BOOK CHAPTER:

Being in Fieldwork: Collaboration, Digital Media and Ethnographic Practice

Heather A. Horst

In *eFieldnotes: The Makings of Anthropology in a Digital World*
Edited by Roger Sanjek and Susan Tratner
University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016
http://www.upenn.edu/pennpress/book/1086.html

August 2014 Final Draft

The growth of interest in a range of new digital phenomenon and terrains has expanded, questioning, challenging, and redefining the possibilities and parameters for ethnographic practice, and especially the practice of fieldwork. One of the central tenets of recent reflections on ethnography (especially anthropologically informed ethnographic practice) is the commitment to the rigor of the experience of "being in fieldwork" through participation in the worlds and milieu's of research participants. As Sherry Ortner (1995) and a range of others have acknowledged in different forms and fashions, the "self as an instrument of knowing" remains a key tenet in anthropological fieldwork. Indeed, fieldwork in anthropology involves embodied forms of knowing and knowledge production and, in Konstantinos Retsika's words, "the deployment of the fieldworker's body as a living, physical, sensing, and experiencing agent enmeshed in practical and intimate encounter" (2008: 127) within a range of spaces and places. This experiential and immersive commitment to engagement is often what sets anthropological ethnography apart from other disciplines and approaches. Yet, many of these theories of "being in fieldwork" hinge upon a single ethnographer or anthropologist as the centre of the encounter.

As feminist anthropology and the reflexive turn in anthropology highlighted extensively, collaboration has always been part of ethnography, especially through our relationships with research assistants, participants, and “key informants” whose contributions often remain invisible to the final productions for a series of reasons ranging from issues of privacy to exploitation (Sanjek 2014). Indeed, feminist ethnography grappled with attempts to experiment with engaging research participants in the writing and representation in the ethnographic text that explicitly sought to acknowledge the co-constitution and co-production of knowledge in the field (Behar 1993). Yet, such collaborations represent only one example of the different practices and patterns of collaboration in anthropology and its consequences for knowledge production.

This chapter explores the negotiations around knowledge production and forms of “knowing” in collaborative, distributed, and interdisciplinary projects that privilege ethnography as an epistemological and methodological approach to knowing. More specifically, it explores the relationships between “traditional” forms of knowing and knowledge production and the processes of “being in fieldwork” in contemporary anthropology’s complex and dynamic research environment that is increasingly mediated through digital technologies, spaces, places, and artefacts. Drawing upon my participation on three ethnographic collaborations over the past decade, I reflect upon a shift from personalized, private experiences of fieldwork, wherein the individual self is the primary instrument of knowing, to a de-centred self by which knowledge is constructed through different forms of interaction and mediated in and through digital interfaces and technology. I conclude with a brief discussion of the challenges of each mode of mediation and collaboration.

Digital Technology, Mediations, and Remediation

From the introduction of audio recorders, cameras, video recorders, and the laptop, technology has always been a part of the anthropological research endeavour, mediating our relationships, our memory, and the very construction of “the field” as a place, site, or network (Burrell 2010). Largely viewed as tools that facilitate and aid the process of fieldwork and the writing of ethnographic monographs, new digital media and technologies over the past decade have spurred a range of debates around their roles in ethnographic research, both as objects of inquiry and as tools or techniques for research. Early work on newsgroups and online communities experimented with new forms of participation that considered the implications of conducting “virtual” or “online” ethnography, particularly efforts to respect the integrity of the endogenous categories of participants in these worlds (Hine 2000).

Early theorizing of “online” and “virtual worlds” often stressed the potential immateriality of the body for researchers who were imagined to carry out research from the “convenient” vantage point of their homes and offices. In addition to negating the corporeal dimensions of this process (e.g. eye-strain, neck and wrist pain, and other side effects), more recent work has returned our attention to the importance of the researcher’s body and the experience of embodiment within our fieldwork experience. Boellstorff, for example, reveals how the research avatar in Second Life was the “locus of perception and sociality," one that cannot be understood as disembodied or disconnected from everyday practice or ways of knowing; moreover, he stresses the importance of context in understanding the role of the body while "being in fieldwork," noting that "virtual embodiment is always embodiment in a virtual place, and that this placeness of virtual worlds holds foundational implications for online corporeality" (2011: 510).

In a number of the collaborative ethnographic projects I have been engaged in over the past decade, we have developed mechanisms for creating and retaining embodied forms of knowing through perception and sociality, often through digital media and technology. During our research on the use of mobile phones among low-income Jamaicans in 2004 (Horst and Miller 2006), we used digital media and technology (particularly the internet) to facilitate the 4Ts – tours, time (or temporality), translations, and texts – that structure collaborative, ethnographic research.

To illustrate, Daniel Miller and I began our research together in rural Jamaica in January 2004. Because I had been living and visiting in this area of rural Jamaica for a decade, our household questionnaires utilized *tours* of local sites and key people. After this first visit, Miller came to Jamaica two additional *times* during the middle and end of the fieldwork, during which we developed a practice of co-producing fieldnotes via audio recording our immediate notes and reactions to interviews and other interactions; these supplemented our individual fieldnotes. We also started a process of "downloading" and, in effect, *translating* and archiving my experiences in Jamaica prior to the fieldwork period. Translation also involved extensive discussions on the differences between

Jamaica and Trinidad, where Miller has carried out research (see Miller and Slater 2001).

Between Miller's visits (in January, July, and December 2004), we continued, through email, to circulate *texts*, such as fieldnotes, interview transcripts, and regulatory reports accessed in the United Kingdom. On the later visits, we continued to carry out tours to introduce Miller to key people and places that he had read about in my fieldnotes, transcribed conversations, and summaries. Through these techniques, Miller was able to attain a sense of 'being in fieldwork" via the different modalities through which he was introduced to and came to know particular places, people, and events. Like other forms of episodic fieldwork (Postill 2011; White 2013)[1], the structured process of phasing the research, engaging in a process of translation, and developing "tours" enhanced my own efforts to articulate and translate ideas, thoughts, and experiences.

A dramatic change in the accessibility and affordability of digital media technology occurred in the five years between the research on mobile phones in Jamaica and a new project on mobile phones that I began with Erin Taylor in 2010, and which expanded the use of digital media and technology as a form of mediation for "being in fieldwork." The project was designed[2] to explore the impact of the changing telecommunications landscape for Haitian migrants living in the Haiti-Dominican Republic border zone who have access to two different telecommunications networks.

As with my previous research with Miller, Taylor and I utilised the 4Ts to structure our research collaboration. In this case, however, I was the distant self who was experiencing "being in fieldwork" through multiple mediations. For example, throughout the research I was able to use Skype (audio only) during fieldwork to call Taylor's local mobile in the Dominican Republic, usually every day or every other day in the evening. This also meant that I could sensorially experience "being in the field" through sound and other background noises, and could listen to and discuss her daily activities and events, often prior to Taylor's writing of fieldnotes. This process, which occurred during the critical early phases of fieldwork, enabled us to identify, in close to synchronous *time*, new questions and themes, and to draw comparisons with places and experiences from my previous fieldwork on mobile phones in Jamaica and from Taylor's knowledge of the urban Dominican Republic (instances of *translation*). She also uploaded photographs and videos while in the field, which we discussed and exchanged notes about during her fieldwork (examples of *text*). During the time I was situated geographically in the field in 2012, while conducting our portable kit study (Horst and Taylor 2014), Taylor took me on a *tour* of the field as she had constructed it, introducing me to places and people I had read about in fieldnotes, observed in pictures, or heard in the background on our Skype calls. Together, the tours, translations, texts, and the temporal dimensions of our research became a way through which I came to "know" the field through a variety of mediations.[3]

In these two, relatively small, research "teams," which consisted of two core people with a shared (although sometimes different) understanding of anthropological forms of ethnography, collaborative research continued to privilege the ethnographic mode of knowing through the self (or, more precisely, two selves) as an embodied form of knowledge production, one which in the face of geographic distance can be mediated by digital devices and technology. These engagements situated digital media and technology as channels through which a distant fieldworker comes to know and maintain relationships with “the field,” as well as with the other researcher who directly constructs the field. In essence, digital media and technology becomes a form of mediation.

Yet, “being in fieldwork” through digital media and technology is also a form of remediation. As Bolter and Grusin observe, “What is new about new media is therefore also old and familiar: that they promise the new by remediating what has gone before.” (2000: 14). Here, older, face-to-face practices of both collaboration and “being in fieldwork” are being reshaped and represented by new practices in different forms. This presents the possibility of extending and, in the case of social media, even amplifying “being in fieldwork” as people move across different spaces and platforms (Postill and Pink 2012). However, as others in this volume describe (in particular Burrell, Chapter X), the use of digital media and technology as a proxy for physical and sensory co-location presents challenges for the realization of “knowing” in the classic sense of “being in fieldwork” epitomised by such figures as Malinowski and Geertz.

Knowing Beyond the Self

In the previous section, I focused upon the ways in which digital media and technology present anthropologists and other ethnographers with possibilities for mediated forms of collaboration, particularly from a distance, that are attuned to a more traditional sense of “being in fieldwork” in anthropology. While these issues remain pertinent to the emergent practices of anthropology, a raft of new research endeavours have emerged that often include interdisciplinary teams, “audiences” for research outside of the discipline of anthropology (and/or academia generally), and an interest in comparison and contextualisation on a broader scale. Although, arguably, applied anthropologists and others in fields such as science studies (Barry, Born, and Weszkalnys 2008; Suchman et al. 1999) have engaged in non-traditional forms of collaboration for some time, there is a growing recognition of “the imperative and impulse to collaborate,” as George Marcus (2012: 433) characterises this shift. Referring to these collaborative “third spaces” (Fischer 2003; Marcus 2012, 2013), Michael Fischer argues that here “anthropology’s challenge is to develop translation and mediation tools for helping make visible the difference of interests, access, power, needs, desire, and philosophical perspective” (Fischer 2003:3). As Marcus’s (2012) recent work tracing the emergence of collaborations in these third spaces suggests, the experience of “being in fieldwork,” the production of fieldnotes, and forms of knowing are being redefined, and moving the margins to the center of the anthropological project.

Between 2005 and 2008, I was involved as a postdoctoral researcher in one such third space: “Kids’ Informal Learning with Digital Media: An Ethnographic Investigation of Innovative Knowledge Cultures,” or the Digital Youth Project, a collaborative research effort funded by the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation. Led by Peter Lyman, Mizuko Ito, Michael Carter, and Barrie Thorne, the project began as a broad-based study of young people’s new media usage and the everyday, informal learning in these new spaces. The twenty-eight researchers involved in the project were affiliated with one of the two organizing institutions, the University of California, Berkeley (UCB), and the University of Southern California (USC).

Institutionally, I moved during the project from USC to UCB in light of the geographic focus of my research in Silicon Valley; subsequently, I participated in the weekly meetings at UCB as well as continuing to attend monthly meetings at USC in Los Angeles in person or via phone.

The project involved utilization of shared research instruments (e.g., a background questionnaire), disposition towards ethnography as the primary way of ‘knowing,” and two additional approaches to studying engagement with new media. At the outset of the project, there was an understanding that fieldnotes and material would be shared across the team, although the exact mechanisms for this were not defined until later in the research project. The first of these approaches focused upon knowing through engaging with young people in their everyday lives and then following “the action” to the various digital media and technology they were using. The second approach focused upon participation in social network sites, interests groups, and online communities, and then followed participants offline and/or across other online research sites.

In the autumn of 2007, I flew from the San Francisco Bay area to Los Angeles to participate in a two-day meeting with my fellow researchers: two Principle Investigators, four postdocs, and eight graduate student, masters, and Ph.D. level research assistants who were based at USC and UCB. Tooled out with our various laptops and mobiles, we assumed our positions around a long conference table, pulling out an array of devices, power cords, and other paraphernalia. Once settled in, we kicked off our meeting by creating and inviting everyone, onto a Google doc for public notes and action items. We also logged into a shared wiki space where a group of us had already started to develop "codes" based on our "case studies," including my research on the relationships to media and technology among families living in Silicon Valley (see Horst 2009, 2012) and a smaller study of Neopets with Mimi Ito and Laura Robinson. Like every other meeting we held throughout the project, we also established a "backchannel" where people could pose questions or other issues that might not be "heard" during this large group meeting. A smaller group of us also logged onto IM to further "backchannel" our reactions to the discussions.

After a lengthy discussion about the expected outcomes of the project (a final report, co-authored book, and public forum), we began focusing upon a few themes and questions. What did we mean by "youth"? Should we be using "youth," "young people," or the more colloquial term "kids"? How should we describe kids' identities in relation to technology in a language that reflected the practices we saw collectively? Given the shifts in the discussion, we decided to turn to the "identity" wiki page, where many of us had uploaded direct quotes from interviews, excerpts of fieldnotes, and descriptions of pictures, videos, and other materials. Rather than reading from our individual screens, one person decided to connect to the projector to make it easier for everyone in the room to see the main document. A few people added more material based on the discussions, but we eventually decided to discourage having too many of us on the wiki at once for fear of losing edits and, by extension, traces of those changes; the Google doc became a backup for some of this new material.

As the discussion turned to the range of identity practices posted on the wiki, one Ph.D. student commented that the research from a former M.A.[4] who had stopped working on the project a year earlier had not been integrated into the wiki. Thinking the former researcher still had the transcriptions of the interview and the discussion he was remembering, the Ph.D. student sent her an email asking her to confirm his memory of the transcript and conversation, which was held during one of the weekly meetings in Berkeley. He also asked if she was comfortable with the use of her case study as an exemplar of this kind of identity practice. A few minutes later, the former researcher was logged into IM and made a few comments that the Ph.D. researcher subsequently read, copied, and pasted into the back channel for discussion. In this IM conversation, the former researcher also agreed to write up her case study for inclusion in the co-authored book (Ito et al. 2010).

After a few hours of discussion of different notions of identity, “geek” emerged as the term most often used by kids for those with technical proficiency. However, a few of us were reluctant to use the word “geek” because it suggested a reification or stereotype--the notion of an individual tech user, or a signal for “rich”, or “Asian” and “white,” kids--something which the research team had been actively trying to avoid in characterizing their research findings. During our backchannel and informal conversations, we started to discuss practice and participation across the diverse range of youth we had encountered, a few people working in less-privileged and ethnically-diverse locations described examples of kids who had become deeply immersed in amateur music, video making, online gaming communities, and so on. The team finally agreed upon “geeking out” (not “geeks”) as a working term to describe young people who were deeply involved in these activities. The other two “genres of participation” we had identified proved to be more difficult to name concisely, but a day later we agreed upon one more working term--“hanging out”—to describe those who devoted long hours to social network sites, gaming with others, and messaging. The third term, which eventually crystalized as “messing around”—to designate extensive individual exploration via the internet--took more collaborative writing, reviewing, coding, and time. This process was scheduled on a shared Google calendar, and suggestions circulated via the wiki, email, and the project staff mailing list.

In many ways, the series of discussions was the beginning of collective “analysis” for the project, a moment where we could stop and take stock of the material we had produced over the past few years. Yet, this was also one of only a few times that our dynamic and spatially dispersed research team were able to come together (in person or via conference call) to make sense of what had been occurring in our primary fieldwork “on the ground,” whether that ground meant schools, afterschool programs, homes, or “online” spaces such as gaming guilds, vlogging communities, or social network sites. Moreover, and my personal reflections upon this experience of collaboration suggests, there was ongoing temporality embedded within the project. Many individuals changed their academic status during the life of the project, from undergraduate to graduate research assistant; master’s degree to Ph.D. candidate; and postdoctoral scholar to assistant professor. Other researchers moved on from the team, or became more centrally enmeshed in different, concurrent projects.

Beyond the changing constitution of the research team, the broader realization we shared was that an understanding the range of everyday experiences of youth using digital media and technology, and of their informal learning processes, could not be reduced to any individual “case study” as we came to term the several different research sites in the Digital Youth Project. The challenge was to bring the “federated” set of project sites into one conversation. This often began at the regular meetings. Rarely recorded or archived, these discussions of “being in fieldwork” among research team members became a shared knowledge bank that was reopened and referred back to in subsequent meetings and for the generation of interim reports. In addition, a few people emerged as the “mediators” or “spokespersons” for the project by familiarizing themselves with the entire study, making sure project results were archived, and staying in touch with people who had moved on but who were still viewed as “owning” a case study in the project with the responsibility to undertake a final review of how the material presented to the team was represented.

In the second year of the project, we also began posting “Stories from the Field” on the project’s public website (http://digitalyouth.ischool.berkeley.edu/) to share experiences and insights consolidated during regular meetings. There were several researchers, as well, who worked together on particular facets of the research, especially those that involved schools or afterschool programs. In my case, other researchers with expertise relevant to better understand one of my project participants sometimes came along to an interview or diary study session. In most instances, researchers shared and archived all or part of their de-identified fieldnotes, interview transcripts, and other materials via our online collaboration site, including the wiki based at USC[1].

Given the collective, relational nature of our research approach, I eventually came to see the engagement with project wikis, back channels, Google docs, shared calendars, internal mailing lists, word docs, track changes, websites, conference calls,

---

1

and formal and informal meetings as another form of “being in fieldwork.” The interactions in and through these various meetings and platforms become ways of knowing and relating to other people involved in the research endeavour and to their findings. In such projects, the self is no longer the central instrument of knowing; instead, the experience of knowing emerges through interactions between material objects, platforms, and spaces that have been collected or created throughout the collective and coordinated research process (Nafus and Anderson 2009; Suchman et al. 1999). These spaces also come to constitute the experience of “being in fieldwork,” and are fundamentally as important to the very constitution of “fields” as they are spaces for analysis.

Co-Presence and Relational Scales

To take this argument a step further, I want to explore how “being in fieldwork” can be scrutinized through an alternative lens from ethnographic approaches outside of the discipline of anthropology. Science studies scholar Anne Beaulieu’s discussion (2010) of co-presence provides a useful framework for reflecting on the different forms of “being in fieldwork” carried out on the Digital Youth Project and other large-scale collaborations wherein the process of “being in fieldwork” cannot be confined to an individual, a location, or a form of mediation.

Drawing a distinction between co-location and co-presence, Beaulieu stresses the fluid and processual nature of fieldwork and of the very definition of the fields that we create and inhabit. As she describes it, developing a relationship of co-presence is “a very active form of ‘field-making.’ The field is constituted in the interaction. The field is not a container or background in which interaction takes place, and a certain lack of stability of the “field” could be considered a potential loss of adopting this approach“ (2010: 11). Beaulieu further notes that the “condition of co-presence” challenges ethnographic genres of analysis and production, opening up a space for a more nuanced discussion of changing practices of ethnography across sites, spaces, time, and multiple research team members. Rather than portraying these mediations and experiences of research as a pale attempt to capture co-location, Beaulieu introduces the notion of co-presence as another way to conceptualize the multiplicities and temporalities of “being in fieldwork,” and the associated processes of knowledge production.

Whether the collaboration is “federated,” as in the case of the Digital Youth Project, or more systematically comparative, such as in the Global Social Media Impact Study http://www.ucl.ac.uk/global-social-media, it is the connection or relational processes that remains central to any collaborative (and arguably any ethnographic) enterprise. As Marilyn Strathern (1999) has argued, fieldwork has always involved the ethnographer making her or himself open to entering into relationships with others. The findings, data, or materials we gather always reflect these relationships and, in many ways, they are what makes the material meaningful. Whereas more traditional anthropological projects often focus upon the relationships in their primary field sites, individual researchers in the kinds of large-scale collaborations I have been discussing must come to terms, first, with their field relationships in their “primary” research, and then, as well, with their relationships with the broader research teams where the ethnographer is, effectively, the representative of (often even fused with) the perspectives and analysis of their particular field research experience.

In these situations, individual fieldworkers bear primarily responsibility for the issues of rapport, representation, and experience of “being in fieldwork” in their individual or collective research sites, issues of the sort that have preoccupied anthropology in the post-*Writing Culture* (Clifford and Marcus 1986) era. Their second relationship with the research material and the research team comes through interactions on phone calls, instant messaging conversations, reading and posting in wikis, face-to-face meetings, and blog posts. Making the material and the primary experience of “being in fieldwork” accessible to others effectively opens the individuals who “represent” their case study to other relationships and reflections affecting fieldwork results and conclusions. This also reflects a process of moving from fieldnotes that directly inform the writing of the text to “certain accessible, if not public, forms of concept work and critique in the protracted phased segments of many fieldwork projects today” (Marcus 2012: 430).

The new relationships and interactions that are formed between research projects, ethnographers, and the constituent case studies can vary in scale and scope. In some instances, these become visible in perspectives, criticism, and reflection that feed back into the analysis of each primary study. However, this is a second order effect of such projects. As Marcus characterizes “third spaces” like the Digital Youth Project, “the creation of knowledge in the sense of fieldwork itself – partial to the traditional hypothesis of fieldwork – is displaced for innovations in collegial collaboration. This is a true diminution of the individualist project and its ideologies” (2013: online edition). This kind of collegial collaboration became evident in the Digital Youth Project and our discussion of the overlay of structural inequalities tied to the concept “geek” (versus “geeking out”). The sharing of material from our collective fieldwork sites substantiated a murkier picture of digital engagements and structural challenges, and reinforced our commitment to ethnography and comparison across many sites. Such efforts can result in the formation of relationships, ideas, and concepts that are new or, at the very least, surprising, and could not have been articulated in the same form, or with the same analytical vitality, outside the collective endeavour.

At the same time the extension of “being in fieldwork” also raises ethical concerns about the sites and boundaries of research. For example, the discussion of the Digital Youth Project is based upon my own reflections of learning about working on a large, collaborative endeavour of this scale. But because the project itself was not understood at the outset as an object of inquiry (which would in turn require negotiations of permissions and possibly even a formal ethics submission), my ability to write about the experience has involved developing an ethics around the politics of representation which, in the spirit of the project, included request for feedback from colleagues on the project. It also inspired considered reflections on the ethics of retrospectively making public what might otherwise remain the private domain of the project members.

Conclusion

This chapter has explored how ethnographic collaborations are challenging our understanding and research models of “being in fieldwork.” It highlights multiple forms of collaborative research, ranging from the small-scale collaborations of two researchers to larger teams. Presenting three examples of collaborative projects, I described how small scale projects can use digital media and technology to maintain the goals and aspirations of more traditional ethnography by mediating relationships between individual researchers, research sites, and the practice of “being in fieldwork.” While case studies in large scale ethnographic projects may also use such methods to enable the completion of the primary ethnography, my focus upon comparison across multiple case studies revealed how digital media, technology, and collaborative relational spaces can be used not only in mediating relationships with the field or field site, but also can be focused on creating co-presences which facilitate the creation and appreciation of relations or connections between different sites.

For many small research teams, practices such as taking collaborators on tours, sharing texts and other research material, translating conversations and events, and phasing fieldwork in time (the 4Ts), become ways through which experiences are mediated, and the experience of “being in fieldwork” can infuse collaborative ethnographic research. The challenge in mediated experiences in such fieldwork is that they must create a sense of co-presence which can augment and even reframe the experience of “being in fieldwork.” Without this mediated framework, fieldwork in and through digital media and technology is merely a remediation.

In large-scale collaborations, rather than a mediation of “on the ground” research, there is often a shifting the locus of knowledge from the single ethnographer to a collaborative, external, visible, and moving object or focus. Here, the novel forms of collaboration shape everything from archiving practices, to the tenor of weekly meetings, to the sense of “ownership” in research. What becomes recognized as knowledge is constructed in these spaces and is open to those who choose to participate or to enter into relationships with others and their research material. There is a movement from the locus of “being in fieldwork” in various locations, sites, and spaces, to a notion of “being in fieldwork” through co-presence via collective meetings, analysis sessions, and the production of material artefacts (Nafus and Anderson 2009) and written results.

Still, as in primary ethnographic research, what is viewed as important or relevant in collaborative efforts is formed through the quality of the relationships and the work to keep the connections “alive,” and this may fail when individual goals and aspirations are prioritized or the spirit of collegiality is not reciprocated. Even more importantly, while the research team (and the broader field) certainly benefits from more explicit discussions about the process and conditions of knowledge production, there are distinct challenges involved in navigating the ethics and the power dynamics between colleague-collaborator and fieldwork relationship. Anthropology’s increasing in collaborative and comparative research will require continuous rethinking of the multiple practices and contexts of “being in fieldwork” over time, space and scales.

Acknowledgements: This chapter would not be possible without the good will of my colleagues and collaborators as well as the constructive comments from Becky Herr-Stephenson, Mimi Ito, Daniel Miller and Sarah Pink. I bear all responsibility for any errors, gaps or leaps in logic.

References

Andrew Barry, Georgina Born, and Gisa Weszkalnys. 2008. Logics of Interdisciplinarity. *Economy and Society* 37(1): 20-49.

Beaulieu, Anne. 2010. Research Note: From co-location to co-presence: Shifts in the use of ethnography for the study of knowledge. *Social Studies of Science* 40: 453-470.

Behar, Ruth. 2003 [1993]. *Translated Woman: Crossing the Border with Esperanza's Story*, second edition. Boston: Beacon Press.

Boellstorff, Tom. 2008. *Coming of Age In Second Life: An Anthropologist Explores The Virtually Human*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

--. 2011. Placing the Virtual Body: Avatar, Chora, Cypherg. In *A Companion to the Anthropology of the Body and Embodiment*. Edited by Frances E. Mascia-Lees, 504–520. New York: Wiley-Blackwell.

--, Tom, Bonnie Nardi, Celia Pearce, and T.L. Taylor. 2012. *Ethnography and Virtual Worlds: A Handbook of Method*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Bolter, Jay David, and Richard Grusin. 2000. *Remediation: Understanding New Media.* Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Burrell, Jenna. 2009. The Field Site as a Network: A Strategy for Locating Ethnographic Research. *Field Methods* 21 (2): 181–199.

Clifford, James, and George E. Marcus. 1986. *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Deger, Jennifer. 2006. *Shimmering Screens: Making Media in an Aboriginal Community*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press

Faubion, James D. 2011. *An Anthropology of Ethics*. New York: Cambridge University

Press.

--, and George E. Marcus, editors. 2009. *Fieldwork is Not What It Used To Be: Learning Anthropology's Method In a Time of Transition*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.

Fischer, Michael M. J. 2003. *Emergent Forms of Life and the Anthropological Voice*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.

Geismar, Haidy. 2013. *Treasured Possessions: Indigenous Interventions into Intellectual and Cultural Property.* Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.

Halstead, Narmala, Eric Hirsh, and Judith Okeley, editors. 2008. *Knowing How to Know: Fieldwork and the Ethnographic Present*. London: Berghahn.

Hine, C. 2000. *Virtual Ethnography.* London: Sage.

--. 2008. Overview: Virtual Ethnography: Modes, Varieties, Affordances. In *The Sage Handbook of Online Research Methods.* Edited by Nigel G. Fielding, Raymond M. Lee, and Grant Blank, 257-270. London: Sage.

Holmes, Douglas, and George E. Marcus. 2008. Collaboration Today and the Re-Imagination of the Classic Scene of Fieldwork Encounter. *Collaborative Anthropologies* 1: 81–101.

Horst, Heather A. 2009, Aesthetics of the Self: Digital Mediations. In *Anthropology and the Individual: A Material Culture Perspective*. Edited by Daniel Miller, 99-114. Oxford: Berg.

--. 2012. New Media Technologies in Everyday Life. In *Digital Anthropology*. Eduted by Heather A. Horst and Daniel Miller, 61-79. New York: Berg.

--, and Daniel Miller. 2006. *The Cell Phone: An Anthropology of Communication*. New York: Berg.

--, and Daniel Miller, editors. 2012. *Digital Anthropology*. New York: Berg.

--, and Erin B. Taylor. 2014. The Role of Mobile Phones in the Mediation of Border Crossings: A Study of Haiti and the Dominican Republic. *The Anthropology Journal of Australia* 25 (2): 155-170.

--, Larissa Hjorth, and Jo Tacchi. 2012. Media Ethnography Revised: An Introduction. *Media International Australia* 145: 86-93

Ito, Mizuko, Sonja Baumer, Matteo Bittanti, danah boyd, Rachel Cody, Rebecca Herr-Stephenson, Heather A. Horst, Patricia G. Lange, Dilan Mahendran, Katynka Z. Martinez, C.J. Pascoe, Dan Perkel, Laura Robinson, Christo Sims, and Lisa Tripp. 2010. *Hanging Out, Messing Around, and Geeking Out: Kids Living and Learning with New Media*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Ito, Mizuko, Heather A. Horst, Matteo Bittanti, Rebecca Herr-Stephenson, Patricia G. Lange, C.J. Pascoe, and Laura Robinson. 2009. *Living and Learning with New Media: Summary of Findings from the Digital Youth Project*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Marcus, George E. 2012. The Legacies of Writing Culture and the Near Future of the Ethnographic Form. *Cultural Anthropology* 27 (30): 427–446.

--. 2013. Experimental Forms for the Expression of Norms in the Ethnography of the Contemporary. *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 3 (2): 197–217

Miller, Daniel, and Don Slater. 2001. *The Internet: An Ethnographic Approach*. Oxford: Berg.

Nafus, Dawn, and Ken Anderson. 2009. Writing on Walls: The Materiality of Social Memory in Corporate Research. In *Ethnography and the Corporate Encounter:*

Reflections on Research in and of Corporations. Edited by Melissa Cefkin, 137-157. New York: Berghahn.

Ortner, Sherry. 1995. Resistance and the Problem of Ethnographic Refusal. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 37 (1): 173-193.

--. 2006. *Anthropology and Social Theory: Culture, Power, and the Acting Subject*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.

Pink, Sarah. 2007. *Doing Visual Ethnography: Images, Media and Representation in Research*. Revised and expanded second edition. London: Sage.

Postill, John. 2011. *Localizing the Internet: An Anthropological Account*. Oxford: Berghahn.

--, and Sarah Pink. 2012. Social Media Ethnography: The Digital Researcher in a Messy Web. *Media International Australia* 145: 123-134.

Retsikas, Konstantinos. 2008. Knowledge from the Body: Fieldwork, Power and the Acquisition of a New Self. In *Knowing How to Know: Fieldwork and the Ethnographic Present.* Edited by Narmala Halstead, Eric Hirsch, and Judith Okeley, 110-129. London: Berghahn.

Sanjek, Roger. 2014. *Ethnography in Today's World: Color Full before Color Blind*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Strathern, Marilyn. 1999. Property Substance and Effect Anthropological Essays on Persons and Things. London: The Athalone Press.

Suchman, Lucy, Jeanette Blomberg, Julian Orr, and Randall Trigg. 1999. Reconstructing Technologies as Social Practice. *American Behavioral Scientist* 43 (3): 392-408.

Taylor, Erin, and Heather Horst. 2014. The Aesthetics of Mobile Money. In *Mobile Media Companion.* Edited by G. Goggin and L. Hjorth, xx-xx. London: Routledge.

Whyte, Michael. 2013. Episodic Fieldwork, Updating, and Sociability. *Social Analysis* 57 (1): 110-121.

Williams, Raymond. 1977. *Marxism and Literature: From Medium to Social Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Notes

[1] Episodic fieldwork is the form of engagement that most academic anthropologists practice, particularly after their first fieldwork experience. Along with facilitating the aspiration of long-term engagement for anthropologists committed to a particular place or people, it has also been shaped by the structural conditions of academia and funding for research and travel funds.

[2] In the aftermath of the earthquake of 2010, the original funded project shifted to research on the introduction of mobile money and involved another core researcher, Espelencia Baptiste (see Taylor and Horst 2014).

[3] Although I will not discuss this extensively, there is another layer of translations in and through the institutions through which research is conducted and funded. In this case the Institutional Review Board process and the funding for the project (an IMTFI grant) took some time to manage given the earthquake that took place in January 2010, days after the project funding was awarded.

[4] As noted in the text, I have disguised the identities of the researchers as my account of events that may not be shared among all members of the research team.