Hybridity of hybrid studies of work: Examination of informing practitioners in practice

Nozomi Ikeya

Keio University

ORCID: 0000-0002-0241-7470

Abstract

The achievement of topical relevance to the parties of the research is a common aim in qualitative approaches in the social sciences, and ethnomethodology is no exception. Harold Garfinkel sought to realise this aim by introducing the notion of hybridity, with which he attempted to merge the topic of ethnomethodological studies with the investigative topic treated by members in the field. While he is known to have set a high standard for researchers, particularly in terms of the unique adequacy requirement, there are cases of hybridisation of studies that provided practical value to the practitioners, indicating that they were of topical relevance to them. Thus, while ethnomethodological principles have been mostly discussed in methodological arguments for producing adequate descriptions, this paper explores the principles in the context of hybridisation of studies in practice. First, the paper examines Garfinkel's arguments on hybrid studies of work as a radical restatement of principles of ethnomethodological studies; second, it examines a case of hybridisation of a hybrid study of emergency control to show the distinctiveness of his solution to the issue of topical relevance to the parties. The examination demonstrates how hybridisation of studies with the specific audience/reader's corpus of knowledge is carried out within the constraints of the study, within which the presentation is embedded. It also demonstrates how the hybridity of hybrid studies achieved through collaboration between ethnomethodology and emergency control is treated as the basis of its hybridisation with management, including both demonstrations of descriptions of work and suggestions made by the researcher. These demonstrations will reveal how policies of ethnomethodological studies are critical to the hybridisation of hybrid studies.

1. INTRODUCTION

One point that becomes apparent from reading Harold Garfinkel's arguments on hybrid studies of work published in *Ethnomethodology's Program* (Garfinkel 2002) is his strong

concern that descriptions by researchers must be of topical relevance to practitioners. This concern is surely shared with other qualitative approaches in the social sciences, including sociology, but with some ambivalence. For researchers taking different qualitative approaches, while capturing what is topically relevant to the practitioners is essential, presenting the findings as topically relevant to the researchers' respective disciplines is ultimately more important. To them, prioritising topical relevance to practitioners is not scientifically justifiable.

Garfinkel presented an approach called ethnomethodological hybrid studies of work to tackle the problem of both examining the activities under study and presenting the analysis to be topically relevant to practitioners. With the introduction of the notion of hybridity, he attempted to merge ethnomethodological studies with investigative topics treated within the settings being studied. He is known to have set a high standard for the achievement of hybridity in studies of work, with his unique adequacy requirement in particular: ideally, the researcher has the same competence as that of members of the field (Garfinkel and Wieder 1992; Garfinkel 2002; Lynch 1993; Wilson 2003; Pollner and Emerson 2001). Hybrid studies have been conducted in different professional workplaces, including scientific ones, as well as in activities outside a typical workplace. A list of such studies was created by Garfinkel (2007).

The results of such studies are of topical relevance to practitioners; therefore, they can be expected to be hybridised with other disciplines whose members are interested in the activities the studies describe, thus forming hybrid disciplines. There are several arguments about the possibilities of hybrid disciplines, but these are mostly abstract with a few exceptions (Button and Dourish 1996; Crabtree 2004; Lindwall and Lymer 2005; Rooke and Seymour 2005; Crabtree et al. 2012; Sormani 2014). Furthermore, there are also some critiques of such arguments, including the one by Greiffenhagen and Sharrock (2019). There is also an argument to characterise some of Garfinkel's studies of sociological practices as a 'hybrid ethno-sociology' (Anderson and Sharrock 2018, 170). When it comes to hybridisation, neither discussions nor studies have yet been conducted in depth. Thus, most arguments about hybrid studies apart from actual studies have centred mostly on methodological issues, such as the properties of descriptions and how such descriptions can be possible. For example, there has been no examination of how actual hybridisation is carried out to affect practitioners' activities.

Hence, this paper focuses on hybridisation in practice. It will examine the hybridisation of studies as phenomena, how a study is organised for presentation to the reader and/or audience, how members respond to it and how it led them to organise their activities. Focusing on hybridisation as accountable phenomena will make it possible to examine hybrid studies in terms of members' methods, and this will lead to examination of hybrid studies not only as an ethnomethodological programme but also in terms of a method that seeks to ensure topical relevance to practitioners in the social sciences, including sociology.

2. HYBRIDITY AS A PROBLEM FOR SOCIAL SCIENTISTS

2.1. Hybridity in qualitative approaches

Capturing how people live and conduct activities and conveying the analysis in a topi-cally relevant way not only to academic members but also to practitioners is the prob-lem with which social scientists, and more specifically those who take qualitative ap-proaches, are commonly engaged. In participant observation research, for example, re-searchers try to achieve topical relevance to practitioners by immersing themselves in the settings and spending time with members (Bernard 2006, 342–386; DeWalt and DeWalt, 2010; Kawulich 2005). By doing so, researchers can learn and acquire a con-textualised understanding of members' practices and culture.

> For anthropologists and social scientists, participant observation is a method in which a researcher takes part in the daily activities, rituals, interactions, and events of a group of people as one of the means of learning the explicit and tacit aspects of their life routines and their culture (DeWalt and DeWalt 2011, 1).

Regarding the topical relevance of research to practitioners, it is assumed that it is maintained as a result of the researcher immersing themselves in the field. One of several methodological issues (Bernard 2006, 342–386: Kawulich 2005) that is widely recognised is, as Sharrock and Anderson succinctly describe the reflective conundrum, 'how the researcher is to offer an analysis which both respects the view of social reality as seen from within and is recognisably and properly sociological?' (2013, 20). This issue is inevi-table in a way, because in participatory observation research, the data collected from fieldwork must be transformed with formal or theoretical schemes derived from the dis-cipline to which the researcher presents the study.

Action research, according to Clem Adelman, was originally implemented by Kurt Lewin and his students in the early 1940s in the USA; in this model, researchers worked with field members to determine topics to investigate and how to eventually find solu-tions (Adelman 1993). Action research is characterised by Davydd J. Greenwood and Morten Levin (2007) in the following way.

> AR is a set of self-consciously collaborative and democratic strategies for generating knowledge and designing action in which trained experts in social and other forms of re-search and local stakeholders work together. The research focus is chosen collaboratively among the local stakeholders and the action researchers, and the relationships among the participants are organized as joint learning processes. AR centers on doing 'with' rather than doing 'for' stakeholders and credits local stakeholders with the richness of experience and reflective possibilities that long experience living in complex situations brings with it (Greenwood and Levin 2007, 1).

Maintaining topical relevance of research to practitioners in this context is achieved through collaboration with members throughout the process of identifying a topic for investigation and designing and testing solutions. Some questions raised in participant observation are also raised in action research (Adelman 1993), as, after all, identification of topics in the field to be dealt with in the project requires some of the techniques used in participant observation, including methods such as observation, interviews, group interviews or workshops.

2.2. Hybridity in ethnomethodological studies

What becomes clear from reading one of Garfinkel's most recent books, *Ethnomethodology's Program* (2002), is that the problem of topical relevance to practitioners has been one of his central concerns. He argues that ethnomethodological studies exhibit 'standing topical relevance to the local order producing parties of descriptive adequacy and evidence'.

> It is as members' methods that EM studies describe the corpus status of EM results. Therein, but just in any actual case, they furnish by exhibiting standing topical relevance to the local order producing parties of descriptive adequacy and evidence (Garfinkel 2002, 72).

It is noteworthy in the above excerpt that he states that 'just in any actual case', ethnomethodological results exhibit 'topical relevance to the local order producing parties'. In introducing the section of 'hybrid studies of work', where he discusses criterial properties of ethnomethodological hybrid studies, he highlights being 'topically relevant to the parties in the actual empirical lived workplace occasions of the work it describes' as a criterion that hybrid studies of work need to satisfy (Garfinkel 2002, 100).

The issue, then, is how Garfinkel tries to solve the problem of topical relevance to the parties. In his attempt to deal with this problem of topical relevance to practitioners, he introduced the notion of hybridity. He addresses this problem by merging ethnomethodological studies with investigative topics treated within the settings being studied. Ethnomethodological hybrid studies of work are conducted in accordance with policies such as unique adequacy, praxeological validity of instructed action and ethnomethodological indifference.

Some methodological issues have been raised with this approach to hybrid studies as well as concurrence, as will be examined in the next section. Prior to the examination, arguments Garfinkel made on hybrid studies of work will first be explored.

3. ETHNOMETHODOLOGICAL HYBRID STUDIES OF WORK

Garfinkel's most recent and most exhaustive arguments regarding hybrid studies and hybrid disciplines are found in *Ethnomethodology's Program* (2002). It will be shown how the

descriptions produced are a hybrid of the 'field' and ethnomethodology, and how the hybridity of descriptions is critical in hybrid studies. Further, the presentation of the descriptions to disciplines is called hybridisation, and it will be shown how its operation itself can be crucial to the success of hybridisation. The first group of five of his eleven points he listed in the section of 'Hybrid Studies of Work' (Garfinkel 2002, 100–103) can be categorised as 'members' methods for production of hybrid descriptions' and the other group of six points can be categorised as 'properties of members' methods embedded as the findings of studies. According to the way the list of eleven points is listed, the reader needs to refer to different sections of the book to understand each point, and the list can be understood as radical restatement of ethnomethodological studies. This will be shown through an attempt to present Garfinkel's arguments as clearly as possible and, at the same time, to examine the relationships between some of the main policies he presented in the past, such as ethnomethodological indifference, the unique adequacy requirement of methods and ethnomethodological studies as alternates to formal studies.

3.1. Work as the object of hybrid studies

When Garfinkel introduces his arguments of hybrid studies, he uses the term 'hybrid studies of work' and 'hybrid studies of work and science'.

> Ethnomethodology's concerns in hybrid studies are with properties of work in densely recurrent structures of immortal, ordinary society, not occasionally but systematically, and therein ubiquitously with astronomically massive prevalence. Whereas tutorial problems focus on phenomenal field properties of common occurrences, the focus of hybrid studies is with members' methods in work's discipline-specific constituents of the Shop Floor Problem (Garfinkel 2002, 100).

He saw the object of study for ethnomethodological studies as the work of the local production of social order. The use of 'work' in this sense can also be found in 'On Formal Structures of Practical Actions' (1970), in which an example of such studies is provided in the context of talk; more specifically, 'glossing practices' are provided as an example of accountable phenomena.

> The interests of ethnomethodological research are directed to provide, through detailed analyses, that accountable phenomena are through and through practical accomplishments. We shall speak of the work of that accomplishment in order to gain the emphasis for it of an ongoing course of action. 'The work' is done as assemblages of practices whereby speakers in the situated particulars of speech mean differently than they can say in just so many words, i.e., as 'glossing practices' (Garfinkel and Sacks 1970 [1986, 163–164]).

While the above example provided is only in the context of talk, in *Ethnomethodological Studies of Work* (1986), Garfinkel incorporates studies in various contexts, including Kung

Fu performance and post-accident truck tyre repair. In the introduction, he states that 'ethnomethodological studies of work began in 1972 with Harvey Sacks's observation of conversational practices upon whose existence all previous studies depended, but missed' (Garfinkel 1986, vii). He then lists David Sudnow's study of the work of professional jazz ensembles and improvised touch typing, as well as a study of university chemistry lectures carried out by Garfinkel and Sudnow, as a set of initiatives of studies of work.

In his use of the term 'hybrid studies of work' in the argument regarding hybrid studies, we can see that Garfinkel sets the study object as the local production of order and how accountable phenomena are constituted in various settings, including interactional settings, without being exclusive to them. Further, in the quotation above, he says that 'the focus of hybrid studies is with members' methods in work's discipline-specific constituents of the Shop Floor Problem' (Garfinkel 2002, 99). His emphasis on this seems to suggest hybrid studies of work pay attention to members' methods in work's discipline-specific problems involved in carrying out activities and are not confined to problems that are 'context free' and 'context sensitive', the focus in conversation analysis (Bjelic 2019; Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 1974). The statement that hybrid studies of work focus on members' methods in work's discipline-specific problems seems to suggest that the studies will not be selective in deciding on their focus in advance, but will deal with any relevant topics as they emerge in the settings under study.

3.2. Members' methods for producing hybrid descriptions

Garfinkel argues that descriptions of hybrid studies should be 'careful descriptions' (Garfinkel 2002, 100 (1)) written in natural language, which can be read in alternate ways depending on the occasion; that is, as descriptions, as instructions, or as actions produced in response to those instructions, 'without absurd errors and other incongruities' (Garfinkel 2002, 100 (1)). He emphasises this point of descriptions being 'without absurd errors and other incongruities' from other aspects, namely, their logic's subject and coherence. He insists that logic and coherence of descriptions should be situationally relevant to the actual activities, as both are encountered as such by the parties to the activities.

Garfinkel thus states that the subject of logic of the descriptions produced in hybrid studies should concern the 'oriented objects' or 'directional and orientational properties of objects' that work both produces and is organised around (Garfinkel 2002, 100 (2)). These are to be found within particular settings in and through the work of 'making and describing the coherence of ordinary things in figurational details' (Garfinkel 2002, 100). 'Figurational details' are details made relevant by the parties to the activities as they make and describe the coherence of oriented objects within the setting. Here again, the coherence of objects that studies deal with can only be found as the parties within the studied settings orient to them.

Besides the subject of logic of the descriptions, Garfinkel also argues that the coherences of the descriptions should accord with the one situationally encountered by the

parties to the activities. Coherences are encountered 'in essentially situated assemblages of phenomenal field properties', thus coherences of the descriptions of activities should reflect this, meaning they are 'encountered as unavoidable, without remedies, or alternatives' (Garfinkel 2002, 101 (4)). Here again, 'coherences' are characterised as properties to which parties in actual settings orient as the properties that make those settings and their work within it what they are. Thus, hybrid studies are to provide descriptions of coherences of the phenomenal field—the work and its tasks as they are encountered and accomplished—as exhibited in workplace-specific material contents. In other words, the coherences described in the studies are different from the property of coherence pursued in scientific studies.

Thus, Garfinkel addresses that both logic and coherence of the descriptions of hybrid studies must be endogenous to members' activities, and this is consistent with the familiar policy of ethnomethodological indifference, but in positive terms. In introducing the policy of indifference, Garfinkel and Sacks (1970) argue that ethnomethodologists are interested in practical reasoning in any domain, whether professional or lay—that is, professionals' and laypersons' practical (sociological) reasoning—and that they are interested in studying practical reasoning by ignoring sociological discourse. In other words, they try to make explicit that ethnomethodologists are interested in understanding how lay and professional activities of all kinds constitute particular social orders (Garfinkel 1967, vii–viii). Thus, in the case of arguments regarding hybrid studies in *Ethnomethodology's Program* (2002), Garfinkel clearly tries to address analysts' attitudes towards conducting studies in a more positive and concrete manner in reference to logic and coherence of activities that will be part of the descriptions the researchers are to produce.

3.3. The hybridity of hybrid descriptions and its praxeological validity

In the foregoing section, some properties of descriptions of hybrid studies and members' methods for producing such descriptions introduced by Garfinkel were discussed. This section will focus on his arguments about certain properties of such descriptions, namely the hybridity of hybrid descriptions.

Garfinkel states that studies should describe how things are, in a primary sense, organised to be coherent for and by the parties, something subsequently, and in a secondary sense, made accountable as 'specifics of adequate analytic ethnography' by those studying these activities (Garfinkel 2002, 100 (3)). He calls these descriptions 'instructed actions', implying that the descriptions exhibit an order that is accomplished by the parties through methods. In this sense, the descriptions produced by analysts are of topical relevance to the parties only insofar as they speak of and to their work as a result of being grounded in those methods.

In terms of hybridity of hybrid descriptions, Garfinkel specifically focuses on these 'instructed actions' being part of descriptions provided by hybrid studies. He argues that following the descriptions as instructed actions should exhibit the phenomenon that the text describes (Garfinkel 2002, 115, n39). He calls these criteria for hybridity of hybrid

descriptions 'the praxeological validity of instructed action' (Garfinkel 2002, 100 (5)). Thus, hybrid studies provide descriptions of methods, following which as instructions become phenomena that the descriptions describe. In this sense, hybrid studies deal with members' competence in performing activities in accordance with the methods and in describing the methods. The latter competence relates to a policy Garfinkel introduced, the unique adequacy requirement.

3.4. Members' methods as the findings of studies

In the second set of six points, Garfinkel talks about members' methods as the findings of hybrid studies. The findings should consist of 'accountable methods' (Garfinkel 2002, 101); in other words, they should deal with the methods through which actions are made situationally accountable. These methods do not just produce accountable activities but are central to the 'careful description of phenomena of order' (Garfinkel 2002, 101). As these methods are central to the production of activities, participants are oriented to them, and thus, they have topical relevance for the participants involved in the production of activities.

Members' methods, which ground the findings of studies of work and can only be found in the actual course of activities, can be read interchangeably as descriptions and instructions. They are also presented and demonstrated as adequate for the production of order for accomplishing the specific objective. The methods presented in studies are also presented and demonstrated as adequate for the accountable production of activities by parties as workplace-specific, discipline-specific work. 'Workplace' in this context means a discipline under study, including science, and 'discipline' means ethnomethodology. Thus, members' methods that are uniquely adequate to the workplace are only possible through a collaboration between practitioners in a workplace and ethnomethodologists, which may make up a hybrid discipline (Garfinkel 2002, 101, 270).

Studies that were accomplished through such collaboration can be 'tutorially available to the staff of order production as a descriptive/pedagogic order of argument' (Garfinkel 2002, 101). Garfinkel uses the word 'pedagogies' interchangeably with 'instructions' to emphasise the point that descriptions in the studies can be 'misread' as instructions that can be followed. However, in a footnote, Garfinkel says that Lucy Suchman, Randy Trigg and their colleagues at Xerox PARC (Palo Alto Research Center) reportedly suggested that the use of the word 'pedagogies' as inadequate, and 'cooperative participation' was more appropriate for describing the activities that take place during the study of learning from the parties and sharing their findings with them (Garfinkel 2002, 101, n18). In the following, 'collaboration' will be used to mean what Suchman called 'cooperative participation'.

The point made by Suchman and her colleagues is important in two ways. First, when researchers in the field conduct fieldwork, they are trying to learn from the practitioners in the field and are not in the position of 'teaching' them; thus, 'collaboration' may be a more appropriate word to describe the situation. Second, their point allows us to see that

a distinction needs to be made between checking researchers' understanding with practitioners and sharing researchers' findings with them. The former is part of researchers' learning from the field, and the latter, sharing researchers' findings with the practitioners, may involve different considerations, depending on the circumstances under which the presentation is made, as 'practitioners' are not confined to members of the field under study and may be members of academic disciplines. Hence, one needs to consider the discipline of the readership or the audience, what is known in their corpus, what they expect to hear/read and whether such expectations are clearly expressed in advance. This point is specifically discussed by Garfinkel when he argues that studies can be made available for 'the work-enhancing edification' of the parties engaged in the local production of the activities described by the studies (Garfinkel 2002, 102). These are the problems of hybridisation, that is, presenting hybrid studies to a discipline. While the strong version of hybridisation is the formation of a hybrid discipline (Button and Dourish 1996; Crabtree 2004), examination of hybridisation in practice will be explored in the next section.

4. HYBRIDISATION OF STUDIES IN PRACTICE

4.1. Discussions on hybridisation

In the previous section, Garfinkel's arguments on hybridity and hybrid studies of work were examined to show how his arguments demonstrate that the topical relevance to parties is central to his argument, and he sought to resolve this problem of topical relevance to the parties of the research by introducing the notion of hybridity, thus aiming to merge ethnomethodological studies with investigative topics treated by members in the settings. When hybridity is achieved in a description, the description should be topically relevant to the parties. However, the presentation of ethnomethodological descriptions to the readers or the audience in practice has not been examined closely regarding issues around hybridisation. When ethnomethodological studies are presented in the form of academic papers, such as presentations in conferences, journal articles and books, attempts are made to hybridise the studies with specific disciplines, while this has been discussed only in abstract. If we pursue Anderson and Sharrock's suggestion (2018) that Garfinkel's studies of sociological practices can be understood as a 'hybrid ethno-sociology' (170), his study of clinical records that described how methodological troubles were encountered by sociologists in coding clinical records, for example, can be seen as an attempt to hybridise the study with sociology. However, how his study can be characterised as an attempt of hybridisation is an open question.

Christian Greiffenhagen and Wes Sharrock (2019) extensively discuss Eric Livingston's study of mathematical proofs in the context of ethnomethodological studies of work. Here, the author focuses only on their point that practitioners are not interested in ethnomethodological studies, as it is closely related to the problem of hybridisation. They establish this by referring to how world class mathematicians on his thesis

committee responded to Livingston's PhD thesis. As explained by Garfinkel (2002, 278), two mathematicians on his committee responded to Livingston explaining his thesis at the blackboard, indicating what to look for: 'What do you want of me? What do you want me to look at? I'm looking! What's to look at?' Greiffenhagen and Sharrock argue that the audience of the thesis comprised philosophers, social scientists, and others who were novices in mathematics and not practitioners—that is, mathematicians. They point out that 'novices and "commentators" (philosophers, sociologists, journalists), those who want to know about mathematics rather than those who do mathematics' represent the main audiences for studies of this kind (Greiffenhagen and Sharrock 2019, 279).

While it might be the case that mathematicians did not respond to the thesis similarly to other audiences, it is too hasty to generalise that other practitioners presented with hybrid studies are not interested in such studies. One point to note is that the mathematicians were participating in the committee as mathematics researchers and committee members to assess the relevance of the thesis to the mathematical corpus of knowledge. Thus, they had a distinct interest and role in the committee, in comparison with the sociologists and philosophers who assessed the relevance of the thesis to their respective corpuses of knowledge. Livingston's thesis can be regarded as a case of hybridisation of his studies with mathematics as well as sociology and philosophy, but it was not regarded as relevant to the mathematical corpus of knowledge in the context of thesis examination. Whether, for example, the study may be hybridised with mathematical teaching, is open to question, as Livingston's study deals with mathematical proofs in the context of teaching, Greiffenhagen and Sharrock point out (2019). Therefore, hybridisation with the discipline of mathematical teaching may produce different results.

John Rooke and David Seymour (2005) consider the issues of hybrid studies and hybridisation in the context of construction management. They suggest that ethnomethodological studies can be introduced to disciplines in three ways. The first is anthropological application to market research, in which studies of end users are introduced to designers and managers on the basis of which systems will be designed. The second is hybridisation with a 'field' consisting of system design practitioners, corporations, research groups and others, and its strong case is introduced as 'technomethodology', which was originally introduced by Graham Button and Paul Dourish (1996, 1998). In technomethodology, ethnomethodology is hybridised with the discipline of system design or human-computer interaction. The third approach, which Rooke and Seymour call 'holding-up-a-mirror' (2005, 212–214), involves reporting back to the members of a setting regarding their own activities. In order to achieve this effectively, they argue that following ethnomethodological policies, such as unique adequacy requirements and ethnomethodological indifference, are vital. However, they do not consider the achievement of hybridity enough for studies to be called hybrid studies. Hybrid studies will be properly hybrid if they make recognised contributions. Further, they argue that presenting studies to different audiences with respective criteria for adequacy is the source of confusion, especially regarding ethnomethodological indifference, for example, by making value judgements based on the studies, which may be required by practitioners. This issue may disappear, however,

if the hybridity is conceived as an objective for descriptions that the study is to provide, as discussed in this paper, rather than the hybridity being conceived as the objective for the entire operation of conducting the study and presenting it to a specific disciplinary corpus of knowledge. Rooke and Seymour (2005) view hybridity in the latter way.

If the hybridity is achieved in the descriptions of the hybrid study and 'reporting back to the field' is carried out based on the descriptions, the report should satisfy both members of the field and ethnomethodology, whereby the topical relevance to practitioners is achieved first. Study reports may be generated for disciplinary members who are interested in the activities under study and should be organised with the readership/audience in mind, considering issues concerning 'recipient design'. This means that organising a report involves taking into consideration both explicit and implicit requests from the discipline, whether academic or non-academic, and its disciplinary corpus of knowledge. These are the matters to be considered in the practical management of the hybridisation of studies, which will be dealt with in the next section.

4.2. Examination of hybridisation of studies

In this section, the practical management of hybridisation of actual cases the author was involved in will be examined based on the foregoing discussion about hybridity and hybridisation of hybrid studies. The examination will include how the hybridity of descriptions is dealt with in attempts to organise reports of hybrid studies, which will partly reveal the organisation of attempts to achieve hybridity in descriptions. It will also examine how researchers' assessments of the disciplinary corpus of knowledge in terms of the activities under study, of requirements and of both explicit and implicit expectations, were organised into the report. The notion of a disciplinary corpus of knowledge will be used to refer to corpuses of knowledge in both academic and non-academic disciplines. More specifically, the disciplinary corpus of knowledge can be characterised as 'the locally collective corpus of knowledge', in the sense that it is seen by members as locally available and collectively shared knowledge within a discipline (Ikeya and Sharrock 2018, 165). In academic disciplines, members' activities operate around the corpus that is available in such modes, and their primary objective is to make contribution to the corpus of knowledge, namely, adding modifications to it. Outside academic disciplines, the primary objective differs depending on the discipline, and modifying the corpus of knowledge is only carried out as part of realising the respective primary objective. For example, the classification scheme for books at the university library will not be modified each time a new development is made in science, but it is modified when the scheme is considered no longer practical in terms of classifying books in the library (Ikeya and Sharrock 2018).

Descriptions that hybrid studies provide is made possible through collaboration between the 'field' under study and ethnomethodology. The descriptions are about how activities are carried out under the auspices of the disciplinary corpus of knowledge in the field, with specific focus on the occasioned corpus of knowledge, which is what

members know and how they know it in situ (Zimmerman & Pollner 1970, 94). Hybridisation of studies must be carried out to inform the reader/audience's disciplinary corpus of knowledge, and how hybridisation is organised is its members' accomplishment; moreover, the ways in which it is organised in relation to the reader/audience's disciplinary corpus of knowledge vary. For example, managers may know or have had experience in conducting the activities, but currently may only be overseeing them. In such a case, descriptions of hybrid studies will be provided to inform the managers' disciplinary corpus of knowledge, and the disciplinary members may find it useful to be updated with the current activities in detail if it is non-academic discipline, where its primary objective is not to add modification to its corpus. If hybridisation is carried out for an academic research audience, descriptions of hybrid studies will be organised differently to inform their disciplinary knowledge; the same descriptions will still be presented, but the points made will be different when presented to the management responsible for the activities. This is because the descriptions of hybrid studies themselves will not be regarded as contributions to the academic disciplinary corpus of knowledge.

Next, hybridisation of hybrid studies with the disciplinary corpus of knowledge under study will be examined. Specifically, this section will discuss one case in which the author was involved, to which the reader/audience responded in their respective ways. This is a case that led management to change the way an emergency control centre organises their work.

While the case led the reader/audience to respond, it can be regarded that it achieved the hybridity of studies under examination; however, it did not achieve the ideal as presented by Garfinkel. In terms of unique adequacy requirements, the study only achieved in the weak sense: the researcher became only 'vulgarly' competent in the local production and the phenomenon of order (Garfinkel and Wieder 1992, 182; Garfinkel 2002, 175). This is contrasted with his use of unique adequacy requirements in the strong sense; that is, the researcher becomes competent enough to conduct the activity under study. If hybridity is achieved in this case, then the praxeological validity should be demonstrated in the weak sense of a unique adequacy requirement. Further, if the praxeological validity is demonstrated, then how it is organised as specifics of adequate analytic ethnography is a question. Another question would be how ethnomethodological indifference is achieved in making suggestions to the reader/audience. Thus, the examination of hybridisation will be carried out in these respects.

5. HYBRIDISATION WITH THE DISCIPLINARY CORPUS IN EMERGENCY CONTROL

5.1. Background of the study

The case to be examined is a study of work in an emergency control centre as an example where hybridisation of the study led management to reconsider their members' work. When it was conducted, it was not that the researcher attempted to follow the set

of criteria Garfinkel presented for hybrid studies of work, as it was conducted a few years prior to the publication of *Ethnomethodology's Program* (Garfinkel 2002). Still, this case is worth examining as the response from its reader/audience demonstrates that it was made topically relevant to the disciplinary corpus of the management of emergency control. Thus, it is worth examining how the praxeological validity was demonstrated in the descriptions as part of the hybridisation, while the unique adequacy requirement is only satisfied in the weak sense.

When management faces a challenge and finds a need to modify existing methods, they want to know what happens in this work. Under such circumstances, management may require researchers' studies to help them make informed decisions. This was the case with a committee that was organised by the Emergency Services Department in a metropolitan city in Japan that was exploring how to deal with the increasing number of emergency calls. In particular, the management needed to know the extent to which the emergency service controllers were capable of triaging patients while taking calls, differentiating the seriousness of patients' conditions based on which decisions are made as to which service will be provided.

The author was a member of the committee's research group investigating the question. The author, as the only member who conducted qualitative analysis, asked to conduct fieldwork to understand the practice of taking and dispatching ambulances in the control centre but was only allowed to analyse recordings of 50 calls taken from citizens where an ambulance team was dispatched in response to the calls. Analysis of taking calls and dispatching ambulances was conducted without narrowing down the focus to the organisation of conversations, while the conversational organisation was considered to find out what problem members were trying to deal with in what way in each case. Later, the author also interviewed several controllers. The research group could visit the control centre only once to take a tour. The ethnomethodological analysis was presented to the committee in both written and oral forms, together with quantitative analysis conducted by other members of the research group.

5.2. The presentation of the descriptions in terms of the hybridity

Descriptions as part of the presentation demonstrated how information about a patient's condition is obtained, how his or her location is identified and how the ambulance unit is dispatched and navigated by controllers, all of which demonstrate controllers' competence in taking emergency calls. The analysis showed that controllers have two different approaches. One type of controller, who can be called a prompt decision-maker, obtains just enough information about the patient's condition to decide whether to dispatch an ambulance (Tokyo Fire Department 2000; see also Ikeya 2003). The other type, who can be called a listener, tries to obtain more information about the patient's condition, with which the controllers not only inform the ambulance but also provide the patient with instructions while waiting for the ambulance. In the

analysis, each type is demonstrated through descriptions of actual cases. These descriptions are presented with findings from interviews.

The interviews with the controllers who took calls showed that those with the prompt decision-maker approach regarded themselves as more experienced than others, embodying the method of the centre by referring to what was then called the five-minute rule (i.e., the controllers should dispatch an ambulance within five minutes after taking the call). They considered it their mission to dispatch the ambulances as quickly as possible. In contrast, those who took the listener approach were regarded by prompt decision-makers as newcomers who took too much time to obtain information from the callers. It turned out that the controllers who took the prompt decision-maker approach had been specifically trained as controllers who were specialised in taking calls from citizens and dispatching ambulances, whereas those who took the listener approach were licensed paramedics with at least three years of experience as paramedics in ambulances and newly appointed to the work within six months. Descriptions of each type of activity displayed that the paramedics were clearly oriented more sensitively to those who would be dispatched to the patient, knowing well how they operated on site. Furthermore, the descriptions of their actual cases showed that they tended to provide more advice to callers while they awaited an ambulance.

As part of the conclusion, the researcher suggested that if the emergency control centre wanted the call takers to do triage, the paramedics should take calls at the control centre, as they have the competency to ask the callers adequate questions about medical conditions. The information obtained would enable more decisions to be made. This was exactly what the descriptions demonstrated. So, while this suggestion may be what Rooke and Seymour (2005) would regard as the researcher making value judgements, in fact, it is not; this was demonstrated in the descriptions of practices of calls and dispatches at the emergency control centre. This means that it was possible for the managers to see the validity of the suggestions in the descriptions. In this sense, the descriptions in the study can be regarded as achieving the praxeological validity of instructed actions without absurd errors or other incongruities. In the presentation of the report, the descriptions not only showed how the work of taking calls and dispatching ambulances was carried out in the centre but also demonstrated the conclusion that could be drawn. The conclusion presented was in fact, in response to the very question posed by the management when they organised the committee.

There are two points that can be observed about the descriptions presented in terms of hybridity. The first concerns ethnomethodological indifference. The descriptions were organised in accordance with the policy of ethnomethodological indifference, in the sense that the analysis was made without reliance on sociology or the social scientific discourse. This can be described in more concrete terms. The descriptions presented the two different approaches of the call takers, comparing them in terms of how each treats the problem of taking calls and dispatching ambulances and how each attempts to solve the problem. This allows for analysis, taking the rationale of each approach into account. It should be noted that no criteria for making comparisons between the two approaches

were brought from outside of the practice under study, including organisational theories or general criterion that there should be one standardised operation in a public organisation. This criterion could have been brought in to characterise the practices (in fact, this was the first thought when the researcher encountered two different approaches). From this case, it can be observed that ethnomethodological indifference was achieved in the analysis not only in the sense that the criteria for judgement or issues were not brought from sociology, but more broadly, outside of the practices under study.

Second, the descriptions were presented as an alternate, not as an alternative in terms of the management's corpus of knowledge. What this means is that in this case, the descriptions were presented in a manner that reflected that the analysis was based on what the researcher learned from the controllers. In other words, it was not presented in a manner that indicated that the researcher had discovered facts the managers did not know or new findings in terms of their locally collective corpuses of knowledge. For example, the report could have been presented as the researcher's 'discovery' that two approaches to taking calls existed, as if this was not known in the organisation. However, at the very least, this fact was known to the controllers and possibly to the management. The descriptions that demonstrate in detail how the two approaches were rationally organised in their own ways were new in terms of their corpus of knowledge. Thus, this can be said to be in keeping with one of Garfinkel's policies: presenting a study as an alternate and not as an alternative.

5.3. The management's response in terms of hybridity

When the researcher presented the study to the committee members, the first response from the management was prefaced with an acknowledgement of the researcher's good understanding of their practices. This acknowledgement indicates that they saw the presentation as a demonstration that the researcher was able to comprehend and explain their practices; thus, this can be regarded as granting a credential to a study that was conducted by a sociologist, an outsider. In other words, the descriptions were taken to have satisfied the unique adequacy requirement in the weak sense.

Also, the organisation subsequently decided that paramedics would take calls and dispatch ambulances. The department's management must have noticed in the report that the paramedics' way of handling calls had the potential to overcome the challenges of the increasing number of calls and possibilities of triaging the call takers had to handle. Their decision indicates that the management took seriously the demonstration of controllers' practices through actual cases of how both prompt decision-makers' and listeners' methods of taking calls and dispatching ambulances were rationally organised in their respective ways. In other words, they accepted the descriptions as satisfying topical relevance to the parties and praxeological validity of instructed actions without absurd errors or other incongruities.

6. CONCLUSION

So far, this paper has examined the ethnomethodological hybrid studies of work Garfinkel introduced in terms of achieving topical relevance to parties, the ambition that qualitative approaches such as action research and participatory observation have in common. In order to realise this ambition, Garfinkel put forward the notion of hybridity. With this notion, he presented methodological arguments on how hybridity of studies should be achieved. In his argument, the researcher ideally should satisfy the unique adequacy requirement in the strong sense, thus the descriptions, the adequate analytic ethnography, produced by the researcher will satisfy the praxeological validity in the sense that the researcher can produce the local production of order by following the descriptions. The adequate analytic ethnography in this context ideally takes the form of 'first-person hands-on studies' (Garfinkel 2002, 94).

However, the reality of ethnographic studies conducted in the social sciences, including sociology, rarely takes the form Garfinkel proposed, especially in terms of satisfying the unique requirement of adequacy in the strong sense, apart from a few examples even in ethnomethodology (Lynch 1993, 274, n25) and several other examples in ethnography (as discussed, including some issues related to such attempts, in Anderson and Sharrock 1982). At the same time, ethnomethodological studies have been carried out with hybridisation of disciplinary corpuses of knowledge of various kinds leading to consequences of practical values to practitioners, which clearly means they are of topical relevance to parties (Crabtree et al. 2012; Szymanski and Whalen 2011; Crabtree 2004; Rooke and Seymour 2005). Thus, this paper examined a case of hybridisation that was taken seriously by the practitioners. By doing so, it aimed to understand how hybridisation of studies with the reader/audience's corpus of knowledge are realised in practice and how hybridity is dealt with in such hybridisation. Examination of hybrid studies of emergency control revealed ways in which hybridisation with the disciplinary corpus of management of emergency control was practically accomplished in relation to the objectives of the committee within the study. It was also revealed that hybridity of hybrid studies achieved through collaboration between ethnomethodology and the work of emergency control was treated as the basis of its hybridisation with management, thus including both demonstrations of members' work and suggestions made based on the study. Hence, the hybridity achieved in the description in terms of the ethnomethodological indifference, unique adequacy requirement, praxeological validity and presentation of studies as alternate was critical to the hybridisation of the hybrid study.

Hybridisation of hybrid studies in practice has rarely been examined before. The examination of even one case shows the distinctiveness of ethnomethodological hybrid studies of work in relation to other qualitative research. There are three points that make hybridity of hybrid studies distinctive. First, in hybrid studies of work, the researcher always turns to the investigative topic treated in the setting, which is constituted within the organisation of activities. This is because ethnomethodologists are concerned with the local production of order per se. This means that ethnomethodologists always

attempt to relate what people state their interests are with actual investigative topics embedded in the activities in the setting. For example, in the analysis of recordings of taking calls and dispatching ambulances, the researcher was paying attention to the problem (topic) investigated by the controller. Also, when a call taker told the researcher that they would try to respond to the citizen as soon as possible, the researcher did not just accept it as their problem (topic), but tried to locate it within their actual work of taking calls and dispatching ambulances, to see whether it can be located as the investigative topic in the setting, and if so, how it is actually tackled in each case. This may make the ethnomethodologists appear sceptical prima facie, but they are not.

Second, when the investigative topic treated by parties in the setting is investigated by the researcher, the researcher does not narrow down the analytical focus for methodological reasons. Thus, in the analysis of recordings of the work of call takers, the investigative topic of the setting, in this context, the topic of locating the patient for navigating the ambulance, was investigated by the researcher as to how activities were organised in the setting by the parties, without narrowing down the analysis to the investigative topic concerning how the conversation is organised. In other qualitative approaches, the researcher may decide what to focus on for methodological reasons.

Third, when suggestions are made to practitioners based on a hybrid study, the suggestions are, in fact, already demonstrated in the descriptions presented in the report. In this sense, the praxeological validity is not only satisfied in the description, but it is also part of the report for the reader/audience to see the suggestions as valid, by seeing that the suggestions are actually demonstrated in the description. Thus, the suggestions are presented in such a manner that there is not much room for the researcher to manipulate.

These three points, 1) always turning to how the investigative topic is treated in the setting whenever making any statement, 2) doing so without narrowing down analytical focus for methodological reasons, and 3) demonstrating the praxeological validity in the presentation of a report by providing descriptions that satisfies it, are what makes ethnomethodological hybrid studies of work distinctive in producing descriptions, hybridisation of the study, and making suggestions based on the study. While these identified characteristic of ethnomethodological hybrid studies of work seem to suggest their differences from other qualitative approaches, the question, for example, of how exactly hybrid studies differ from those based on other qualitative approaches needs further examination.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

Adelman, Clem. 1993. 'Kurt Lewin and the Origins of Action Research'. *Educational Action Research* 1 (1): 7–24.

Anderson, Robert John, and Wes W Sharrock. 2018. *Action at a Distance: Studies in the Practicalities of Executive Management. Philosophy and Method in the Social Sciences*. London: Routledge.

Bernard, H. Russell. 2006. *Research Methods in Anthropology: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. 4th ed. Landham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Bjelić, Dušan. 2019. '"Hearability" Versus "Hearership": Comparing Garfinkel's and Schegloff's Accounts of the Summoning Phone'. *Human Studies* 42 (4): 695–716.

Button, Graham, and Paul Dourish. 1996. 'Technomethodology: Paradoxes and Possibilities'. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 19–26. New York: ACM.

Crabtree, Andy. 2004. 'Taking Technomethodology Seriously: Hybrid Change in the Ethnomethodology-Design Relationship'. *European Journal of Information Systems*, 195–209.

Crabtree, Andrew, Peter Tolmie, and Mark Rouncefield. 2012. *Doing Design Ethnography*. London: Springer.

DeWalt, Kathleen Musante., and Billie R. Dewalt. 2011. *Participant Observation a Guide for Fieldworkers*. 2nd ed. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Dourish, Paul, and Graham Button. 1998. 'On "Technomethodology": Foundational Relationships Between Ethnomethodology and System Design'. *Human-Computer Interaction* 13 (4): 395–432.

Garfinkel, Harold. 1967. *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Garfinkel, Harold, and Harvey Sacks. 1970. 'On Formal Structures of Practical Actions'. In *Theoretical Sociology: Perspectives and Development*, edited by J. C. Mckinney and E. A. Tiryakian, 337–66. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Garfinkel, Harold, ed. 1986. *Ethnomethodological Studies of Work*. London: Routledge.

Garfinkel, Harold, and D Lawrence Wieder. 1992. 'Two Icommensurable, Asymmetrically Alternate Technologies of Social Analysis'. In *Text in Context: Contributions to Ethnomethodology*, edited by Graham Watson and R. M. Seiler, 175–206. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Garfinkel, Harold. 2007. 'Lebenswelt Origins of the Sciences: Working out Durkheim's Aphorism'. *Human Studies* 30 (1): 9–56.

Garfinkel, Harold. 2002. *Ethnomethodology's Program: Working Out Durkheim's Aphorism*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Greenwood, Davydd J., and Morten Levin. 2007. *Introduction to Action Research: Social Research for Social Change*. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Greiffenhagen, Christian, and Wes W. Sharrock. 2019. 'Tensions in Garfinkel's Ethnomethodological Studies of Work Programme Discussed Through Livingston's Studies of Mathematics'. *Human Studies* 42 (2): 253–79.

Ikeya, Nozomi. 2003. 'Practical Management of Mobility: The Case of the Emergency Medical System'. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* 35 (9): 1547–64.

Ikeya, Nozomi, and W. Sharrock. 2018. 'Social Distribution of Knowledge in Action: The Practical Management of Classification' In *Relevance and Irrelevance: Theories, Factors and Challenges*, edited by Jan Strassheim and Hisashi Nasu, 161–86. Mouton: de Gruyter.

Kawulich, Barbara B. 2005. 'Participant Observation as a Data Collection Method'. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 6 (2): Art. 43.

Lindwall, Oskar, and Gustav Lymer. 2005. 'Vulgar Competence, Ethnomethodological Indifference and Curricular Design'. In *Computer Supported Collaborative Learning 2005: The Next 10 Years - Proceedings of the International Conference on Computer Supported Collaborative Learning 2005, CSCL 2005*, edited by Tim Koschmann, D Suthers, and T.W. Chan, 388–97. Bloomington, IA: International Society of the Learning Sciences.

Lynch, Michael. 1993. *Scientific Practice and Ordinary Action: Ethnomethodology and Social Studies of Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pollner, Melvin, and Robert M. Emerson. 2001. 'Ethnomethodology and Ethnography'. In *Handbook of Ethnography*, edited by Paul Atkinson, Amanda Coffey, Sara Delamont, John Lofland, and Lyn Lofland, 118–35. London: Sage.

Rooke, John, and David Seymour. 2005. 'Studies of Work: Achieving Hybrid Disciplines in IT Design and Management Studies'. *Human Studies* 28 (2): 205–21.

Sacks, Harvey, Emanuel A. Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson. 1974. 'A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation'. *Language* 50 (4): 696–735.

Sormani, Philippe. 2014. *Respecifying Lab Ethnography: An Ethnomethodological Study of Experimental Physics*. London: Routledge.

Sharrock, Wes W., and Robert John Anderson. 2013. 'The Gentle Seer: The Unappreciated Prescience of Egon Bittner's "Objectivity and Realism in Sociology"'. *Ethnographic Studies*, 13: 18–29.

Sharrock, W.W., and R.J. Anderson. 1982. 'On the Demise of the Native: Some Observations on and a Proposal for Ethnography'. *Human Studies* 5 (2): 119–35.

Tokyo Fire Department 2000. 'Report of the 23rd Discussion Forum on Emergency Medical Work'. [Tokyo Shobocho 2000. Dai 23 kai Tokyo Shobocho Kyukyu Gyomu Konwakai Toshinsho.]

Szymanski, Margaret H., and Jack Whalen, eds. 2011. *Making Work Visible: Ethnographically Grounded Case Studies of Work Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wilson, Thomas P. 2003. 'Garfinkel's Radical Program'. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 36 (4): 487–94.

Zimmerman, Don H., and Melvin Pollner. 1970. 'The Everyday World as a Phenomenon'. In *Understanding Everyday Life: Toward the Reconstruction of Sociological Knowledge*, edited by Jack D. Douglas, 80-103. London: Routeldge & Kegan Paul.