expect. And we are especially interested in rich points that aim at an understanding of how those particular industries operate in the CCI's country today. So, two guidelines for sorting information are to focus on the unique features of the history and to emphasize those feaures that are particularly important to understand what contemporary leaders have to deal with.

The general goal, then, is to get a picture of the specifics of the industries in the local national setting, to get a context for the industries into which the study is penetrating. Some questions to help get started might be the following:

1. A sketch of the origins of the industry. How did the industry first start? Traditional societies have always had ways of getting agricultural products to the evening meal and ways of earning, saving, and spending, usually at a local subsistence level with a relationship to a regional market center. At some point, though, a shift occurs to so-called modernization, where a separate industry develops that takes over these processes, an industry that mediates between agriculture and eating, between paycheck and interest.

When did it first happen that an organized industry began to replace or supplement traditional activities in the area of food preparation and financial services? Of particular interest is the extent to which the industries grew up internally or developed with colonialism, and the extent to which they started with a national or international orientation.

The reason for such questions is to better understand the ethnographic data as a CCI sorts through the similarities and differences in leadership in his/her country. If an industry, for example, developed more as an internal institution that served primarily local country markets, we would want to see if that kind of history supported more of a culture-specific style of leadership in the contemporary world. On the other hand, if an industry developed primarily through colonial imposition with an orientation toward international trade, the opposite might be true. These are not conclusions, but rather hypotheses that the origins sketch would address.

2. Provide a more detailed historical account for the last twenty years or so. Are the industries expanding or in decline in terms of the role they

play in the national economy? Has the role of the national government changed with reference to the industry? Are the industries engaging in more or less international trade? Are there particular kinds of people within the country who dominate the industry?

Such questions aim at understanding recent historical trends in the industries under study. Again, the questions will help understand current patterns of leadership uncovered in both the ethnographic and the quantitative data. It is a truism to say that industries, like any organizations, operate by adapting to their environment. The questions about recent trends are meant to teach us about how the environment in which the industries operate is shifting.

In Mexico, for example, where I've done some work recently, the business environment is changing in fascinating ways. Changes in government policy, in industrial practice, in patterns of management and work, make Mexico an incredibly exciting, and sometimes difficult, place right now.

Such changes help understand changes in Mexican leadership. Leaders are the ones who experiment with shifts in industry to try to adapt them to the emerging marketplace, whose nature is at this point far from clear. When outsiders undertand this fact, they can better understand the different styles of leadership, liderazgo, that they encounter in Mexico today. For example, there is a traditional patriarchial style, rooted in the elite families, often of Spanish or other foreign descent, and a newer style, more oriented to international business models, that is more open to participation whatever the background of the leader/entrepreneur.

To help prepare a section on recent trends, a CCI might take a look at some recent cases reported in popular or business media which he/she probably already knows about, cases that illustrate recent stories of success and failure within each industry. The reasons for success or failure will elucidate what kinds of leadership have been adaptive and what kinds haven't over the last several years.

3. Finally, we'd want a sketch of the contemporary <u>hot issues</u> in the industries we're looking at. What are the debates in conversations and newspapers, <u>right now</u>? What are the debates in the industries on which any leader would have to take a position, and why do these debates matter? We need to learn the hot issues in a particular country because it will be just those issues that are on everybody's mind when they talk about leadership. Leaders will be evaluated, in part, on how they are handling such issues, how they are shaping their industries to deal with them.

If I can return to Mexico for an example, one of the hot issues that you couldn't miss unless you kept your eyes closed and your ears plugged is NAFTA, the North American Free Trade Agreement, <u>Tratado de Libre Comerci</u>o in Spanish. I worked with a company that proposed to rebuild diesel engines in the U.S. for distribution to commercial transportation fleets in Mexico City. So, one of the ways the hot issue came to life in the auto/truck parts industry was, how can we (Mexican parts manufacturers/distributors) compete with a wave of imports from the U.S. if tariff barriers disappear? A leader in that industry has to take a position. Some lobbied for a multi-year exemption from NAFTA; some started to establish relationships with U.S. partners; some worked to consolidate their positions in distribution networks that operated differently from what the anticipated new U.S. competitors would understand.

The moral of the story is simply that, if we were studying the auto/truck parts industry, understanding the hot issue of NAFTA would help us interpret what we learned from leaders in that industry, both the common patterns and the variations, in both the ethnographic and the quantitative data.

So, the three kinds of industry data--origins, recent trends, and hot issues--will sketch the broader world within which the leadership study is being conducted. The focus of the sketch is aimed at understanding current leadership, in the two industries in a particular country, as it is investigated by both ethnographic and quantitative methods. The point is to make sense of what we learn about leaders, in part, by understanding the world to which they have to adapt, a world that took shape in particular political and economic circumstances, developed recently with changes in the national and global economy, and now finds itself in the middle of significant hot issues.

The industry background can also be viewed through the eyes of the dimensions of cultural variation that underlie our study. "Recent trends" and "hot issues" may well signal changes in the variables now in process, a push from collective to more individualistic, for example, or a call for more tolerance of uncertainty, for another. In fact, we might set up a research question that looks for trends and issues that reflect shifts from traditional values on a variable to values that are perceived to be more adaptive to the tradition of Western capitalism that is said to characterize the emergent global marketplace.

The Study Variables

In the introduction to this manual, I mentioned the tensions that arise between the need to standardize and the investigation of local context and meaning. In this section, I want to bring the tension home by spelling out a hypothetical problem scenario, that is, hypothetical results that might complicate the study variables. I do so not to engage in evil ethnographic deconstruction, but rather to encourage CCI's to look for problems that will yield theoretically interesting challenges.

Ethnographers typically begin their research with several skeptical questions in mind concerning proposed universal dimensions. First, how can one entertain the idea of characterizing an entire society, in all its diversity, in such terms? Second, in the flow of situations that make up social life, one suspects that it's difficult to unambiguously map real behavior--as opposed to questionnaire responses--onto the categories. Third, even if the catgories could be so mapped, the same person, familiar with the flow of situations, will guess that <u>both</u> sides of the opposition occur, along with intermediate forms, and that the question is not whether a society is A or B, but rather when and under what conditions A and/or B occur, if A and B are the right categories to make sense out of what is going on at all.

Any number of complications might come up. First is the situation of translation. Mapping the dimension into the local language might not be such an easy task. Second is the problem of application, that some dimensions might be difficult to connect with the concepts that are important to understanding definitions and stories in a particular language. Third is the problem of ambiguity, that a dimension might be seen to "sort of" apply but "sort of" not. Fourth is the issue of coverage, namely, that a dimension applies, but it doesn't apply very much, and it isn't much help. Fifth is the problem of linkage, that a dimension is part of a scheme for understanding the ethnographic data, but only when it is seen in its relationship to other concepts.

So, now you've learned something about ethnography, but also worry about comparison and standardization. What are you supposed to do now? One of the reasons for this blend of methods--whether it's innovative or schizophrenic remains to be seen--is to take both sides of the argument seriously and put them to the test. The hypothesis-testing side sets out some dimensions; the ethnographic side brings out local detail and actual situations. We want to use the two to <u>challenge</u>, to <u>stimulate</u> each other, but how?

With the ethnographic methods presented in this manual, data will show how "leadership" is defined, how stories of leaders in action teach us something about their attributes, and how particular industries took their shape and what current issues they struggle with. These data will be "naturalistic;" that is, they will be expressed in whatever ways people choose to talk in their native language. These people will define leadership, tell stories, and talk about the industry in ways that link those topics up with other concepts in the language.

So, the challenging question is, <u>what do the dimensions and the ethnographic data have to do with each other?</u> The CCI, in other words, can use the ethnographic data to test the relevance of the key variables, perhaps confirming their ready application, perhaps complicating it, perhaps showing that something different is going on than what was expected from the theory.

As a hypothetical problem example, let's say a CCI in Japan has heard a couple of stories meant to exemplify good leaders in action. (My knowledge of Japan is superficial, to put it generously, and I hope the example is at least plausible to those with more sophistication.) Let's say the leaders are described as exceedingly humble with frequent use of honorifics in their language, though at the same time they use the <u>bushido</u> or warrior tradition as metaphor. Let's say they are idiosyncratic and willing to take risks. On the face of it, such a story would suggest a classification towards the feminine, the individualistic, and the uncertainty tolerant side of the dimensions, while the nation as a whole might be characterized as masculine, collectivistic, and risk aversive. Just to make it even more interesting, let's say that those leaders are also described as effective, in part, because of their two years of study at an American business school, together with their ability to bring what they learned back to Japan. Where does this fit into the dimensions?

This hypothetical example is, from the theoretical point of view, a "problem" scenario, with the variables contradicted and other important information that doesn't fit the variables at all. From this example, we might learn several things: First, if we haven't already, we might ask about an interviewee's training and experience in other countries and their facility with other languages; second, we might look at the dimensions more carefully in terms of within-country variation; third, we might entertain a new hypothesis, that leaders tend to be in the tails of the distribution for their country; fourth, we might be alerted to new measures, such as the use of honorifics in Japanese, or the use of the bushido metaphor, that may not be available in other countries; fifth, we might wonder about the surface inconsistency between a "feminine" style and frequent allusions to the warrior tradition; and sixth, we might learn that we need some sense of the country's general stance vis a vis the import of "foreign" ways.

Even in this hypothetical scenario, then, the results would be stimulating, productive, and challenging with reference to the universal dimensions, not destructive of them. The point for now is simply that we want CCI's to use the ethnographic data to challenge the theoretical dimensions, to look for correspondence, but also for problems and contradictions. It is impossible to predict at this point what the results of this continual challenge will turn up. But the continual juxtaposition of different kinds of data, one kind reaching for local detail, the other for standardization across societies, will leave us at the end of the study with a much richer theory than the theory with which we started.

Ethnographic Attitude

Three specific methods have been presented in this manual--SPEAKING, ethnographic semantics, and industry case studies. If one thinks in terms of a film, the three are different camera angles to explore the world of leadership in a particular country, from the country's point of view. SPEAKING teaches us about the significant attributes of a leader as reflected in what is included in stories told about good and bad ones. Ethnographic semantics offers a way to locate the concept of "leader" in the local language and culture. The industry cases offer a broader context to understand what issues leaders have to handle and why.

These data alone, when gathered together, compared, and published by the CCI's and the project team, will constitute a unique and important contribution to our general understanding of leadership in international perspective.

However, the ethnographic approach is meant to function more broadly than this, in two respects. First of all, the ethnographic and quantitative studies can interact throughout the course of the research. What a CCI learns in the ethnographic studies can help shape the quantitative instruments in a more locally appropriate way. Concepts of "leader," attributes of "leadership," and issues that shape leaders' behavior will help take the hypotheses and variables of the general study and translate them into locally appropriate concepts and questions.

And vice-versa. When a CCI takes the standardized measures of the quantitative study and applies them to his/her home country, he/she will find that some aspects of the study fit better than others. We think of such problems as <u>cultural leaks</u>, ways that the local culture seeps into the research design and causes interesting issues in data collection and interpretation. When cultural leaks appear in the quantitative research, the CCI can use an ethnographic perspective to investigate the cultural phenomenon that causes the problem. He/she might investigate using some of the methods outlined in this manual, or he/she might simply adopt an ethnographic perspective, as outlined at the beginning of the manual, change the setting of the control switch, and look into the problem in a different way.

This last possibility leads to the second point about an ethnographic attitude. In this manual three focused methods have been featured. But they aren't the <u>only</u> possible ways to gather data. A CCI can think of him/herself as a <u>participant observer</u>, all the time. Rich points about leaders and leadership will come up all the time, not just when the CCI is doing interviews.

Anytime a rich point comes up, especially rich points that help understand important differences between the CCI's home country and the general study framework, the CCI can <u>note it down</u>. This is nothing more than the time honored ethnographic strategy of keeping <u>fieldnotes</u>, the same strategy that was discussed in the section on stories.

One of the nice things about ethnography is that it is a research approach that celebrates surprises, the unexpected, and takes them into the study. When something surprising occurs during the study, however and whenever it comes up, we want to preserve it rather than neglect it just because it doesn't fit into the structured ethnographic or quantitative data.

Towards this end, we may develop a second manual, depending on how this initial ethnographic phase goes. A second phase might set up a framework for CCI's to organize selected data from their country as a whole to learn more about how leadership is represented in general, not just in the two industries. As an alternative, we might want to take the process outlined in this manual, if it works well, and apply it to other key topics for the study, like the nature of "organizations."

We'll talk about this manual and these future possibilities in Calgary. But first things first. I've tried to write a manual for CCI's that will show them how to add some focused ethnographic work to their study activities. I've tried to do this at a level that neither assumes too much nor too little on the part of the reader, though with such a varied group, none of whom I've met before, it's hard to tell whether I've hit it right or not. What I need now is feedback from the CCI's. Is the manual clear? Do the tasks seem reasonable given time constraints? Feel free to comment as soon as you've had a look via email or regular mail, and by the time we get to Calgary--after you've also received the analysis section--we'll know what the issues are. I hope you've enjoyed reading the manual, have found something in it that was worth your while, and see, with me, the exciting possibilities for using ethnographic research in coordination with the surveys to take our global understanding of leadership into new territory.

SUMMARY AND REFERENCES TO BE ADDED

onclusion

What I've tried to do here is introduce the characteristics of ethnographic research, show how the characteristics differ from those of the received view, and demonstrate one productive relationship between received view and ethnographic or qualitative research. I've tried for an introductory tour of the territory, one that leaves aside the issues of the different methodologies, theories, and epistemologies that ethnography carries with it. To actually do an ethnography requires training in research design and methodology--design and method that are different from received view traditions--and some supervised apprenticeship. But, with any luck, this introduction will give the reader new to ethnography a better sense of what it is, how it works, and what kinds of questions it is the right answer to.

References

* Agar, Michael. 1980. The Professional Stranger: An Informal Introduction to Ethnography. New York: Academic Press.

* Agar, Michael. 1985. Speaking of Ethnography. Beverly Hills: Sage.

* Glaser, Barney G. and Anselm L. Strauss. 1967. The Discovery of Grounded Theory. Chicago: Aldine.

* Mishler

* Spradley, James. 1979. The Ethnographic Interview. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

* Spradley, James. 1980. Participant Observation. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

NOTE TO THE READER: What questions have come up as you read this manual for which I might provide additional references?

Any number of complications might come up. First is the situation of translation, that mapping the dimension into the local language might not be such an easy task. Second is the problem of application, that some dimensions might be difficult to connect with the concepts that are important to understanding definitions and stories in a particular language. Third is the problem of ambiguity, that a dimension might be seen to "sort of" apply but "sort of" not. Fourth is the issue of coverage, namely, that a dimension applies, but it doesn't apply very much, and it isn't much help. Fifth is the problem of linkage, that a dimension is part of a scheme for understanding the ethnographic data, but only when it is seen in its relationship to other concepts.

Now for a slippery problem that calls for some discussion. We are looking for rich points in the stories, but rich points with reference to what point of view? One answer is straightforward; the second is more imperialistic. The straightforward answer is, we look for rich points given the common frame of reference for all CCI's, namely, the current theory of leadership that drives the study. Using that framework, a rich point occurs in the stories to the extent that some important aspect of leadership is revealed that complicates the shared theoretical frame of reference. The question that generates rich points is, "the stories show that leaders in country X act in the following way; what does this have to do with the propositions in the theory of leadership that the study is based on?"

When rich points are generated, the next step is to build frames to account for them. Frames for whom? Now comes the imperialistic part of the point of view. Since the study language is English, and since it is coordinated from an American base, the target audience for the frames are probably best thought of as American English speakers. So, a good way to think about the analysis, the frames you build to show how leadership is different in your country, is to think of explaining the story and showing the differences to a visiting American colleague. What would you have to tell him/her in order for him/her to look at the story and see how leadership differs in your country from what they would expect?

The best way to do an analysis like this, for our purposes, is to focus on the first few stories in detail. Read them over several times and think about how they are different and how they are similar. The purpose of this initial comparison is to look for common patterns across the stories. We're not so much interested in the idiosyncratic details of a single person, but rather in the common patterns across leaders in that country.

Once the patterns are developed out of a few stories, the comparison continues as new stories are gathered. As new stories appear, you treat the patterns derived in the first few stories as hypotheses to check out against the new stories. Do they work there as well? Why or why not? When the patterns don't quite work, or don't work at all, you have to modify the patterns to take account of the new material.

By the end of the story analysis, you will have a few critical frames, patterns that occur in several stories, that show some key differences between leadership in your country and leadership as it is generally thought of in the theory and as it is thought of by American English speakers. The results will complement the results of the ethnographic semantic work. Ethnographic semantics will document how the term is located conceptually in the local language and culture; the story analysis will show what people see as important in leader behavior in that culture. The two, taken together, will leave us with a powerful documentation of how leadership in the CCI's country is similar to, and different from, leadership as thought of in the theory and in American English.

But there is more. Recall the theoretical variables that guide the leadership study: Individualism vs. Collectivism, Masculinity vs. Femininity, Tolerance vs. Intolerance of Uncertainty, Power Stratification vs. Power Equalization, Humanistic vs. Impersonal Orientation, Achievement Orientation, and Future vs. Present Orientation.

The question is, now that you have a record of how local people define "leader," what do their definitions have to do with the theoretical dimensions of culture? Do people say things like, "a leader has to take the group into account," which one might call "collectivism." Or do they say, "a leader has to know his own mind and do what he thinks is right," which one might call "individualism. Or do people from the same country say <u>both</u> things, which raises further questions of when a leader should do one and when the other. Or maybe everyone said, "the most important thing about a leader is that he or she is polite." Where would we locate that attribute on the theoretical variables?

As discussed earlier in the manual, we want to juxtapose the ethnographic results and the theoretical variables and explore their interrelationships. Specifically, we want to look at where and how the theoretical categories fit the ethnographic results, where they don't, and what kinds of complications arise. Once again, the purpose isn't to eliminate the variables, but rather to evaluate them against the ethnographic results and then change the theory to the extent necessary to respond to that evaluation.

At the end of this manual, I'll mention some possible future projects that CCI's might do. We'll discuss this manual and those future projects at our meeting in Calgary. But for now, the important thing is to get the CCI's started with a focused and important task for our study, namely, what do managers in a particular country think leadership is all about? What they teach us may have a direct and clear relationship to the study variables; then again, it may not. That's the problem that this methodology is designed to address.

This sort of repeated motif, this key that lets one unlock a core and common concern across a variety of stories, is something we might call a theme. Themes are subtle, and their discovery and documentation takes us into advanced stages of ethnographic analysis that are beyond the scope of this manual. At the same time, a CCI can keep a lookout for themes as they work on different stories. If he/she notices themes, repeated content that shows the heart of what leadership is all about in that country, he/she should note them down and discuss them with the project team.