

**Shadowing in/as Work: Ten Recommendations for Shadowing Fieldwork Practice**

Forthcoming in: *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management*, 9(1)

Rebecca Gill, Joshua B. Barbour, and Marleah Dean

Department of Communication  
Texas A&M University  
4234 TAMUS  
College Station, TX. 77843

### **Abstract**

**Purpose** – To provide practical recommendations for shadowing as a method of organizational study with a focus on the situated processes and practices of shadowing fieldwork.

**Design/methodology/approach** – This paper reflects on the shadowing experiences of three researchers – in a hospital emergency department, nuclear power plants, and entrepreneur workspaces – to generate recommendations by identifying and synthesizing solutions that emerged during our encounters with the challenges and opportunities in shadowing.

**Findings** – Considering shadowing as an ongoing and emergent research process can be helpful to prepare for particular aspects of shadowing fieldwork. Shadowing presents research challenges that may emerge in the practice of fieldwork, including how to negotiate awkward conversations with participants, what to bring and wear, and how to take notes.

**Practical implications** – Though our recommendations for shadowing are based on particular experiences and may not generalize to all shadowing engagements, they offer concrete, practical recommendations useful across experience levels. The recommendations should sensitize researchers to the intimate and situational character of shadowing, and offer strategies for coping with the distinctive requirements of shadowing.

**Originality/value** – By looking across diverse experiences of shadowing, we generated guidelines that help to make sense of shadowing processes, manage uncertainty in the field, and build on the emerging work on shadowing. Our ten recommendations provide insight into shadowing that are of particular value to graduate students, junior researchers, and those new to shadowing. Moreover, the experienced shadower may find value in the camaraderie of shared experience, the concrete ideas about another's experience of shadowing, and insight in recommendations that capture aspects of fieldwork that they are also exploring.

**Keywords** – Shadowing, organizational ethnography, recommendations, fieldwork, ethnographic notetaking

**Article type** – Technical paper

**Shadowing in/as Work: 10 Recommendations for Shadowing Fieldwork Practice**

As a methodological tool enjoying resurgence in organizational studies (Vasquez, Brummans, and Groleau, 2012), shadowing offers insight into the immediacy and invisibility of changing late modern or postindustrial organizing processes affected by technological innovation and blurred workplace boundaries (Czarniawska, 2007). Alongside this, calls to (re)visit the actual labor that people do in the late modern or postindustrial workplace underscore the need for creative methodological tools as scholars push the bounds of understandings and explorations of work and organizing (e.g., Ashcraft, 2007; Barley and Kunda, 2001).

As researchers who have ourselves undertaken shadowing projects, we agree that shadowing offers much in the way of methodological rigor and insight. As a kind of one-on-one ethnography, shadowing provides a window into the everyday interactions and practices that comprise and construct organizational processes (Czarniawska, 2007; McDonald, 2005). In this essay, we build on work that attempts to come to terms with the peculiarities of shadowing by reflecting on our own shadowing experiences – in a hospital emergency department, in nuclear power plants, and in entrepreneur workspaces – to provide practical and concrete recommendations for the actual conduct of shadowing fieldwork. We proceed in the following manner: First, we introduce shadowing and review the advantages and disadvantages of this method. Second, we turn our attention to summarizing the recommendations that others have made for coping with the tensions inherent to shadowing. Next, we propose and discuss 10 practical, detailed recommendations for shadowing drawn from our own experiences and geared toward the actual doing of shadowing. We conclude by discussing the implications of our discussion for shadowing theory.

## Shadowing and its Advantages and Disadvantages

Shadowing can be defined in many ways, though recent discussions share commonalities.

Consider the following definitions:

...a researcher closely following a subject over a period of time to investigate what people actually do in the course of their everyday lives, not what their roles dictate of them. (Quinlan, 2008, p. 1482)

...ethnographic work where the focus of attention is upon the daily practice of a single individual, living and working within a complex institutional social setting. (Gilliat-Ray, 2011, p. 470)

...the process by which a trainee or researcher closely observes the work of an experienced employee over a period of time. (Blake and Stalberg, 2009, p. 243)

... following and recording organizational actors during their everyday activities and interactions by using video/audio recording and/or taking fieldnotes. (Vasquez, *et al.*, 2012, p. 145)

Key components across these definitions highlight shadowing as *following an individual to learn about their everyday experience and practices*, often but not always at work. This immersion means that the researcher, *inter alia*, must anticipate shadowing, perform shadowing, and then transition out of the field.

As part of this process, shadowing offers significant advantages and disadvantages across research paradigms. Advantages of shadowing include that it can provide insight into otherwise invisible aspects of people's work; offer individuals opportunities to explain what they are doing, when they are doing it; allow connections to be observed across dispersed work teams; and yield a holistic understanding of work that may be missed through traditional interviews or observations (Blake and Stalberg, 2009; McDonald, 2005). Another productive advantage of shadowing that we find particularly useful is that it provides a way to "[answer] research questions where the unit of analysis is not the individual but the social relation; positions are explored within a complex of interrelated processes" (Quinlan, 2008, p. 1482; Gill, 2011).

Like most research methods, the advantages also create challenges with which the researcher must cope. Czarniawska (2007) has noted that shadowing takes an emotional and psychological toll, particularly because of the length of time spent in the presence of another and the careful coordination and communication required. Additionally, fieldwork can be highly unpredictable and uncertain, which raises anxieties for researcher and participant alike. Blake and Stalberg (2009) noted the tendency for shadowees to feel as though they are being evaluated during the process, and others have recalled participants planning their days around the researcher and apologizing for moments that the researcher missed (e.g., Gilliat-Ray, 2011; Quinlan, 2008). Finally, as a rich data collection method, shadowing provides an abundance of information and experiences that can make notetaking and analysis unwieldy (McDonald, 2005).

To be sure, these advantages and disadvantages are bound up in tension with each other, where there is always give-and-take between what is ventured and what is gained. This may vary, too, depending on the researcher's metatheoretical commitments. What shadowing is *intended to look like* and also *actually looks like* can differ, depending on the commitments of the researcher. Post-positivist approaches may strive to utilize shadowing as a way to objectively observe phenomena and thus, as a means to remain somewhat invisible in the field (Vasquez, *et al.*, 2012, p. 146). Researchers taking an interpretive approach to shadowing may intentionally create opportunities to engage with the shadowee as a way to privilege understanding from the participants' point of view. Furthermore, researchers more aligned with critical or feminist approaches may hope to enact shadowing as akin to Peter Pan's shadow, which "has a life of its own: it escapes when he chases it, plays with him, and even changes form" (Vasquez, *et al.*, 2012, p. 146). Of course, the degree to which one's shadowing practice reflects one's intended

methodological commitments can be in constant flux, subject to the exigencies or expectations of the participants and the researcher.

That is, researchers are somewhat subject to how participants may choose to position them (see Gill, 2011) and may shift their focus as they engage with the field, as Quinlan (2008) noted of her own experience of becoming an “interested” researcher. Shadowing expectations and performances differ from case-to-case, as researchers and participants negotiate specific relationships. A persistent tension of shadowing, then, is that it requires that the researcher be aware of what is most needed from her in a particular moment and improvise to maintain or modify her methodological commitments. Thus, we contend that it is possible to get the most benefit out of shadowing if the researcher remains open and flexible in the process of conducting fieldwork, accepting that the risks of shadowing can never be resolved but must be continuously negotiated.

### **Coping with and Tolerating the Tensions Inherent to Shadowing**

We have thus far characterized shadowing as a research method that requires the researcher to be open and flexible. Because of this give-and-take of shadowing, researchers have begun generating ideas for how to operate within the ambiguity and uncertainty inherent to the tensional tradeoffs of work-based shadowing that are based on their own experiences, particularly related to the changing structures of work and use of technology (e.g., Czarniawska, 2007; Gill, 2011; Vasquez, *et al.*, 2012). Thus, recent work-based shadowing advice has argued for a reconsideration of shadowing as a postmodern research tool (e.g., Czarniawska, 2007) and advice has been given with this in mind. To build on this literature, we frame our recommendations by first reflecting on three broad suggestions for conducting shadowing

research that have emerged in these recent discussions: 1) the shadower should be prepared; 2) the shadower should encourage shadowee reflection; and 3) the shadower should be adaptable.

**Prepare.** Shadowing researchers have advocated planning ahead and preparing questions ahead of time. McDonald (2005) advised shadowers to “never go in cold”, because without some knowledge of the field at the beginning of data collection, “your notes will not be very meaningful at the start of your shadowing” (p. 460). Along with this, Blake and Stalberg (2001) reminded researchers to develop objectives for what they want to accomplish in the field, so that they are able to be involved in the processes that they believe are important to the research. Others have echoed this advice, acknowledging the continually changing nature of the field, and suggest setting or reminding oneself of intended objectives and questions on a daily basis (Vasquez, *et al.*, 2012). Part of planning may also involve deciding what materials and objects to bring into the field. McDonald advised using a hard-back notebook so that it is possible to take notes regardless of the situation or place, and to have back-up note-taking materials.

**Encourage reflection.** Although some researchers may plan to be the invisible “fly on the wall,” and others may plan to be highly involved depending on their metatheoretical commitments, advice from extant literature has recommended encouraging ongoing commentary from the shadowee, because the shadowee can provide clarification and interpretation. In that shadowing offers access to “invisible” aspects of work and organizing, being able to ask questions or gain insight in the moment is significant (Czarniawska, 2007), particularly when the work being done is difficult to observe (such as in the case of knowledge workers). This technique proved useful for Groleau (Vasquez, *et al.*, 2012), for instance, who reflected:

I soon realized that parts of the data I was attempting to collect were escaping me. For example, while they were working with the new software packages, all I could see was that they activated computer commands without fully understanding the sensemaking that

led to their individual and collective actions. ... To overcome these difficulties, I asked shadowees to verbalize what they were doing as they were doing their work. (p. 153)

By gaining access to both the activity and the explanation behind it, “actions are contextualized by the running commentary and every opinion is related to the situation which produced it” (McDonald, 2005, p. 457).

**Remain open.** Finally, shadowing researchers have reminded us to remain open and adaptable to situations. Across the board, shadowing researchers have seemed to share the realization that shadowing was not what they expected it to be. This may be because shadowers end up in unexpected places (Gilliat-Ray, 2011; Quinlan, 2008). This may also be because the relationship between the shadower and shadowee changes and develops throughout the course of the research. As observed by Vasquez, *et al.* (2012), it is important for the researcher to continually make decisions about what they will shadow, perhaps on a day-to-day basis, because “the foregrounding-backgrounding involved in delineating an object of study can never be worked out entirely prior to the fieldwork and needs to be negotiated in the field” (p. 149).

Although discussions of shadowing as a method certainly reflect on the processural nature of shadowing and provide insight into the experience of conducting the method, there has been less discussion of the mechanics of actually conducting shadowing research. Our own experiences have involved questions like: *given that I don't know what to expect, what should I bring with me?* and, *because I will likely take a lot of notes, how should I arrange my notes?* Guided by questions like these, we next offer and discuss explicit strategies for shadowing fieldwork.

### **Practical Recommendations**

We generated these recommendations by reflecting on our own experiences and engaging in iterative periods of reflection and conversation among the three of us. Among us, we have

engaged in nearly 500 hours of shadowing, across very different sites: a hospital emergency department, nuclear power plants, and the workday of entrepreneurs. Two of the sites (the emergency department and the power plants) had very strict security measures, which meant that as shadows, we had to gain special access, follow explicit instructions, and could rarely, if ever, be out of sight of our shadowee. We realize that this nuances our experiences and that not everyone will be shadowing in secure areas.

To generate our recommendations, we began by reflecting on our own experiences with shadowing, sharing the stories of our experience and the practical wisdom those stories contained. We engaged in dialogue wherein we shared “tales of the field” and brainstormed advice that we wish we had been given, or that we would give to others. In this discussion, we built on and interrogated each other’s narratives, conducting a sort of collaborative focus group guided by the ideals of interpretive inquiry and respect for intersubjectivity. We then entered a second period of independent reflection wherein we distilled and forwarded potential recommendations for additional group reflection.

As might be imagined, this iterative process of story sharing, distilling, and dialoguing produced more ideas and examples than could be used. As such, we chose our recommendations and integrated our examples through consensus, guided by a simple decision framework: We sought to generate concrete advice for the actual practice of shadowing fieldwork that gave voice to as many of our ideas as possible and captured the diversity of our experiences. We kept in mind that although it is impossible to create a perfect shadowing experience, it is possible to approach and engage the situation thoughtfully as a way to support a productive and pleasurable working relationship among the shadowers and the shadowed. Thus, we gave preference to ideas and stories that were insightful, useful, practical, and interesting. We resolved conflicts regarding

the synthesis of stories by returning to these guiding principles. Before finishing, we reflected holistically on the recommendations, asking if we had left ideas unstated that were important for making concrete practical recommendations.

Ultimately, our recommendations are focused on the practical “doing” of shadowing fieldwork. We chose to focus mainly on shadowing practice as a way to give voice to shadowing as a nuanced and situational *craft*. This means that, like Czarniawska (2007), we do not spend a lot of time on research design or data management and analysis, though we do draw attention to these issues when appropriate. To support our goal in this paper of providing concrete advice for shadowing fieldwork, we have organized our recommendations into three phases—arrival, shadowing, and leaving. For our purposes, *arrival* encompasses the anticipation and concentrated preparation just before shadowing begins; *shadowing* entails the encounter of the site and the fieldwork itself; and *leaving* includes the ongoing negotiation of changing relationships with shadowees. These phases are by no means neat but can be messy and overlapping; they are also not experienced or borne out in the same way for everyone, as shadowing is informed by the site itself, the personalities involved, and the metatheoretical commitments adopted by the researcher. We want to note, then, that whereas our varied experiences spanned post-positivist, interpretive, and also critical/feminist approaches, we tended to privilege interpretive assumptions regarding the (inter)subjectivity of fieldwork when generating recommendations for this paper. Researchers should consider our recommendations with this in mind so that they may make purposeful choices about which recommendations to adopt or tailor for specific research projects and sites. Briefly, our recommendations are:

#### Arriving

- #1 Proactively engage issues with shadowees ahead of time
- #2 Prepare for embodied shadowing
- #3 Take classes or hold discussion on the emotional side of qualitative methods

#4 Pack a “shadow kit”

Shadowing

#5 Plan to follow the rules, at first

#6 Play around with strategies for notetaking

#7 Dance in the doldrums

#8 Locate or create social support

Leaving

#9 Mitigate the anticipation of shadower-as-betrayer

#10 Exit the field mindfully

In the remainder of our paper, we discuss each recommendation, providing examples and experiences. We should also note that we have given ourselves nicknames (Javalina, Estes, and Millsy) so that we could feel as though we could write and reflect more freely, and to avoid drawing overly explicit connections between our feelings and our particular sites.

### **Arriving**

For us, “arriving” is represented by the period of time before the shadower begins formal observation, and may not encompass the entirety of the research process that precedes shadowing. The shadower has developed a sense of where they will shadow, and their expectations are influenced by processes of communication, including their assumptions about the organization, previous experiences, and stories they have heard from others. Although we conceived of arriving as those poignant moments of preparation before fieldwork, arriving is informed by the design of the study, previous research experiences, general knowledge of the occupation or organization, and stories from the field.

**#1 Proactively engage issues with shadowees ahead of time.** Deciding how to frame the research experience in early conversations with the shadowee is especially tricky but also important. Early conversations frame the shadowing and influence the insights yielded. One conversation we have found helpful was to come to an agreement with the participant about when we would shadow. The schedule of shadowing should balance the needs of the shadowee

and the interest of the researcher. When shadowing in the emergency department and nuclear power plants, we left the decision about when we could shadow to the participants, given the sensitive nature of these workplaces. Because shadowing entrepreneurs offered more flexibility, Millsy asked to shadow during what the entrepreneurs would define as their workday. Of course, this means that researchers do not always have a say in when they shadow, which places constraints on the schedule and responsibilities of the researcher. Javalina and Millsy tried to schedule shadowing around their teaching schedules, accomplishing the bulk of shadowing over the summer months; Estes fitted her shadowing into the academic year. We all negotiated family and other “non-work” responsibilities and sought to conduct our shadowing during hours that were not too disruptive to these other rhythms. As a new parent, for instance, Javalina had to weigh the times he traveled to shadow against time away from his son.

We recommend that the conversation at the start of shadowing engage the tradeoffs of shadowing, making them explicit even if they are not addressed. Recognizing that the trade offs exist and naming them can provide purchase for later conversations, negotiating the disadvantages as they emerge. Regarding Javalina’s conversations with shadowees to accomplish the informed consent, he was surprised that these normally procedural and dry conversations came up later. They gave shadowees language to talk about the research process comfortably (i.e., to ask Javalina to leave the room without feeling they might hurt his feelings).

Along these lines, the researcher can make explicit (to the shadowee or to herself) that she is acknowledging issues, but not try to address them immediately to allow the emergent shadowing to guide the negotiation. Waiting to see how an issue is played out can be fruitful in and of itself. Questions or ways of framing issues as they emerge might sound like: “we’re going to be spending a lot of time together, which can be awkward. Do you think that it would be

helpful to have a short check-in at lunchtime or the end of the day that gives us space to reflect on this?” Another option might be to say, “wow – yesterday was a long day for me, I don’t know about you. Did you feel like you needed a break from me? What could we do today to create a little alone time?” Or, “so, I know this seems odd, but how do you want to handle bathroom breaks?” In these conversations, having a sense of humor and self-deprecation can help.

An open and forthcoming conversation may also help generate specific “action routes” that the parties can take for addressing situations or problems in the field. For example, the shadowee could provide an overview of their routine ahead of time, highlighting sensitive needs or activities that might arise (e.g., perhaps a shadowee will need to breastfeed during the day or meet a friend for coffee). Also during this conversation, the shadower could help the participant to identify questions that they may want to explore throughout the shadowing experience. In this way, research questions could be co-constructed that serve participants’ interests and curiosity. In all of our experiences, we often found that participants would ask for feedback on their performance, as we were about to cease shadowing them (a theme we return to below). If we had thought to ask participants ahead of time what *they* might be interested in, we could have better developed the research questions to also guide their own reflection.

**#2 Take classes, hold discussion on, or just reflect on the emotional side of qualitative methods.** Milling Kinard (1996) once said, “Too little attention is given to documenting the process of carrying out research” (p. 96). Oftentimes as scholars we are prepared for the cognitive challenges of conducting research yet become overwhelmed with the “side effects” of research. We may be taught how to be conscious of the ethics of the research process, but how do we deal with the unanticipated effects on our participants and ourselves? As

researchers, we are supposed to be professional, yet we are personally affected by the sensitive topics and difficult situations in which we find ourselves.

Such concerns and questions are often truest for new scholars, but a new shadowing experience may prove emotionally challenging for even the most seasoned researcher. For example, students may be prepared to handle the methodological aspects of conducting research yet lack the training or experience in handling research as emotional labor. This was the experience for Estes as a shadower in a hospital emergency department. Estes entered the site understanding generally how to observe (a data collection tool), who to observe (physicians and nurses), and why she was observing (to assess communication), but she did not anticipate the side effects of conducting such research, and in this particular way. Estes witnessed traumatic accidents and intense procedures and had to deal with the emotions that stirred as a result. With hindsight, Estes wishes that she had been more prepared for the possible effects the observations would have.

Dealing with emotions is idiosyncratic, and some researchers may be more sensitive or skilled in this arena. That said, it can be valuable to begin to consider the ways that we might train researchers to cope with unexpected, emotional side effects. Being aware of the emotional tensions in shadowing is the first step in this. Drawing from research on emotional distress in healthcare, we also recommend that researchers remain mindful, engage in self-care, and seek out helpful resources (Epstein, 1999, 2003). That is, the researcher – and arguably the research – will benefit from remembering to take care. This may seem like a simplistic reminder, but we too often forgot to do this.

Ultimately, it might be beneficial to think of emotions as insights, recognizing that the emotions felt in the field may be ones with which participants have also grappled. Anticipating

the need to come to terms with emotions during the research process can prepare the researcher to make sense of shadowing—especially as a kind of embedded study—through emotion. Relatedly, the decisions made when analyzing and writing up data might also support or illuminate certain observations from the field at the same time that they help process experience. The decision to write up research through confessional, realist, and/or impressionist tales (Van Maanen, 1988) can help researchers consider to what degree they want to incorporate emotional processing as part of the research and can also serve as an opportunity to acknowledge and reflect on the emotional experience. Finally, we hope that the other recommendations we suggest in this paper regarding preparedness (#1), recognizing the role of the body (#3), seeking social support (#8), and so forth, are also resources for anticipating and understanding the emotional dimensions of shadowing research.

**#3 Prepare for embodied shadowing.** Shadowing is embodied. Perhaps more intensely than any other research method, it is a physically and mentally demanding activity. We include this discussion in the “arriving” phase because of the consideration that embodiment warrants ahead of time, though the experience of embodiment is indubitably present throughout shadowing. For the three of us, the duration of our shadowing varied from 3-4 hour periods of observation to 8-12 hour work days, and each of us at one point found our hands cramping while trying to quickly take detailed notes for extended periods of time. Preparing for shadowing means recognizing that it is material.

Shadowing engages the body in conflict with taboos and politeness norms, and talking about the body can be difficult. Shadowers are embedded in someone else’s daily routine, and on top of adjusting to that routine, the shadower is taking notes, observing, and improvising responses to events as they occur. Thus, recognizing the intense physicality of shadowing, the

researcher must embrace the body to support and preserve the research process. The demands of shadowing research are also compounded by the constant visibility of being the “researcher on the stage” (of course, the same is true for the participant!). These physical demands must be negotiated publicly, including eating habits and food preferences and bathroom breaks and quirks (Javalina routinely experienced “stage fright” when using the restroom with a shadowee). Bathroom behavior made for levity, as when a participant noticed that Javalina rarely used the restroom. The participant asked laughing, “Do they train you to hold it all day?” The response was a wry, “Yes. Yes they do.”

During periods of intense shadowing, taking care of the body also means resting. Each of us has experienced tiredness to the point of sleep during the shadowing experience. Millsy related a tale of observing a meeting in the “wee dawn” of the morning near the end of an intense week-long shadowing engagement. As the speaker droned on, Millsy fell asleep, coffee in hand, waking up only when her head dropped back and banged on the wall behind the chair. She covered for herself by shifting her body as if to say, “I’m just finding my place in my chair.” Sleep happens.

Slipping into another’s routine also means giving up the comforts of your own day. Ahead of shadowing, reflect on daily routines to identify your tea times, coffee breaks, smoking time, or walking time. Short of recreating the activities that serve your body and mind during shadowing, at least awareness may help. Substitutions may also be possible. During one of our observations, the researcher made an effort to make sure there would be coffee available around 3 PM in the office. Conveniently, this coffee break also served as an impromptu afternoon reflection on the day by the shadowee.

Preparing the body involves mental exercises too – the mind and body are not separate entities. Self-reflection is important throughout the research process; this includes being aware of your own limitations, including the emotional burdens of shadowing and being practical about what you can and cannot do. Meditation before shadowing can calm and focus the mind. Meditation can help support practices of mindfulness—“being fully present and attentive to the moment, the person, or the task at hand” (Spickard, Gabbe, and Christensen, 2002, p. 1450)—that are particularly valuable in the field. Being mindful can help focus your attention and awareness skills (Krasner, *et al.*, 2009) and help conserve energy by bracketing other, distracting, thoughts or concerns. Javalina reflected that during the drive to the site, he would “zone out” to find quiet before shadowing.

**#4 Pack a “shadow kit.”** Perhaps no concern is more practical in anticipation of the first day than, *what do I bring?* Answers to this question will differ depending on who you are shadowing and where. For instance, in our experiences, security expectations dictated that we could not bring certain items (e.g., purse or jacket) or that we had to bring other items (e.g., composite- or steel-toed safety shoes). Our experiences taught us that it was a good idea to pack a “shadowing kit” before we started our time in the field every day. We recommend using a small-medium size bag (a side bag or backpack) that is easy to carry and can be readied quickly. Like McDonald (2005), we found a hardback notebook essential; if the notebook is spiral bound, it can fold over for easier handling. Find a pen that writes well and bring extras.

Additional items that we found helpful to include in the kit were: cash (enough to buy coffee or lunch for yourself and your shadowee, if the situation warrants it), a bank or credit card, a cell phone, small and quick snacks like a granola bar or other energy booster, a refill-able water bottle, aspirin and other medication you might need, and a small tape recorder with fresh

batteries for impromptu *in situ* interviews or for post-shadowing debriefing. The shadowing kit can change as conditions warrant. For Estes, a salt deficiency caused her to almost pass out when shadowing (lucky she was shadowing in a hospital!), and from then on, she brought small salt packets with her. During one period of shadowing, Javalina was taken to a greasy spoon diner for lunch. He ate a hamburger and fries, but later regretted it as it weighed on his system all afternoon, and so he resolved to bring lighter foods and snacks in his kit.

Relatedly, researchers will want to consider the clothing they wear on the day of shadowing. On one hand, it is important to dress in accordance with the norms of the site as a way to show respect and understanding for the research participant. When shadowing entrepreneurs and when shadowing in the emergency department (Millsy and Estes, respectively), we dressed “professionally” (e.g., dress pants and button-down shirts, pants suits) as a way to mark our belongingness in traditionally white collar or professional settings. When shadowing in nuclear power plants, Javalina and Millsy marked belongingness by following the rules (steel-toed or composite shoes and cotton clothing were required) and “matching” the business casual but practical dress of the shadowees by wearing fleece vests over button-down shirts or more dressy cargo pants (the additional pockets can be quite useful!).

Of course, your choices might be limited depending on how far you travel to a site. Driving for upwards of an hour or two might mean changing clothes and shoes before beginning the day with the shadowee. Although changing in the car beforehand was an adventure for Millsy, a fresh set of clothes before beginning a long day went a long way. Moreover, if you are flying and staying in a hotel, knowing the clothing situation ahead of time is particularly important. Javalina and Millsy would not have been permitted to shadow if they had forgotten their steel-toed shoes or were not wearing cotton clothing. Preparing clothes the night before was

also important; Millsy once realized that she had left her “professional” clothing behind and so had to do some last-minute shopping.

### **Shadowing Practice**

To a degree, the distinction between arriving and practicing shadowing is a false one. Marking a precise beginning of shadowing can be difficult. For some, a preliminary meeting may signal their initial encounter with the site, or daily decisions made about what to shadow (see Vasquez, *et al.*, 2012) might reproduce a feeling of newness and introduce a new or changing set of questions and curiosities. To be sure, the shadowing practice looks and feels differently to every researcher. It involves the negotiation of life experience, social identity, and perspective, among other factors (see Gill, 2011). For our purposes here, we intend the following recommendations to address the actual doing of shadowing, however defined by the specific researcher for the project at hand.

**#5 Plan to follow the rules, at first.** From the novice to the experienced shadower, it can be nerve-wracking to figure out how you should behave when first in the field. Norms of professionalism can make us feel like we have to always be “on,” constantly paying close attention to actions and comments. This self-consciousness may be particularly poignant if the shadow’s presence has been announced to an entire organization and not just to the person or small circle of people who will be shadowed, increasing the spotlight on the performance of shadowing. It is therefore good practice to show respect by following the rules suggested by the culture in which shadowing takes place. In our experiences, we each noticed that the shadowees tended to position us in accordance with their own mental models for observers. When shadowing inspectors in nuclear power plants, Javalina and Millsy were treated as though they were visiting inspectors. They were given desk space reserved for visiting inspectors and were

included in conversations that indicated that the participants' way of making sense of them as shadows was to think of them in this way. Similarly, Estes felt as though the hospital physicians and nurses placed her in the role of medical student. Recognizing the models that participants have helps to understand how your presence might be interpreted and therefore indicate some of the rules and expectations for being a "good shadower" in that site.

That said, we do not advocate that shadowers completely mold themselves to the expectations of the shadowee. Gill (2011) wrote about the dilemma of wanting to talk back to a shadowee and feeling constrained because she felt it would be inappropriate. Yet, to sustain yourself throughout another's workday, you must find or create space to "be." Thus, our recommendation is that shadowers strive to be themselves, but *be their best self*, to the degree that they can. This recommendation is similar to advice for teachers that suggests that teachers be "real" in the classroom while still maintaining professionalism (Weaver and Cotrell, 1987), and it requires periodic self-reflection on your time and role in the field. Ask how your presence or behavior intersects with your participant's sense of self and their daily activities—are there things that could be done differently to alleviate pressure on the shadow and shadowee to make the experience more pleasurable? Likewise, breaking or poking fun at local taboos can yield insight and ease the tension while trading on novice status.

**#6 Play around with strategies for notetaking.** Notetaking can be a difficult activity to manage, as shadowers struggle with the sheer amount of notetaking involved (McDonald, 2005). Shadowing requires decisions about when to take notes and when to allow for involvement and observation (Vasquez, *et al.*, 2012). As he began shadowing, Javalina endeavored to write down all that he saw and heard, and after two days and wicked hand cramps, realized that he simply could not record everything in the field. He realized that it was a better strategy to take a step

back and try to describe the scene and characterize the ongoing communication rather than report every event. Another trick that we have found useful is to recall and write stories of the field during the doldrums we discuss below. Because we did not want to be writing constantly when conversing with shadowees, we would wait for moments where we shifted into being the “fly on the wall” to keep an eye on the activity but also recall earlier events and interactions. Down time also offered opportunities to draw diagrams into fieldnotes— the layout of the workspace, for instance. These helped to develop the activity of the space and aided in recalling aspects of the field later on.

Overall, then, we would encourage shadowers to have a “light hand” when note taking. There is not a perfect way to capture the field, and each day of shadowing is unique. Think about what makes sense, given the unfolding fieldwork and the patterns observed (Vasquez, *et al.*, 2012). The shadow who is interested in witnessing someone’s everyday work life may not have to capture every single moment for patterns to become apparent. In shadowing emergency department physicians and nurses, Estes’ original intention was to follow a data collection tool closely, and she tried recording who was speaking, when, and about what for every interaction. After about 30 hours of shadowing, however, she realized that following the framework so closely was actually hindering her ability to capture what she saw happening in the field, so she chose instead to pick and choose the aspects of the framework that made sense for each interaction. For example, when a physician or nurse was performing a medical history with a patient, she would record their exact dialogue, but when in the busy trauma room, she would note the general patterns of communication.

Shadowing notetaking can also be a physical juggling-act. The shadower will likely need to jot down notes when also trying to pay careful attention or when distracted, when sitting at a

desk or when walking briskly alongside the shadowee, and so forth. Although audio or video recording can be incorporated into shadowing (see Vasquez, et al., 2012), such technology was either prohibited in our shadowing sites (e.g., the emergency department, nuclear power plants) or we felt that it would be cumbersome given the intimate and fluid nature of shadowing (e.g., entrepreneur workplaces). Others might find it beneficial, however, to capture field interviews or meetings using recording technology. For those who are hand-writing notes, we recommend following traditional ethnographic strategies: jot notes when you can and take “head notes” when you cannot take notes in that moment (Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw, 1995). Then try to write or type up your field notes on a schedule that works for you – later in the day or perhaps a short time after. For instance, Estes found it helpful after shadowing to sit in her car in the parking lot and “neaten” and summarize her notes so that when she typed them later they would be more interpretable/legible.

We also recommend finding a format for notebook pages that helps to organize your notes as you take them. Notetaking can follow formal or informal conventions, but simple notes about the time and place at the start of a notetaking session can provide the meta-information needed to reconstruct observations later. To shadow entrepreneurs, Millsy divided her notepages into three columns. Because she was with participants for upwards of 8 or 10 hours, she wanted some way to mark events and interactions as they unfolded, so in the left column, she provided “time stamps” (a strategy adopted from Mintzberg, 1973). In the center column, Millsy recorded what she observed, trying to note key phrases or qualities of the interaction. Finally, she used the right column to make note of thoughts and questions generated from her time in the field or to start tentatively developing analysis (see Figure 1). This three-column format offers some structure for notetaking but does not need to be restrictive – the columns are guidelines only and

can be written over, erased, and moved around. As another consideration, numbering the notebook pages can be very helpful.

-----  
Insert Figure 1 about here  
-----

Putting thought into how to take and manage notes can go a long way when it comes to managing and analyzing data. In our experiences, the details (such as maps, diagrams, and sketches) and structures (such as “time stamps”) became ways to punctuate and begin to make sense of our data. When typing up our field notes, we were able to keep better track of our experiences and observations. We also kept track of additional documents and materials that we picked up while shadowing. Millsy found it helpful to print out her typed fieldnotes for each day of observations and highlight the date of observation on the top front page. She then incorporated diagrams and attached handouts or business cards that she had gathered for that day. Technology can support work with field notes as well. For instance, Javalina made extensive use of online notetaking software (i.e., Evernote) kept in sync on his phone and the web, though he relied on his paper notebook for the bulk of his fieldnotes. And, Javalina and Millsy used Dedoose (a online, cross-platform qualitative data analysis tool) to organize their collective repository of notes. Although we value the convenience, reliability, and aesthetic of paper, we encourage researchers to play with such technologies (you might want to check out: Skitch, Adobe Ideas, FastEver, FE Snap, iAWriter, Inkflow, CamScanner, and LiveScribe pens). Yet, we also encourage caution. Technology can ultimately complicate the requirements of maintaining protections for human subjects or be more of a hindrance than a help in the field, and organizing fieldnotes can be difficult if they are stored in multiple platforms.

**#7 Dance in the doldrums.** The physical and mental demands of shadowing also require that the researcher find time for moments of rest even as they are on stage with the shadowee. As we noted in recommendation #3, shadowing is embodied. It asks us to be “present” in body and mind. And for some, we might feel the need to justify our presence in another’s workspace by always appearing busy. Busy work can add to the physical and mental exhaustion of shadowing. The feeling that you must always “look busy” in the field notwithstanding, doldrums in shadowing can serve practical purposes. First, recognize that resting while trying to “look busy” is not disingenuous or poor research practice. It is the opposite. The doldrums – a term from sailing referring to those times when there are no winds – should include restful work. Resting during the doldrums gives the shadower time to conserve and restore reserves of mental acuity. Each of us experienced anxiety early on in our shadowing that we might miss something, but this was actually antithetical to much of our rationale for shadowing. If the event or pattern is important, it will happen again.

Second, bring restful work with you. We used the doldrums to review previous notes, jot reflections, write up encounters that we had previously been unable to detail, draw diagrams of the research space, and prepare questions to address in the future. We also reviewed our personal to-do lists, checked email on our phones, wrote grocery lists into our fieldnotes, sketched models and notes related to other projects, and doodled. Most of the time shadowing was balanced with other aspects of our work that involved teaching, advising, and other research projects. During pronounced doldrums, the researcher may consider more engaging activities like grading papers or reading articles. However, activities should be selected that allow the researcher to still keep engaged with what is happening in the research space while also being somewhat disengaged.

Down time in the field can also offer moments to begin the process of analysis. As noted, the researcher might use this time to neaten notes and fill in stories. You can re-read notes to begin to get a feeling for the myriad voices heard in the field and begin to sketch analysis memos (Miles and Huberman, 1994). Starting this preliminary analytic work early on can help draw attention to what you have observed and what you might have missed, sharpening your focus in the field. Highlighting key moments, beginning to cobble together themes, or generating memos can also offer a tentative framework for the analysis process that will likely become a main post-shadowing focus.

**#8 Locate or create social support.** When thinking back to her shadowing experience, Estes recalls two experiences in particular that she will never forget. In one experience, she stood in the trauma room with about 20 individuals—physicians, nurses, technicians, surgeons, medical students—who were trying to save a man’s life after an awful motorcycle accident. As she tried to focus, the team of providers prepped and started brain surgery. In the second, Estes observed the care of a 15-month-old girl who had fallen and hit her head on a tile floor. Her parents had glanced away for a few seconds, and now they were frantic because their child could have permanent brain injury. After encounters like these, Estes left the emergency department physically, emotionally, and mentally exhausted. Estes experienced guilt and uncertainty, leaving each shift wondering what would happen to the patient. And whereas a real provider could find out how the story ended, Estes could not. Hospital regulations and the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPPA) meant she did not know the patients’ names and could not ask about them even if she did.

Because of these intense sessions of shadowing, Estes sought help to cope with the trauma of shadowing, turning to a mentor. Serendipitously, one of her mentors was a professor of

health communication who specialized in social support. Talking to her helped Estes see that she was not the only one struggling to manage the emotional effects of research. Likewise, having a shadowing buddy can be helpful. Such an individual could be an informed colleague, a fellow shadower, a friend, or a family member. Javalina and Millsy team-shadowed inspectors at the nuclear plants, though they were usually at different sites. During shadowing engagements, they would debrief over the phone at the end of the day, sometimes talking through their questions, confusions, and exciting findings for upwards of two hours. This kind of outlet not only gave them an opportunity to debrief but also helped them to begin to make sense of the field and to begin seeding their analysis (though they were also careful to engage in meta-reflection, as they saw this process as influencing their shadowing).

Shadowers can also record their own thoughts and feelings as a way of debriefing at the end of observations, in what McDonald (2005) referred to as a “tape dump” (p. 460). When driving back home at the end of an 8-12 hour day of shadowing entrepreneurs, Millsy would turn on her recorder and talk uninhibited as she navigated traffic, trying to describe aspects of the day that were difficult to put into words, reminding herself of moments that she felt were particularly important, and beginning to draw analytical connections between shadowing engagements. These kinds of strategies can help process your encounters, and create a productive space for voice and trouble-shooting that might not exist in the field.

This discussion also reminds us that shadowing can sometimes be an isolating and displaced experience regardless of the nature of the shadowing site, particularly when traveling to a site and staying overnight for a few days (as Javalina and Millsy did on several occasions). In these situations, we sought to conceive of our traveling as an adventure and took opportunities to visit museums and restaurants in these new places. We also kept in touch with family

members. During the bulk of his shadowing, Javalina was experiencing being a new parent. He was lucky to have the support of family and video calling to stay in touch when he was away. Although Estes could not discuss her specific observations with family members, she would frequently call her parents or her then fiancé after a shadowing bout to remind her that she was not alone and help her transition back into her everyday life.

### **Leaving and After Shadowing**

Pinpointing the exact moment of departure from the research site can be impossible, because some of us may return to the field sporadically, or some time after. Also, no longer being physically present in the field does not mean that the researcher has forgotten about time spent in the field, and leaving the organization does not mean leaving relationships formed in the field. Our own experiences as shadowers reflect this varied continuity, as even though we have all technically “left” the field, we have kept up relationships, and we draw from our experiences in informing other aspects of our work and lives.

**#9 Mitigate the anticipation of shadower-as-betrayer.** Shadowing is a distinctive form of research where participants’ lives are accessible with less of a filter than is the case with interviewing, for instance. We have found that the anticipation of findings and how they will be presented can engender feelings of betrayal more so than other research methods, particularly as the researcher prepares to leave the research site. Shadowees let the shadow “backstage,” yet the shadow will soon “betray” the tacit norms of backstage by exposing it. This is compounded by the fact that it is typically expected that the shadower will be the one to choose what to expose, not the shadowee. Moreover, situations where the researcher shadows a handful of participants but is expected to convey her findings to a larger organization can further heighten anxiety in

leaving. Even with the promise of confidentiality, participants may be concerned about being identified and scrutinized by their organization.

Shadowing can thus benefit from strategic ambiguity. The researcher may want to speak generally about what they are studying to avoid making the shadowed uncomfortably aware of a particular aspect of their behavior. Then again, the shadower, perhaps guided by a variant of grounded theory, may not have a specific research focus. Millsy and Javalina worked to frame their research in generic but genuine ways. They explained that they were studying “how you communicate” (read: interactions with your colleagues when you share information) or “the routine stuff that makes up your day to day” (read: how you enact the ideologies I see in your work). Likewise, when asked about her research purpose, Estes stated she was interested in emergency department communication generally rather than revealing that the Associate Dean of Medical Education and an emergency department physician requested that she assess physicians and nurses’ communication. Doing this may make it necessary to articulate two sets of research questions: a generic set that you share with participants and a more elaborated set that builds on the first. Both may be co-constructed with shadowees by informing the latter through conversations about the former. Visualizing and rehearsing language for those moments when you present or explain your project to participants may empower the dynamics of betrayal, but we would argue that it helps navigate the feelings of betrayal already primed by the traditional public-private split.

Negotiating feelings of betrayal may also be needed when shadowees request feedback on their performance. In some of our experiences, shadowees asked for advice on how to be more effective communicators. In these instances, we tried to stay true to the spirit of this ninth recommendation and to provide useful feedback without causing harm. On one hand, providing

feedback may be part of the necessary reciprocity of shadowing. On the other, we recognize that doing this can be awkward, particularly ahead of the analysis process that typically occurs after leaving. To help with this, we suggest letting the shadowee know that you can provide them with feedback the next day, over the next week, or at a later date, to allow yourself time for reflection. Write down your recommendations and rehearse them as they surface. If you are unsure of what to recommend, select one or two tentative observations and invite the participant to reflect on those observations. We found that these conversations could produce insights for both the shadowee and shadow—a moment for reflection that could inform practice and create a sort of member check. For specific phrasing, consider saying, “this is what I’ve been seeing so far, and if this is the case, then some recommendations are...” or of observations, “does that resonate with your experience? What does that mean to you?”

Co-reflecting along with the shadowee can also provide space to acknowledge the dynamics of betrayal, and to dialogue about what and how the researcher might tell stories based on observations. Sharing reports with the shadowee can not only improve the research itself but also provide a measure of agency in the research process. Coming back to an earlier recommendation (#1), conversations had ahead of shadowing can empower the shadowee to identify “off the record” occurrences that they do not want discussed in reports or publications. Finally, letting the spirit that characterized engagement carry into reporting phases may also help. We advocate a sense of fun professionalism that calls on our best, genuine, selves during shadowing and during reporting. That means goofing off a bit, laughing with the shadowee, and having fun, and that same spirit of joyful sharing should also guide reporting.

**#10 Exit the field mindfully.** Shadowing is a snapshot in time. The researcher walks in the shadowee’s shoes for a time, but we eventually return to our own lives. Because of this,

leaving shadowees and sites can be difficult and bittersweet. Ethnographers have reflected on the emotional confusion that can surround the exit process (Gallmeier, 1991; Taylor, 1991). During time with another person, the researcher may find genuine friendship, shared understanding, and connection. Notably, leaving is not a one-time occasion (i.e., your last day of shadowing), but is ongoing. As a case in point, consider that this article was a way for each of us to continue our connection to the field, months, and even years later.

Drawing from Estes' experiences, we could see the emotional toll that shadowing might take, but also the mindfulness that could help manage this. Estes had a difficult time leaving the emergency department without knowing how the stories ended for patients and their families and friends. She also struggled with letting go of the relationships she had cultivated while shadowing. It seemed strange to her to observe individuals over a long period of time, and then realize she would not be seeing them again. To help with this, we come back to our earlier point about mindfulness and meditation (#3), where it is important to reflect on time in the field and find ways to "be present" when exiting. To facilitate leaving the field, Estes tried to prepare herself mentally during the last few observations by reminding herself that she was on her way out. In addition, however, Estes felt that taking action would provide her with a deeper sense of closure. She wrote thank you notes as an act of "letting go." Unsure of whether or not participants appreciated this or thought it was unusual, taking this action nonetheless helped bring closure. In short, in addition to conceiving of leaving as an ongoing process, we recommend that researchers prepare and act in ways that are most comfortable and helpful for themselves as well as for the participants (to the degree that this is clear). Regardless of how many suggestions we offer along these lines, mindfulness and mediation should grow out of the shadow's process and relationships in the field.

Of course, leaving the field does not mean that the research process is complete. Rather, some of the most in-depth work is still to come. To the extent that our recommendations have focused on the experience before, during, and after the actual doing of shadowing fieldwork, we hope that we have been able to provide tools that, if taken up during data collection, will make data management and analysis go more smoothly. Particularly, careful attention to notetaking (#6), using downtime to further develop one's notes (#7), and balancing anticipated betrayal with responsibility toward the shadowee (#9) can facilitate data management, analysis, and reporting.

### **Conclusion and Theoretical Contributions**

These recommendations for the practice of shadowing as fieldwork should sensitize researchers to the distinctively intimate character of shadowing and offer resources to help cope with the tensions inherent to shadowing. The recommendations also concur with and build on themes distilled from previous examples of shadowing (e.g., Czarniawska, 2007; McDonald, 2005; Vasquez, *et al.*, 2012) that have emphasized being prepared, encouraging reflection, and adapting to situations. Furthering these recommendations, we have echoed the need to be prepared and to balance preparedness with adaptability. We have also encouraged reflection as manifesting in conversations between the shadowee and shadower around potentially awkward situations or possible feelings of betrayal. Another component of reflection that we have suggested is for researchers to consider the emotional dimension of shadowing as an opportunity for insight and self-reflection.

Overall, then, our recommendations build on those suggested by scholars who have contributed to the reconsideration of work-based shadowing. First, a significant contribution of our discussion has been to focus on the details, and at times, banal specificities of shadowing practice, of course keeping in mind that all shadowing experiences are idiosyncratic. Second, in

addition to offering recommendations centering on preparedness, reflection, and adaptability, our discussion has surfaced additional, persistent tensions in shadowing. Thus, we conclude our discussion by highlighting three key implications for the theory of shadowing that emerge from our recommendations: 1) shadowing involves the negotiation of multiple voices; 2) shadowing is embodied; and 3) shadowing benefits from a light, improvisational approach.

The first implication of our recommendations echoes the particular difficulties of negotiating voice, a point made clear in previous shadowing theory and research (e.g., McDonald, 2005; Vasquez, *et al.*, 2012). The shadower faces a deluge of information from multiple voices, and she must sort it, value it, and report it. The intimacy of shadowing suggests that the researcher has really experienced the life of the shadowed, yet their experiences and the experiences of the shadower are distinct, comprising different voices. Our analysis contributes the insight that careful practice, as well as reflection, can help manage voice. For example, careful notetaking, attention to and negotiation of relationships with the shadowed, and specific arriving and leaving conversations between the shadower and shadowee can help.

The second implication contributes to the theorizing of shadowing by drawing attention to its embodied nature. Confronting the practical exigencies of shadowing (e.g., food, tiredness, bathroom breaks) makes salient the embodied character of ethnographic research and shadowing in particular. Centering the materiality of the body in ethnographic research can highlight how research is accomplished and also serve as an entry point to understanding the daily bodily experience of shadowees. The embodied character of shadowing supersedes metatheoretical differences, but our commitments may influence how we respond to it. Our recommendations also begin to speak to the embodied nature of fieldwork post-shadowing, in data management, analysis, and reporting through enabling practice during fieldwork. Our bodies do not disappear

when we leave the field but continue to inform our interpretations and decisions (for instance, Javalina found himself wanting to wear his composite-toed shoes during analysis and when presenting his findings to put him back in the physical space of shadowing). Future research could productively consider how the embodied character of shadowing informs the insights later generated and reported.

To be sure, our recommendations were generated from the experience of particular researchers with particular, embodied experiences. Our experiences were uniquely our own. Our own identities and performances as researchers (in relation to gender, age, sexuality, and so forth) shaped our experiences in and interpretations of the field (Gill, 2011). We overlooked such nuances in this paper to provide a potentially generalizable set of concrete recommendations. We were all also observing work in Western, North American contexts where the centrality of work in people's lives (and therefore, the interest in studying it) is taken for granted. The diversity of our research experiences nonetheless contributed to the robustness of the recommendations, particularly because shadowing is always an idiosyncratic, negotiated experience. Our recommendations should have value for other researchers working in other settings as guidelines to be taken lightly. To this end, we conceived of them as particularly useful for the student or junior researcher, and yet the experienced shadower may find camaraderie in the aspects of our stories that resonate with their shadowing and perhaps insight in aspects of shadowing that they had not encountered.

Finally, a third implication underscores shadowing as emergent and improvisational. It is impossible to predict what the process will look like, how the researcher and others will (re)act in the process, and what skills and ideas might be needed or might develop in the field. The shifting character of shadowing requires gut instinct in terms of self-presentation and style.

Because of this, we propose a “curation” metaphor for shadowing. Drawing from Luttrell’s (2003) discussion of curating, we see the experience of shadowing and the process of managing data, analyzing, and reporting as one where the researcher draws from a series of materials to present a particular scene through their own eyes. Curating invites others into a world as viewed by the shadower, and it is the researcher’s task to self-reflexively present that world through confessional, impressionist, and/or realist tales (Luttrell, 2003; Van Maanen, 1988).

Improvisation can also be a resource for metatheoretical reflection, where paying attention to the complexities of voice, identity, body, and improvised experience takes on particular significance. Our collective experiences have indicated ways to prepare for this, though part of preparation means being open to figuring out shadowing while doing shadowing.

### References

- Ashcraft, K.L. (2007), "Appreciating the "work" of discourse: occupational identity and difference as organizing mechanisms in the case of commercial airline pilot", *Discourse & Communication*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 9-36.
- Barley, S.R. and Kunda, G. (2001) "Bringing work back in", *Organization Science*, Vol. 12 No. 1, pp. 76-95.
- Blake, K. and Stalberg, E. (2009), "Me and my shadow: observation, documentation, and analysis of serials and electronic resources workflow", *Serials Review*, Vol. 35 No. 4, pp. 242-52.
- Czarniawska, B. (2007), *Shadowing and Other Techniques for Doing Fieldwork in Modern Societies*. Liber, Sweden: Copenhagen Business School Press.
- Emerson, R.M., Fretz, R.I. and Shaw, L.L. (1995), *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Epstein, R.M. (2003). Mindful practice in action (II): Cultivating habits of mind. *Families, Systems and Health*, 21, 11-17.
- Epstein, R.M. (1999). Mindful practice. *Journal of American Medical Association*, 282(9), 833-839.
- Gallmeier, C.P. (1991), "Leaving, revisiting, and staying in touch", in Shaffir, W.B. and Stebbins, R.A. (Eds), *Experiencing Fieldwork*, Sage, Newbury Park, CA, pp. 224-31.
- Gill, R. (2011), "The shadow in organizational ethnography: moving beyond shadowing to spect-acting", *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management*, Vol. 6 No. 2, pp. 115-33.

- Gilliat-Ray, S. (2011), “‘Being there’: The experience of shadowing a British Muslim Hospital chaplain”, *Qualitative Research*, Vol. 11 No. 5, pp. 469-86.
- Krasner, M.S., Epstein, R.M., Beckman, H., Suchman, A.L., Chapman, B., Mooney, C.J., and Quill, T.E. (2009), “Association of an educational program in mindful communication with burnout, empathy, and attitudes among primary care physicians”, *The Journal of the American Medical Association*, Vol. 302 No. 12, pp. 1284–93.
- Luttrell, M. (2003). *Pregnant Bodies, Fertile Minds: Gender, Race and the Schooling of Pregnant Teens*. New York: Routledge.
- McDonald, S. (2005), “Studying actions in context: a qualitative shadowing method for organizational research”, *Qualitative Research*, Vol. 5 No. 4, pp. 455-73.
- Milling Kinard, E. (1996), “Conducting research on child maltreatment: effects on researchers”, *Violence and Victims*, Vol. 11 No. 1, pp. 65-9.
- Mintzberg, H. (1973). *The Nature of Managerial Work*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Quinlan, E. (2008), “Conspicuous invisibility: shadowing as a data collection strategy”, *Qualitative Inquiry*, Vol. 14 No. 8, pp. 1480-99.
- Spickard Jr., A., Gabbe, S.G., and Christensen, J.F. (2002), “Mid- career burnout in generalist and specialist physicians”, *The Journal of the American Medical Association*, Vol. 288 No. 12, pp. 1447-50.
- Taylor, S.J. (1991), “Leaving the field: research, relationships, and responsibilities”, in Shaffir, W.B. and Stebbins, R.A. (Eds), *Experiencing Fieldwork*, Sage, Newbury Park, CA, pp. 238-47.
- Van Maanen, J. (1988). *Tales of the field: On writing ethnography*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Vasquez, C., Brummans, B.H.J.M., and Groleau, C. (2012), "Notes from the field on organizational shadowing as framing", *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management*, Vol. 7 No. 2, pp. 144-65.

Weaver II, R.L. and Cotrell, H.W. (1987), "Lecturing: essential communication strategies", *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, Vol. 1987 No. 32, pp. 57-69.

<p>10:30 phone rips. Shil arrives + interviews to M<sup>n</sup> - 1b - lady from energy solutions arena: He answers + says you know what were <del>not</del> probably not interested this year. She wanted to know if he wanted season-tix.</p> <p>M scrolls through email still. we talk about meet-ents in TX</p> <p>S comes in for bank statement + asks for 4 cks.</p> <p>M says he needs to look @ time sheets first + she says he doesn't get time sheets [joking - not?]. He says well then u don't get <del>checks</del>. She says ok + brings them back in saying B didn't do one. M looks them over - are 2 pg. long each. puts aside + back to email - finds email on European trip + we talk about the conf. in Europe + back to racism.</p> <p>friend sent photo of U2 stage for news tomorrow; story of U2 + guys holding conf sign, then also when U2 came here + radio station put a 2 after u on mfn.</p>	<p>how much of shadowing involves merely seeing diff personalities?</p> <p>How do I ferret out identity analysis?</p> <p>Q4M: How often or at what times do have + work collide? Does it bother him? Get him off his game? make sense for him?</p> <p>how would you define home/non-work?</p>
<p>10:45 M goes 2 men's room. Does this every hour/ half hour + tells me its a mtg I'm not invited to. But before or after he uses his time to wander through + say hi or check in w/ chps. I hear him talking to Janice about casual stuff this time.</p>	<p>(25)</p>

Figure 1: Field note page from hardback composition notebook (9 3/4 x 7 1/2 in).