Workplace ethnographies – an underestimated source of subject-oriented work research

Andrea Gabler

The article tries to argue why workplace ethnographies, with their deep immersion into daily social action, are more than other approaches appropriate to illuminate hidden and subjective levels of work. Insofar they should be more picked up by the current debates on subjectivation, subjectivity and informal organisation of work in German sociology of work and industrial sociology. A cursory view of the rich tradition of ethnographic research and of examples within the anglophone language area will show the methodical and factual gains of this approach. The US-American "Workplace Ethnography Project" demonstrates an interesting way to deduce more general insights and patterns from ethnographic case studies. Exemplary findings can be linked to the German debate. Finally a view on one of the few German ethnographic studies will show its value to the analysis of subjectivity, subjectivation and informal organisation of work: and gives reasons for pursuing similar research.

Key words: workplace ethnography, subjectivation of work, informal organisation of work, transformation of work, subject-oriented work research

1. The debate on subjectivation of work

"I am an entrepreneurial self now", Christoph Bartmann writes on his brave new, 'post-bureaucratic' world as an employee (Bartmann, 2012, p. 15). In fact, the subject seems to have been allocated a larger space in the work

International Journal of Action Research, 11(1-2), 2015, 119-145 DOI 10.1688/IJAR-2015-01-Gabler
ISSN 1861-1303 (print), ISSN 1861-9916 (internet)

process today, representing an important aspect of the transformation of work. It is a main characteristic of the (earlier) Fordist organisation of work, to eliminate the subjective factor through strict division of work, mandatory rules and rigid control by management, and thus considerably contribute to alienation. In Taylorist work, the subjective factor seems to be completely excluded, from its ideal typical concept as well as from the average working day, although I will show later that subjectivity is indispensable in everyday work and that, in fact, it does play a central role. With the introduction of post-Fordist, post-bureaucratic working methods however, subjectivity is recognised as a factor that may increase production, and is even promoted. First of all, from the point of view of the company and the management, this subjectivation means a more intense access to the labour capacity of the employee. Higher demands on the presence and the flexibility of the companies, resulting from the process of 'marketisation', are handed 'down' to the employees as higher demands on their creativity, flexibility and subjective potentials which have not been used before. The subjective work capacity, although it had always been present and was practiced, but so far had rarely or not at all been claimed, is today expected and used for the purposes of the organisation. The employees are supposed to work in a 'holistic' way, to give up their creativity and their ability to structure completely, and to exploit their potential of self regulation. Next to their professional skills, they are supposed to integrate social, extra-professional and personal abilities into their work: that is, their complete personality. Thus, subjectivity is functionalised, new ways of control and cooperation emerge: a process that is presently debated, using terms like 'self control instead of surveillance' or 'ways of team or project work'.

The other side of subjectivation of work is based on historically relatively new demands of employees concerning their work. The main social trend of the 20th century, which is an increasing individualisation, materialises here in a stronger insistence on self realisation, on individual responsibility, and on greater freedom of one's own decisions and actions in the work process. This "normative subjectivation" (Baethge, 1994) confronts companies with a need for holistic, more 'liberated' and satisfying work-places. In this way, we are dealing with a "double process of subjectivation" (Kleemann, Matuschek, &

Voß, 2002, p. 58). In German sociology of work and industrial sociology, the current debate focuses, on one hand, on manifestations of this 'double subjectivation'. On the other hand, there are attempts to identify the consequences for employees and employment (see Lohr, 2013, pp. 434f.). The empirical findings remain contradictory (see ibid., pp. 432ff.), in spite of the spectacular thesis of the 'Arbeitskraftunternehmer' (entrepreneur of one's own manpower) (see Voß & Pongratz, 1998). 'Double subjectivation' is first of all an ideal typical description, and should be differentiated according to groups of employees, industries, and demographic and individual factors. Only then, its chance: like self-realisation, higher work satisfaction, breaking of fixed role patterns, and its risks: like work overload, insecurity, and alienation, can be identified empirically.

With the identification of this twofold transformation: a stronger grasp on work ability and higher demands on work, the sociology of work increasingly considers the subjective aspect. However, its "research into subjectivity as well as attitudes towards subjectivation [are] still in the phase of conceptual development" (Langfeldt, 2009, p. 388). "The problem of investigation of subjective attitudes towards subjectivation of work has […] not yet led to a final conclusion" (ibid., p. 391). There seems to be no silver bullet in the search for the subjective factor in work so far. However, we have suggestions to eliminate methodical and factual difficulties by including other disciplines and approaches like gender studies or labour and organisational psychology (see ibid., p. 389).

There are other options which have not yet been exhausted. This contribution suggests consulting sources that have, so far, found too little consideration in subject-oriented work research: workplace ethnographies. At first, the methodological specificity and uniqueness of the ethnographic approach will be explained. A cursory view of the rich tradition of ethnographic research, and of examples within the anglophone language area, will show the methodical and factual gains of this approach (2). Then, an interesting way to deduce more general insights and patterns from ethnographic case studies will be introduced by presenting considerations, implementations and selected findings from the US-American "Workplace Ethnography Project". Through the presentation of examples, options for their application and links to the

German debate can be shown (3). One of the few German language studies of workplace ethnography will show the 'value' of this approach to the analysis of subjectivity, subjectivation and informality in work (4). The contribution will close with reflections on further options of making wider use of ethnographies in the German language area (5).

2. Workplace ethnographies: Methodical and analytical subject orientation *par excellence*

Ethnography, originally part of ethnology (resp. 'social anthropology'), is a methodological approach as well as an analytical perspective (see van Maanen, 2011, p. 218). Its objects are social practices, which are being observed during longer phases of field research: classically a period of one year in the field, and then verbalised (by recording and editing field notes and diaries), and interpreted.[1] Typical formats are single case studies: analyses of *one* culture resp. *one* group, community or organisation. According to Wittel, ethnography can be described as "a process of investigation and textualisation of a culture with relatively clearly defined affiliations and limitations" (Wittel, 1997, p. 17), consisting "mainly in field research" (ibid.). At the center of a "broad scope of techniques of observation and communication" (ibid.), there is always a "longer period of field stay" (ibid.). Although ethnographic research follows different methods and combinations of methods in an opportunistic way (see Breidenstein, Hirschauer, Kalthoff, & Nieswand, 2013, p. 34), the focus is always in participant observation. Even as, in the German language area, one would perhaps not go as far as in Anglo-Saxon countries where, meanwhile, ethnography has been widely identified with

[1] For the following see Breidenstein, Hirschauer, Kalthoff, Nieswand, 2013, pp. 33ff. Ethnographies are time intensive, expensive and demanding. Under the restrictive conditions of the conventional academic activities, it is not surprising that ethnographic field work is in most cases restricted to phases of qualification (mainly for Doctoral degrees), and that the period of the field research is increasingly determined by pragmatic considerations. Pleas for a "focused ethnography" (Knoblauch 2001), are met with comprehensible criticism (see e.g. Dellwing & Prus, 2012, p. 214; Westney & Van Maanen, 2011).

participant observation (see Gans, 1999, p. 544), it is generally accepted: Without participant observation, no ethnography.

Jean Peneff, who not only widely practiced participant observation in the field of work research, but also presented a historical survey on its application in sociology, interprets participant observation as a methodological instrument that is supposed to induce a social experience (see Peneff, 2009; Benouaddah-Muller, 2009). You live with or like (other) social groups, immerse yourself in their milieu, and share experiences. In this way, participant observation becomes an instrument to identify issues that are seemingly self-evident or have never been questioned, to uncover the „unknown in the seemingly known" (Strodtholz & Kühl, 2002, p. 16). It should be stressed that as an effect of active participation, immersion, as with Erving Goffman, opens access to the 'back stage' of the given social field. The technique consists in the collection of data "by subjecting yourself, your own body and your own personality, and your own social situation to the set of contingencies that play upon a set of individuals, so that you can physically and ecologically penetrate their circle of responses to their social situation, or their work situation, or their ethnic situation or whatever. […]. You're artificially forcing yourself to be tuned into something that you then pick up as a witness: not as an interviewer, not as a listener, but as a witness to how they react to what gets done and around them" (Goffman, 1974, pp. 125f.). Through this active state of witness and his active participation in the social processes in the field, the researcher achieves a perspective from within on "relevant structures and concepts of action" (Münst, 2008, p. 372). At the same time, he tries to scientifically objectify his perspective through systematic observation and its documentation.

In a broader sense, this purposeful observation is guided by theory: at least through previous knowledge or the concentration on certain aspects. This is what distinguishes the participant observer from a describing layperson (see Kohl, 2000, p. 111).[2] Ethnographies do not deal with mere descriptions of phenomena and actions, but with their content of meaning, with the

---

[2] This could be an important criterion to distinguish research from journalistic works or social reports.

decoding of cultural and social codes, not only by recording them from 'outside', but through an attempt to co-live and understand them from 'inside'. This is what makes ethnographies so appropriate for the comprehension of social actions from the perspective of the subject. They provide *the* chosen method when it comes to uncover the perspectives from inside, from below, and realise the variety of everyday perceptions and -interactions. On one hand, it offers special options for data acquisition; "especially thick, contextually embedded, contradicting and ambivalent data" (Bachmann, 2002, p. 355) can be generated. On the other hand, this kind of immersing fieldwork is complex, hardly controllable, and hostile to methods in a certain sense. "The more participating the participatory observation, the more it carries problems of qualitative methods to extremes" (ibid.). Meanwhile, an ethnographic approach can be observed in many areas, even in "experimental writing" and "political interventions" (Silverman, 2004, p. 45), meaning that ethnographic research can be conceptualised and practiced as action research. But this is not imperative, even if particular characteristics of both areas of research overlap. As a rule, the ethnographer mainly participates in order to observe and to draw his conclusions from this, and less to drive something forward with his actions.

As has been indicated earlier: "Ethnography is an attitude and not a particular application" (Helmers, 1993, p. 8), and the respective ethnographic attitude can be applied to all forms of social practice. Ethnographic fieldwork on the Trobriand Islands does not principally differ from fieldwork in a German factory (see Senft, 2002). Nevertheless, approaches in ethnographic research have hardly been registered in German language sociology of industry and work. This is in obvious contrast to the English language area, where, for example, industrial relations on the micro-level of the factory have often been ethnographically investigated in form of a 'workplace study'. It is also in contrast to the French *sociologie du travail*, which has so far been underestimated as a possible source of subject-oriented work research. In addition, Anglo-American organisation research counts on ethnographies of and in organisations (see van Maanen, 2001, p. 240), which are, above all, supposed "to uncover and explicate the ways in which people in particular work settings come to understand, take responsibility, take action, and otherwise

manage their day-to-day-situation" (van Maanen, 1979, p. 540). Such ethnographies of organisation and work have a great tradition, going back to the Chicago School (Park, Whyte and others).

Since the publication of the famous Hawthorne Studies, many ethnographically oriented single case studies investigate the central problem, how processes and norms of a work-group shape the approaches and attitudes of their members. They are especially interested in informal structures and obstinate patterns of action (see Vallas, Finlay, Wharton, 2009, pp. 54ff.). But these work ethnographies have been drafted only exceptionally as intervening action research (for one example, see Gabler, 2010). Michael Burawoy's study "Manufacturing Consent" (1979), presently in its 10th edition, is a classic of participatory-observatory work sociology. In the German language area, Burawoy has mainly been perceived as participant in the 'Labour Process Debate' or as the president of the American and the International Sociological Association and less as a work ethnographer. But "Manufacturing Consent" impressively demonstrates how much can be gained from ethnographic approaches to subject oriented work research. Working ten months as a machine operator in a factory for agricultural equipment, (see ibid., pp. ix ff.), Burawoy reports of acts of game playing, that is, of open or hidden bargaining processes by which the 'playing' internal actors could reproduce and manipulate the rules of the game, and thus support a basic consensus in the factory. That means, a consensus is produced by actions, and even by acts of resistance, of the protagonists on the shop floor; dynamic production politics emerge, with the work processes and results dependent on them. Here, the subjective effort of the workers are interpreted as voluntary co-operation in their own exploitation (see Neuberger, 1995, p. 266): a 'harmonising' conclusion, with which one does not have to agree. It seems more important to refer to Burawoy's immediate observations, which relate to large quantities of small acts of self-determination, to acts of making out, and to active actions of workers who are seemingly suffering passively: something that is not envisaged in (Marxist) theory. The study can also be read as a coincidentally long-term study: by chance, Burawoy worked in the same factory as Donald F. Roy, who had done ethnographic field studies there thirty years earlier (see Burawoy, 1979, p. x). Roy's studies are regard-

ed as milestones of early ethnographic work research (Roy, 1954; Roy, 1959). He did his research in 'wild' settlements and, since 1934, worked himself in 24 of the lowest jobs in about 20 factories (see Burawoy, 2001, p. 454), among others, 1952, in the factory for agricultural equipment that had already been mentioned. These occupations formed the basis of his research on work conditions, workplace interactions, conflicts, and the role of the unions (see Duke University Libraries n.d.). Roy's "Banana Time" (1959) is one of the most frequently quoted ethnographic studies of organisation and industrial sociology. It reflects his experiences in a textile factory in New York. The term "Banana Time", coined by Roy, describes "how employees have made workplaces more tolerable by participating in off-task camaraderie. Banana time refers to the collectively determined break time of factory workers, the start of which was signaled with a lunch box banana" (Duke University Libraries, n.d.). A banana was stolen regularly from a co-worker, leading to predictable but entertaining disruptions. Roy describes how the workers succeed in rendering meaning to the monotonous work "through playing 'games' and ritualised social interaction" (Burawoy, 2001, p. 455). In other studies, Roy shows that not only money, but also dignity, poses an issue at the shop floor. He shows how a particular culture of the work-group is formed by its own norms (and norm setting), but also how much, at the same time, work-groups are heterogeneous, fragmented and shaped by a fragile coherence. His close relation to the object develops through participant observation, explaining the rich analyses as well as their limits (e.g. the influence of exogenous factors) (see Caveng, 2006).

In a later study, Roy examines the influence of sexual relations on production ("Sex in the Factory", 1974), a long time before the gender aspect of work became topical (see Burawoy, 2001, p. 455). Burawoy reports that Roy was also increasingly interested in the role and the interests of the emphatic researcher; he was "a participant observer in search of a new science of ethnography, what he called action research" (ibid., p. 456).

Roy's material has been taken up and referred to over and over. William F. Whyte's analysis of industrial piece work and incentive systems is only one example. It relies heavily on ethnographic material, among others on

Roy's work diary as a drill mechanic in a steel factory (see Whyte, 1955).[3] He quotes descriptions: e.g. how an experienced worker explains time measurement and facilitative arrangements to an inexperienced worker, and concludes that these devices and inventions are paradigmatic for "the ingenuity of the American workman. They evidence a knowledge of machine operation that could be exceedingly valuable to management" (ibid., p. 177). Whyte does not always agree with Roy's interpretations, but gives great significance to his material in regard to "the problem of fixing the piece rates" (ibid., p. 29). Roy's experiences with informal actions, various ways of output restriction, informal group norms as well as with the invention of individual tricks (see ibid., p. 39) are taken up by Whyte under a different perspective, as he is interested in a socially acceptable and efficient piece rate. Nevertheless, they do not lose anything of their fascination and explanatory power. Burawoy refers to Roy's research as well, insisting in retrospective that the company where both did their fieldwork had "an amazing constancy in the organisation of production between 1944 and 1974" (Burawoy, 2004, p. 3). During these 30 years, the industrial relations had developed from a despotic to a hegemonic regime: where there was coercion before, now consent has become more important (see ibid., p. 4).

Not only Burawoy's widely received study, but also his job history is a good example for the inspiring effects of workplace ethnographies. Only a few years before "Manufacturing consent", Miklos Haraszti had published "Workers in a Workers' State" (1975), a workplace ethnography from a Budapest tractor factory that soon became famous. Haraszti does not only show the equivalence of exploited and alienated work in 'real socialism', but also describes the workers' self-action and solidarity. They put their own strategies against a seemingly complete alienation, e.g. in form of *fusizni*: paid work on their personal items, that is only inadequately translated by the term moonlighting. The significance of *fusizni* lies in the self-determined actions of the workers through which they are able to regain control over their work process (see ibid., pp. 105f.). The "startling" parallels in the work

---

[3] Whyte himself came forward with a classical study on the social structure of restaurants and a study on slums of Italian migrants (see also Vallas et al, 2009, pp. 56f.).

experience in capitalism and real socialism: “the same array of drills, mills, and lathes, etc. and operators were paid on individual piece rates” (Burawoy, 2004, p. 14), but also the differences (a higher degree of exploitation in the Hungarian factory, a production policy that can be seen as “bureaucratic despotism” (ibid.)), inspired Burawoy in the 1980s to work and pursue participant research in various Hungarian factories. A systematic comparison of various production regimes leads him to the conclusion that state socialism is a system that manufactures dissent (see ibid., p. 16). In the early 1990s, Burawoy continues his ethnographic studies in the USSR, first for two months in the “dungeon” (ibid., p. 17) of a well-known Moscow rubber plant with “atrocious working conditions” (ibid.), then for four months in a furniture factory in north west Russia. Here, he becomes witness to the process of economic transformation, to internal “civil war” (ibid.) between different factions of management, to the emergence of new classes and to de-industrialisation (see ibid., pp. 17f.).

This series of English-language workplace ethnographies, which are sometimes classical works of work sociology, could be continued; for a first glance on the long list of important studies I would like to recommend the web site of the “Workplace Ethnography Project”.[4] But already the examples mentioned above prove that the ethnographic method produces “gold mine(s) of data” (Hodson, 1999, p. 3). They allow to understand a situation in the same way the participant does, in other words, they merge the perspective of the participant, who calls for empathy, and the perspective of the researcher, who conducts causal research (see ibid., p. 4; Burawoy, 1991, p. 3). By describing the “polyphony of the field” (Eberle & Maeder, 2011, p. 67), they refer to the multifaceted social reality. In consequence, they are especially interesting when it comes to problems of subject-oriented work research. Unlike a large part of research in work sociology, the concept of subjectifying work action does not aim at objectifiable, scientifically managed work practices, but on work behaviour (see Böhle, Bolte, Neumer, Pfeiffer, Porschhen, Ritter, Sauer, & Wühr, 2011). Certain phenomena or skills are not seen as deviant, but as autonomous forms of action and experience-led

[4] see http://www.sociology.ohio-state.edu/rdh/welist.htm.

knowledge. Sensory perceptions, subjective sensations, body and emotion, as well as interaction and nonverbal communication, may play a role. "The expanded view on the 'how' of action thus opens a widened view on the 'what' of work. The limits of planning and the overcoming of insecurities in the every day work process come into the open. Most of the time, they have been hidden from perception and description 'from outside'. On one side, they are not officially envisaged, and on the other side, they are the more hidden, the more successfully they are overcome. Therefore, they come into sight predominantly from the perspective of work behaviour, and in many cases only are realised through the reflection on the particular work action" (ibid., p. 22).

Here, ethnographies, with their perspective of extreme subjectivity and their strong focus on the social actions of the subjects, could be adapted. Other sub-fields of work sociology that focus on dimensions of action in a shop, could profit from them as well. For a long time, mainstream research had assumed that depersonalized, technical and organisational "objectivated forms of domination" (Minssen, 2013a, p. 255) exposed the employees as predominantly "powerless" (ibid.) towards everyday domination in the plant. Ethnographic studies, however, could observe "subtle and unspectacular forms of resistance" (ibid.). Minssen's claim that these "hardly matter" (ibid.) vis-à-vis everyday domination, however, illustrates a widespread narrow conception of labour in work sociology. Meanwhile, work sociology, according to Minssen, is no longer only concerned about structural dimensions, but also increasingly interested in the dimensions of action. This opens up the possibility to explore, through ethnographic approaches, related phenomena like power resources, power politics, trust, exchange processes in the plant, development of new kinds of domination etc.

At present, a general increase in the significance of the factory level can be observed: signs of which are the increasing importance of bargaining policy in the plant, but also the workplace as a space of subjectivation and of subjective normativation, of delimitation and of conflict (see Heiden, 2011). This points to the increasing significance of micro studies. Heiden, for example, states that "work conflicts become an every day matter" (see ibid., p. 27) and concludes from the results of studies of work sociology that the "conflict

potential of the transformation of work" is realised "more and more in conflicts of everyday work" (ibid., p. 39) and thus on the level of interaction on the shop floor. At the same time, the conflict potential concerning the aims and consequences of the current transformation of work tends to become higher.

Consequently, it makes sense to interpret the very space where actors move, dealing with rules, forms of power and control, and zones of insecurity etc., as a political arena (see Minssen, 2013b). Not only linguistically but also logically it makes sense to capture this micro politics through micro analysis. Burawoy's participant observations of 'games' on the shop floor are examples of the productiveness of such an approach. Beyond the individual example, the usefulness of ethnographic approaches to problems of work sociology can be convincingly demonstrated with the "Workplace Ethnography Project".

3. The Workplace Ethnography Project

It is not surprising that researchers frequently refer to Burawoy when it comes to certain topics. He represents an elaborated research tradition in the Anglo-American area that has existed for decades in various sociological fields. Therefore, it takes some effort to get a complete overview over the ethnographic work research in English. The Workplace Ethnography Project (WEP) gives this overview over these multitudes of micro studies. It was started in the early 1990s by a team around the sociologist Randy Hodson at Ohio State University. The concept of the project is as simple as it is effective. It attempts to identify as many workplace ethnographies as possible, makes them available in a data base and prepares them for secondary analysis. Systematic search for and compilation of English language workplace ethnographies were conducted in two waves so far, in the early 1990s and during the early 2000s (for the following, see Hodson, 2005, p. 49). From thousands of case studies, a selection was done according to certain criteria, like all English language monographs that were published after 1940 with the main research method of participant observation for at least 6 months. The observation should have focused on only one organisation and on at least one

specific group of employees (e. g. one working group at an assembly line, one office, one project group).

Consequently, it is one of the important achievements of the WEP to represent and continuously increase, as a work in progress, a pool of academic English language studies that have already been published. The current data base of the WEP contains 217 coded cases (Hodson, Chamberlain, Crowley, & Tope, 2011, p. 128) from 162 monographs (as listed on the WEP website, March 2014). These cases represent a large variety of different areas of work, ranging from services over industrial work and commercial jobs to experts, managers and clerks. However, beyond the compilation of a virtual library, the focus of WEP is mainly the development of a system of access through codification of the ethnographic material in order to facilitate various kinds of utilisation in job training and research. Its digitalisation permits to retrieve data from all areas and to combine them. In this way, interactions, dependencies and correlations can be shown, and repetitive patterns and relations can be identified. Even as this does not lead to statistically representative data, the elaborately compiled data pool can be seen already as an argument against allegations that ethnography deals with absolutely individual cases. As this compilation of data is also open to third parties, further analysis like cross or longitudinal sections are possible. Hodson and his colleagues have done this already in several cases. Publications on the following topics already exist: on organisation and behavior of workers and management; on relations at work; on interrelations between union representation and formal resistance; on implications of work team demography; on attitudes towards work life and home life; on dignity at the workplace. Furthermore, the list of publications contains questions of correlations between workplace organisation and sexual harassment as well as on supervisory bullying, trustworthiness, work-group effort and rule-breaking. Issues of gender, forms of control, social inequality, occupational change, and implications of neo-liberalism on organisation are addressed also.

Even if not all results and conclusions from the Anglo-American area can be directly transferred to other regions, there are certainly inspiring points of reference to the debate on the subjectivation of work. I would like to illustrate

this by highlighting some findings and an offshoot from the WEP, chosen at random.

3.1 Solidarity at the workplace

According to a popular thesis in the current debate, not only companies, but also employees focus more and more on strategies of their 'marketing' and 'marketisation' under the conditions of globalised markets, of enhanced orientation on the finance markets and of subjectivation. As far as the companies are concerned, this leads, according to general view, to an "economy of excess" (Gerst, Pickshaus, & Wagner, 2010, p. 4) and to a policy of shareholder value with a short-term pressure of return that reaches into small and medium companies (see Dörre & Holst, 2010, p. 30). Employees, on the other side, develop new 'marketable' strategies of adaption, even leading to a new social type of the 'entrepreneur of one's own labour power', who, although employed, acts as an employer of his own manpower. (see Pongratz & Voß, 2003). Although this assumption is not shared by everybody, the debate in work sociology agrees on the point that intensified external competition is reflected in increasing internal organisational and social competition within the company. Researchers observe an intensification of work and a resulting higher pressure on time and effort, leading to higher mental and physical stress (see Lohmann-Haislah, 2012; DGB-Index Gute Arbeit, 2011). At the same time, flexibilisation and precarisation of work lead to new conflicts among the employees: permanent staff are, for example, pitted against leased labourers and contract workers. Increasing diversification of the employment and work situation makes collective identification and representation of interests more difficult. From this situation, many authors conclude on a trend to an increasing individualisation and competition, a de-collectivisation and de-solidarisation. Solidarity at the workplace, they claim, is undermined by this development, is diminishing or disappears completely. At the same time, a wave of newly introduced team work facilitates group processes within the organisation. In fact, such types of work are partly given up and substituted by re-Taylorisation as well as more 'managed' types of work (see Gerst et al., pp. 9f.): but also then, social relations and collective knowledge are supposed

to be used more systematic as forces of production. “Obviously, there is a paradox in modern organisations: changes in the environment and in the structure of organisations lead to a growing demand of solidarity, but changes closely connected to that, also obviously lead to an erosion of the respective *supply of solidarity*” (Sanders, van Emmerik, & Raub, 2005, p. 122; original emphasis). These contradicting tendencies lead to the current and central problem of social cohesion among staff, starting with a look into attitudes and their determinants on company level. Which factors have which effect? Group processes, relations among team members and among co-workers are important dimensions, not only of work relations in general (see the significance of job satisfaction), but they are also indicators of solidarity at the workplace. Here, the findings from the WEP show important correlations. ‘Solidarity and mutual defence’ is often named as one of four functions attributed to relations among co-workers, and it is also one of the categories of interpretation of the WEP. The results confirm that higher degrees of interaction within the team-based organisation of work may develop into a source of increasing solidarity as well of increasing tensions (see Hodson, 2002, p. 294). An analysis of 204 ethnographic case studies shows that, of all exogenous factors, employee involvement has the greatest positive effect to cohesiveness, peer supervision and conflicts on the micro level (see Hodson, 2008, pp. 181f.). Participation of the employees increases the intensity of *all* social relations in work, desired or not desired, supportive or conflictual. Management behavior has a similar intense effect. A certain degree of predictability of resources, of functioning organisation, control, reward and justice is central to the establishment of trust and is the precondition to cohesiveness and integration. An incompetent management that respects the employees neither materially or ideally is a powerful stimulant to internal conflict and generally one of the main factors of destabilisation of relations between co-workers. In other words, coherence in organisations and especially management’s organisational as well as social competence enhances the relations between the co-workers, facilitates peer supervision, and reduces conflicts (see Hodson, 2004; Hodson, 2008, p. 176). German findings support this as well, as they stress the need for the management as the last decision level to deal with decision insecurities resulting from increasingly self-

directed and decentralised work processes. The employees do not only expect clear guidance in 'critical moments', but they also expect "'guide railings' for orientation in their daily work" (Bolte, Neumer, & Porschen, 2008, pp. 105ff.).

Analysis of data from the WEP also shows differences according to the respective organisational settings and the distribution of power between management and employees that comes with it. It can be observed that in some settings, intense solidarities can be obtained or newly developed. For example, in balanced constellations of organisational power, e.g. in the craft organisation of work of half-autonomous work-groups ethnic minorities experience protection from interventions by the management (see Hodson, 2010). Also, the percentage of women and ethnic minorities in work-groups, as well as the status of the employees, have effects on the solidarity among co-workers. High percentages of a minority in work-groups go along with a lower degree of supportive human relation practices, a higher percentage of women in a work-group is connected to a lower cohesiveness and less peer review, and employees with high status show less cohesiveness than employees with low status (see Hodson, 2008, pp. 181f.). With all this, findings from the WEP make important contributions to the debate on development and changes of the solidarity potential on the shop floor.

3.2 Deviant behaviour and autonomous activity in organisations

Since Weber's reflections on bureaucracy, deviance in organisations has been a recurrent topic. Frequently, the debate on work concentrates on causes and forms of deviant behavior, with an autonomous activity of the workers that had not been intended, as well as on the consequences for the respective organisation. These processes change in the course of the transformation of work organisation and tend to become more important to the analysis of organisations. Therefore, the debate on subjectivation of work takes up the self-activity with regard to. The "double reality of enterprises" (Weltz, 1988) as a crucial question. However, precisely here, conventional qualitative research methods come to their limits. There is a lack of further and more up to date results. Insofar, it attracts attention when Martin et al. cast a glimpse

on ‘rule breaking’ in and around organisations (Martin, Lopez, Roscigno, & Hodson, 2013, p. 550). Their considerations are not primary analyses of the WEP data base, but a stimulating example of an offshoot. Using ethnographic examples which illustrate types of rule-breaking they systematise earlier, fragmented and partly contradictory results of various disciplines dealing with forms and contexts of deviant behavior of workers (for the following, see ibid., pp. 550ff.). In this, the authors identify two basic dimensions of rule-breaking: on one side, the degree of contentiousness as a yardstick of permitted or contested rule-breaking, on the other side the hierarchy as a framework of rule-breaking and mobilisation (or ability to mobilise) of the organisational power in this interest. The theoretical model of the authors is initially based on these two dimensions and aims, excluding motivation and consequences, to illuminate the potential influence of the rule-breaking on three levels of the organisation: individual actions at low hierarchy levels, collective actions in work-groups, and organisational actions of the top management.

Individual rule-breaking shows the deviation of interests of individual workers from formally prescribed rules, embraces a variety of forms and can reflect corruption as well as courage. Collective rule-breaking by work-groups can represent an act of resistance or happen in unison with the objectives of the organisation, but is also found in confinement to other groups. Compared to individual rule-breaking, collective rule-breaking is more difficult to put into practice, because the participation of all group members has to be assured in the first place, and in the end, the rewards that resulted from the deviant behaviour have to be distributed to all participants. If, on the third level of the organisation, rule-breaking is initiated and expected by the top management, and it is expected that the lower hierarchy levels share it, an organisational ‘decoupling’ takes place: In most cases, such an unofficial policy is directed against an external pressure that is thus separated from the internal objectives of the organisation. Of course, this has consequences for the whole organisation. Inconsistency of rules often leads to routines and unproblematic rule-breaking. But tensions between organisations and their surrounding fields regarding. external institutions of the organisation environment also play a role. The authors combine these three hierarchical levels

of social actions with the intensity degree of rule implementation (high or low) and thus receive six interconnected, dynamically effective variations of rule-breaking in work organisations. New questions can be formulated on the basis of this integrating typology, thus widening the perspective on certain topics. If, for example, traditional approaches select the topic 'stealing' and focus on the motivations of individual workers, Martin et al. additionally question the role of management tolerance in this context. Another example refers to safety violations. Here, conventional concepts mainly mention work-group pressures and expectations on the side of the management; but the authors believe that also the way how the management judges the intention and the abilities of external government authorities to enforce safety laws, is crucial (see ibid., p. 570). This analysis on the dynamics of deviant practices systematically screens the interaction between the actions of workers and bureaucratic organisation. The organisational setting is an essential factor of compliant as opposed to deviant behavior, of activities of adaption or defense of the workers. The current discourse on the transformations in the use of subjective labour power could profit from this, as it mainly focuses on changes, consequences and modes of reaction on the side of the subject, so far. In this, the bureaucratic organisation functions as an impulse generator, communicating the constraints of the market to the employees, but then is often neglected as a systematic factor. Often, it seems to have disappeared behind the ever present talk of reduction of bureaucracy. It seems to be rendered superfluous because of the change of work as well as the 'self-entrepreneurial individual'. In the 'games' of the delimited subjects that are somehow muddling through, the organisation does not seem to play a role any more. But not only from the experiences of the employee, Bartmann suggests that this is a premature conclusion. He is regularly afflicted by "a certain discomfort (…) when it comes to the order of the present office" (Bartmann, 2012, p. 14) and to the computer indicated "new bureaucracy" (ibid.). In the same way, the findings that have been mentioned go beyond the individual context when they conceptualise informal and deviant action in the bureaucratic organisation. Simultaneously this analytic offshoot opens up further paths to benefit from the WEP data base.

4. A German beacon

As workplace ethnographies and the results of WEP are a very suitable basis for subject-oriented research, it is interesting to look for something comparable in the German language area. Only some individual studies can be found, like Konrad Thomas' "Die betriebliche Situation der Arbeiter" (1964), a 'beacon study', published already in the early 1960s, but widely ignored in German language sociology of work and industrial sociology. After academic studies in Theology, Thomas worked between 1955 and 1959 as a semi-skilled worker in the metal industry (see Thomas, 1964, p. 1), changing his work-place twice (Thomas, 2011, p. 189. For the following see ibid.). Inspired by the experiments of Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy who attempted to bring together different social groups in voluntary work service, Thomas, as well, tried to overcome estrangement through sharing of similar ways of life. He distanced himself from other motives to go into a factory, be they academic, political or motivated by social reform or material gains, as it was the case with working students. Although he originally planned to leave the academic world for good, he returned to an academic career when his work experiences found the attention of sociologists. But initially, he completely dived into the world of industrial work. After some time, he did not feel like a stranger any more; the newcomer learned a lot from his co-workers, shared their perspective and perceptions and found personal friends: the immersion had been successful. He acquired a comparably thorough knowledge of work processes and the circumstances of work and life of industrial workers, authenticated by his colleagues. In his own view, this is caused not only because of the long period of his stay in the field: four and a half years, but also because of the introduction into this unknown world by door-openers. "The unknown cannot be understood without mediators from within the world of the unknown" (ibid., p. 191). This was a classical ethnographic experience in the same way as Thomas' experience of immersion into the field corresponds to Goffman's conclusions given above. Thomas describes dense and exemplary observations of various settings. Some illustrating examples aside, he does not speak of concrete persons and never of his own person, but delineates general roles, processes and actions on the shop floor. Accordingly, a precise identification of individual work experiences is not

possible. The distance is stressed by a reserved language. Nevertheless, Thomas does not remain neutral but draws on his observations as a basis for his arguments and valuations as well as for his debate of the contemporary state of research. The ethnographic data material led his reflection to the direction of a "suitable" (Thomas, 1964, p. V) theory. He terms this way of knowledge acquisition a "post-scientific" (ibid.) method, going beyond "everything that we academically know and have acquired so far" (ibid.). Different from what the title suggests, it is not *the* situation of *the* workers in the factory that is described. The economic significance of the metal industry and the "typical situation and problems of general machine work" (ibid., p. 1) do allow conclusions which may be generalised cautiously. This view is confirmed by almost identical findings and sets of problems in other reports on Fordist industrial work (see e.g. Roy, 1954; Gabler, 2009).

Especially the first part of the study is instructive on what ethnographies of work are and what they can achieve.[5] This part deals, on one side, with the situation on the shop floor: mainly with dimensions of work analysis like the treatment of material, noise, acquisition of skills, grading and evaluation, measurement of effort and wages, control and hierarchies as well as the efforts of the workers. On the other side, it deals with the organisational coherence in the factory, like working times or the spatial dimensions of authority in the plant. The precise and multifaceted observations are concerned with structural frameworks like harsh work conditions, socialisation and qualification through work and co-workers, determination of wages, effort and working hours, as well as with visible and invisible hierarchy. Here, work appears to be a daily struggle against the impositions of the organization, as a struggle for the necessary free spaces and against alienation and objectification. For reasons of space, it is not possible to go into further details of this description, which would certainly be worth reading. Instead, I would like to focus on the part of Thomas' study that relates on actions of the workers even more explicitly, and that analyses the hidden "self-determined

[5] The second part of the book deals with the contemporary state of research on factory and industrial work, the third part deals with problems of social ethics of the situation on the shop floor.

actions in the production process" (Wolf, 1999, p. 81). Dimensions of self-determined actions resp. of informal actions are already reminiscent in the description of frame conditions and of typical everyday situations. We hear about the application of tacit knowledge, being highly superior to the official requirements, about underhand learning through peer support, about the struggle for a self-determined, individual rhythm of work, about the deliberate isolation of the individual although the work process is collective, about the priority of unwritten rules etc. Subordinated to an extensive preliminary planning and to highest requirements, the "real effort of the workers" (Thomas, 1964, p. 43) lies in changing "the non-function of the organisation into function and to press factors that have not been accounted for into the time planning process" (ibid., pp. 43f.). Part of the informal organisation is the compensation of gaps in the work organisation as well as resistive actions against "unbearable conditions and additional efforts" (ibid., p. 46), self-determined work according to one's own rhythm with inevitable sideline jobs or acts of solidarity. This informal self-activity is necessarily directed against requirements of formal planning and consequently expresses a form of deviant behavior in organisations. It can not only be found in Thomas' observations, but also in other reports on work situations and workplace ethnographies. When it comes to the introduction of new rules and orders that are implicitly or explicitly directed against them, self-determined actions become extremely obvious. Whatever measures are being taken, "it always goes according to the slogan: 'Plus ça change plus c'est la même chose'" (Whyte, 1955, p. 59). With these words, Roy alludes to the classical vicious circle of bureaucracy, where the introduction of new rules generates new defensive reactions, from prefabricating pieces to bypassing the rules, and in the end everything remains business as usual.[6] However, hidden autonomous behaviour is not only a reaction to external intervention, but results from "within the work itself" (Thomas, 1964, p. 133). It structures everyday work in an essential way. Work sociology, according to Thomas, has neither taken up

[6] A recent example of precisely these bureaucratic processes and forms of reaction is presented by Kühl in his description of the permanent reform of the (German) institutions of higher education (see Kühl, 2012).

this "effort of the workers" (ibid.) nor the "clandestineness of the situation" (ibid.). Half a century later, this statement is, in grosso modo, still applicable. Thomas' findings play an important role for the arguments of Wolf, who has referred to the significance of these phenomena of 'necessary self-activity' in the work process (see Wolf, 1999). Otherwise, they have only been taken up sporadically (see Modrow-Thiel, 1997; Fischer & Röben, 1997). The closest reference to such motives can be found in the concept of subjectifying work action (see Böhle, 2010).

5. Conclusion

Regardless of their topic, be it social relations at the work-place, self-activity or deviant behaviour, informal action or other dimensions of work: workplace ethnographies are rich sources for the subjective aspect of work. This survey could only range from Roy and Thomas to Burawoy, authors who stand as examples of the factual richness as well as the inspiring analytical potential of many other work-place ethnographies from various countries, time periods and organisational settings.

Their methodological approach makes them extremely useful for the quest for the subject. They present data covering various dimensions of work that can hardly or not at all be captured by conventional qualitative methods. The WEP shows a practicable way for secondary analysis of workplace ethnographies and thus opens a perspective that enables the researcher to identify recurrent patterns and relations in the studies of individual cases. Thomas' work experiences, too, reach beyond their temporary and specific context and can contribute to questions of informality and the subject in work in a productive way.

At present, subject oriented approaches are prominently presented in German language sociological work research. They also seem to develop a sense for the quality of ethnographic approaches. For example, when it comes to the definition of interactive work, Dunkel and Weihrich refer to Leidner's profound study on employees of a fast food chain (see Dunkel & Weihrich, 2010) However, a broader access to ethnographic data material is still missing. It makes sense, therefore, to attempt a secondary analysis of ethnograph-

ic work studies for the German language area as well. As thick descriptions with an ethnographic quality are rather infrequent, it is advisable to include studies from other academic disciplines as well. Recently, interesting activities in work research can be observed especially in folklore / cultural anthropology. A number of studies draw increasingly on topics of sociology of work and are looking into additional dimensions of subjectivity and work behavior from a perspective of organisation culture. Irene Götz, for example, observes and interprets the everyday standardisation and production of arrangements of work in stores of a bakery chain (see Götz, 1997). Andreas Wittel's ethnographic case study examines the interpretation of the corporate ideology of a computer firm by the employees, and its re-interpretation into their 'culture of work' (see Wittel, 1997). The "double reality of enterprises" (Weltz, 1988) also shows up in Birgit Müller's study on the transition situation 1991 in three East German companies (see Müller, 2002). Judith Krohn's ethnography on the subjectivation of the work of fashion shop attendants (see Krohn, 2008) or Götz Bachmann's study on selected aspects of the employees' culture in two department store branches (see Bachmann, 2014) can be named as examples of recent studies in workplace ethnography. Moreover, also especially rich case studies on companies within industrial sociology may be included into a pool of subject oriented ethnographies of work (see Pongratz & Trinczek, 2010). A systematic collection and secondary analysis of all such ethnographic (and near-ethnographic) sources, could drive subject oriented work research a good way forward.

References

Bachmann, G. (2002). Teilnehmende Beobachtung. In S. Kühl & P. Strodtholz (Eds.), *Methoden der Organisationsforschung. Ein Handbuch* (pp. 323-360). Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt-Taschenbuch-Verlag.

Bachmann, G. (2014). *Kollegialität. Eine Ethnographie der Belegschaftskultur im Kaufhaus*. Frankfurt am Main / New York: Campus Verlag.

Baethge, M. (1994). *Arbeit und Identität*. In U. Beck & E. Beck-Gernsheim (Eds.), *Riskante Freiheiten* (pp. 245-265). Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag.

Bartmann, C. (2012). *Leben im Büro. Die schöne neue Welt der Angestellten*. München: Hanser.

Benouaddah-Muller, S.-O. (2009). Jean Peneff, Le goût de l'observation. Comprendre et pratiquer l'observation participante en sciences sociales. *Lectures,* [En ligne], Les

comptes rendus, 2009, mis en ligne le 14 Octobre 2009. http://lectures.revues.org/801 (recall 11.9.2012)

Böhle, F. (2010). *Arbeit als Handeln*. In F. Böhle, G. G. Voß, & G. Wachtler (Eds.), *Handbuch Arbeitssoziologie* (pp. 151-176). Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Böhle, F., Bolte, A., Neumer, J., Pfeiffer, S., Porschen, S., Ritter, T., Sauer, S., & Wühr, D (2011). Subjektivierendes Arbeitshandeln. „Nice to have" oder ein gesellschaftskritischer Blick auf das Andere der Verwertung? *AIS Studien*, 4(2), 16-26.

Bolte, A., Neumer, J., & Porschen, S. (2008). *Die alltägliche Last der Kooperation. Abstimmung als Arbeit und das Ende der Meeting-Euphorie*. Berlin: Edition Sigma.

Breidenstein, G., Hirschauer, S., Kalthoff, H., & Nieswand, B. (2013). *Ethnografie. Die Praxis der Feldforschung*. Konstanz / München: UVK Verlagsgesellschaft.

Burawoy, M. (1979). *Manufacturing consent. Changes in the labor process under monopoly capitalism*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Burawoy, M. (1991). *Ethnography unbound. Power and resistance in the modern metropolis*. Berkeley / Los Angeles / London: University of California Press.

Burawoy, M. (2001). Donald Roy: Sociologist and Working Stiff. *Contemporary Sociology*, 30(5), 453-458.

Burawoy, M. (2004). *Another thirty years. Introduction to the Chinese edition of "Manufacturing Consent"*. http://burawoy.berkeley.edu/biography.htm (recall 14.3.2014)

Caveng, R. (2006). "La fabrique de la sociologie." *ÉspacesTemps.net*, Books, 28.11.2006. http://www.espacestemps.net/en/articles/la-fabrique-de-la-sociologie-en/ (recall 9.1.2014)

Dellwing, M., & Prus, R. (2012). *Einführung in die interaktionistische Ethnografie. Soziologie im Außendienst*. Wiesbaden: Springer.

DGB-Index Gute Arbeit (2012). *Ergebnisse der Repräsentivumfrage 2011 zum Thema „Arbeitshetze – Arbeitsintensivierung – Entgrenzung"*. http://www.dgb-index-gute-arbeit.de/downloads/publikationen (recall 9.2.2014).

Dörre, K., & Holst, H. (2010). Flexibilisierung als arbeitspolitisches Forschungsfeld. In IG Metall Vorstand (Ed.), *Beiträge zur Arbeitspolitik und Arbeitsforschung. Handlungsfelder, Forschungsstände, Aufgaben* (pp. 28-32). Frankfurt am Main.

Duke University Libraries (n.d.). Preliminitary Inventory of the Don Roy Papers, 1921-1980. *University Archives Duke University Durham, North Carolina*. http://library.duke.edu/rubenstein/findingaids/uaroy (recall 23.3.2014)

Dunkel, W. & Weihrich, M. (2010). Arbeit als Interaktion. In F. Böhle, G. G. Voß, & G. Wachtler (Eds.), *Handbuch Arbeitssoziologie* (pp. 177-200). Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Eberle, T. S., & Maeder, C. (2011). Organizational Ethnography. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research, issues of theory, method and practice* (3rd edition, pp. 53-74). Los Angeles: Sage.

Fischer, M., & Röben, P. (1997). Arbeitsprozeßwissen im chemischen Labor. Die Arbeit von Chemielaboranten im Spannungsfeld von Arbeitserfahrung, Naturwissenschaft und Technik. *Arbeit*, 6(3), 247-266, http://www.zeitschriftarbeit.de/zeitschrift-arbeit/docs/3-1997/fischer.pdf (recall 4.5.2013).

Gabler, A. (2009). *Antizipierte Autonomie. Zur Theorie und Praxis der Gruppe "Socialisme ou Barbarie"*. Hannover: Offizin Verlag.

Gabler, A. (2010). Ethnographische Forschung als Aktionsforschung. Über die Arbeitsanalysen von Socialisme ou Barbarie. In I. Götz, B. Lemberger, K. Lehnert, & S.

Schondelmayer (Eds.), *Mobilität und Mobilisierung. Arbeit im sozioökonomischen, politischen und kulturellen Wandel* (pp. 417-426). Frankfurt am Main / New York: Campus Verlag.

Gans, H. J. (1999). Participant observation in the era of „ethnography". *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 28(5), 540-548.

Gerst, D., Pickshaus, K., & Wagner, H. (2010). Handlungsfelder und Aufgaben arbeitspolitischer Forschung und Praxis – ein Diskussionspapier für den Arbeitskreis Arbeitspolitik und Arbeitsforschung der IG Metall. In IG Metall Vorstand (Ed.): *Beiträge zur Arbeitspolitik und Arbeitsforschung. Handlungsfelder, Forschungsstände, Aufgaben* (pp. 3-22). Frankfurt am Main.

Goffman, E. (1974,1989). On fieldwork. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 18(2), 123-132.

Götz, I. (1997). *Unternehmenskultur: Die Arbeitswelt einer Großbäckerei aus kulturwissenschaftlicher Sicht*. Münster: Waxmann.

Haraszti, M. (1977). *A worker in a worker's state. Piece-rates in Hungary*. Harmondsworth / New York: Penguin.

Heiden, M. (2011). Der arbeits- und industriesoziologische Konfliktbegriff und die Notwendigkeit seiner Erweiterung. *AIS Studien*, 4(2), 27-44.

Helmers, S. (1993). Zur Einführung. In S. Helmers (Ed.), *Ethnologie der Arbeitswelt. Beispiele aus europäischen und außereuropäischen Feldern* (pp. 7-10). Bonn: Holos-Verlag.

Hodson, R. (1999). *Analyzing documentary accounts*. Thousand Oaks / London / New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Hodson, R. (2002). Demography or respect? Work group demography versus organizational dynamics as determinants of meaning and satisfaction at work. *British Journal of Sociology*, 52(2), 291-317.

Hodson, R. (2004). Organizational trustworthiness: Findings from the population of organizational ethnographies. *Organization Science*, 15(4), 432-445.

Hodson, R. (2005). Management behaviour as social capital: A systematic analysis of organizational ethnographies. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 43(1), 41-65.

Hodson, R. (2008). The ethnographic contribution to understanding co-worker relations. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 46(1), 169-192.

Hodson, R. (2010). Work group effort and rewards: The roles of organizational and social power as context. *Organization Studies*, 31(7), 895-916.

Hodson, R., Chamberlain, L. J., Crowley, M., & Tope, D. (2011). Coding ethnographies for research and training: Merging qualitative and quantitative sociologies. *Sociological Perspectives*, 54(1), 125-131.

Kleemann, F., Matuschek, I., & Voß G. G. (2002). Subjektivierung von Arbeit. Ein Überblick zum Stand der soziologischen Diskussion. In M. Moldaschl & G. G. Voß (Eds.), *Subjektivierung von Arbeit* (pp. 53-100). München und Mering: Rainer Hampp Verlag.

Knoblauch, H. (2001). Fokussierte Ethnographie. Soziologie, Ethnologie und die neue Welle der Ethnographie. *Sozialer Sinn*, 1, 123-141, http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-6930 (recall 2.2.2014).

Kohl, K.-H. (2000). *Ethnologie – die Wissenschaft vom kulturell Fremden. Eine Einführung* (2nd revised edition). München: Beck.

Krohn, J. (2008). *Wir verkaufen Mode. Subjektivierung von Arbeit im Filialverkauf eines Textilkonzerns*. München und Mering: Rainer Hampp Verlag.

Kühl, S. (2012). *Der Sudoku-Effekt. Hochschulen im Teufelskreis der Bürokratie. Eine Streitschrift*. Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag.

Langfeldt, B. (2009). *Subjektorientierung in der Arbeits- und Industriesoziologie. Theorien, Methoden und Instrumente zur Erfassung von Arbeit und Subjektivität*. Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Lohmann-Haislah, A. (2012). *Stressreport Deutschland 2012. Psychische Anforderungen, Ressourcen und Befinden*. Dortmund, http://www.baua.de/de/Publikationen/Fachbeitraege/Gd68.html;jsessionid=58CAD5992C349C25997686A2F8C7977B.1_cid380 (recall 17.3.2014).

Lohr, K. (2013). Subjektivierung von Arbeit. In H. Hirsch-Kreinsen & H. Minssen (Eds.), *Lexikon der Arbeits- und Industriesoziologie* (pp. 430-437). Berlin: Edition Sigma.

Martin, A. W., Lopez, S.H., Roscigno, V.J., & Hodson, R. (2013). Against the rules: Synthesizing types and processes of bureaucratic rule-breaking. *Academy of Management Review*, 38(4), 550-574.

Minssen, H. (2013a). Herrschaft. In H. Hirsch-Kreinsen & H. Minssen (Eds.), *Lexikon der Arbeits- und Industriesoziologie* (pp. 251-255). Edition Sigma, Berlin.

Minssen, H. (2013b). Mikropolitik. In H. Hirsch-Kreinsen & H. Minssen (Eds.), *Lexikon der Arbeits- und Industriesoziologie*. (pp. 334-340). Berlin: Edition Sigma.

Modrow-Thiel, B. (1997). Subjektivität im Arbeitshandeln und Ziele der Personalarbeit. Eine allgemeine Betrachtung mit Beispielen aus dem Produktionsbereich des metallverarbeitenden Gewerbes. *Zeitschrift für Personalforschung*, 11(3), 262-281.

Müller, B. (2002). *Die Entzauberung der Marktwirtschaft. Ethnologische Erkundungen in ostdeutschen Betrieben*. Frankfurt am Main / New York: Campus Verlag.

Münst, A. S. (2008). Teilnehmende Beobachtung: Erforschung der sozialen Praxis. In R. Becker & B. Kortendiek (Eds.), *Handbuch Frauen- und Geschlechterforschung* (2nd revised and updated edition, pp. 372-377). Wiesbaden: Springer.

Neuberger, O. (1995). *Mikropolitik. Der alltägliche Aufbau und Einsatz von Macht in Organisationen*. Stuttgart: Enke.

Peneff, J. (2009). *Le goût de l'observation. Comprendre et pratiquer l'observation participante en sciences sociales*. Paris: Èditions La Découverte.

Pongratz, H. J., & Voß, G. G. (2003). *Arbeitskraftunternehmer. Erwerbsorientierungen in entgrenzten Arbeitsformen*. Berlin: Edition Sigma.

Pongratz, H. J., & Trinczek, R. (2010). *Industriesoziologische Fallstudien*. Berlin: Edition Sigma.

Roy, D. F. (1954), Efficiency and the fix. *American Journal of Sociology*, 60(3), 255-266.

Roy, D. F. (1959). Banana time. Job satisfaction and informal interaction. In C. D. Bryant (Ed.) (1972), *The social dimensions of work* (pp. 374-389). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Sanders, K., van Emmerik, H., & Raub, W. (2005). Solidarität am Arbeitsplatz: Fiktion, Fakten und Kräfte. In J. Berger (Ed.), *Zerreißt das soziale Band? Beiträge zur einer aktuellen gesellschaftspolitischen Debatte* (pp. 121-142). Frankfurt am Main / New York: Campus Verlag.

Senft, G. (2002). Feldforschung in einer deutschen Fabrik – oder: Trobriand ist überall! In H. Fischer (Ed.), *Feldforschungen. Erfahrungsberichte zur Einführung* (pp. 207-226). Berlin: Reimer.

Silverman, D. (2004). *Interpreting qualitative data. Methods for analyzing talk, text and interaction* (2nd edition). London / Thousand Oaks / New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Strodtholz, P., & Kühl, S. (2002). Qualitative Methoden der Organisationsforschung – ein Überblick. In S. Kühl & P. Strodtholz (Eds.), *Methoden der Organisationsforschung. Ein Handbuch* (pp. 11-31). Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt Taschenbuch Verlag.

Thomas, K. (1964). *Die betriebliche Situation der Arbeiter*. Stuttgart: Enke.

Thomas, K. (2011). Vermittelte Einsicht. In N. C. Korte (Ed.), *Grenzgänger und Grenzgänge. Konrad Thomas: Schriften aus vierzig Jahren* (pp.187-196). Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Vallas, S. P., Finlay, W., & Whartin A.S. (2009). *The sociology of work. structures and inequalities*. New York / Oxford: Oxford University Press.

van Maanen, J. (1979). The fact of fiction in organizational ethnography. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24(4), 539-550.

van Maanen, J. (2001). Afterword: Natives 'R' us: Some notes on the ethnography of organziations. In D. N. Gellner & E. Hirsch (eds.), *Inside organizations. Anthropologists at work* (pp. 231-262). Oxford: Berg.

van Maanen, J. (2011). Ethnography as works. Some rules of engagement. *Journal of Management Studies*, 48(1), 218-234.

Voß, G. G., & Pongratz, H (1998). Der Arbeitskraftunternehmer. Eine neue Grundform der Ware Arbeitskraft? *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, 50(1), 131-168.

Weltz, F. (1988). Die doppelte Wirklichkeit des Unternehmens und ihre Bedeutung für die Industriesoziologie. *Soziale Welt*, 39(1), 97-103.

Westney, E. D., & van Maanen, J. (2011). The casual ethnography of the executive suite. *Journal of International Business Studies,* 42, 602-607.

Whyte, W. F. (1955). *Money and motivation. An analysis of incentives in industry*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Wittel, A. (1997). *Belegschaftskultur im Schatten der Firmenideologie. Eine ethnographische Fallstudie*. Berlin: Edition Sigma.

Wolf, H. (1999). *Arbeit und Autonomie. Ein Versuch über Widersprüche und Metamorphosen kapitalistischer Produktion*. Münster: Verlag Westfälisches Dampfboot.

About the author

Andrea Gabler is lecturer in sociology and actually developing a research project on German workplace ethnographies. Her main interests are sociology of work, ethnographies, political theory, feminist theory, and sociology of social movements.

Author's address

Andrea Gabler
Hunteweg 4a
37081 Göttingen, Germany
E-mail: agabler@gwdg.de