**Green N, Zurawski N. Surveillance and Ethnography : Researching Surveillance as Everyday Life.** *Surveillance and Society* 2015, 13(1), 27-43.

**Link to article:**

http://ojs.library.queensu.ca/index.php/surveillance-and-society/article/view/ethno

**Date deposited:**

03/04/2017

| **Article** | # Surveillance and Ethnography:<br>Researching Surveillance as Everyday Life |

## Nicola Green

University of Surrey, England.
n.green@surrey.ac.uk

## Nils Zurawski

University of Hamburg, Germany.
nils.zurawski@uni-hamburg.de

## Abstract

This article argues for a wider and more nuanced understanding of ethnography's role in Surveillance Studies than has sometimes historically been the case. The article begins by (briefly) deconstructing some of the ways that the concepts of both 'surveillance' and 'ethnography' have been deployed in empirical surveillance research over time, in order to set the scene for a critical interrogation of the variety of ethnographic approaches so far used within Surveillance Studies. The paper then goes on to review Surveillance Studies approaches broadly, and a range of qualitative and ethnographically-informed approaches in particular, within interdisciplinary empirical research related to surveillance relations. The ensuing discussion identifies several points where the existing empirical evidence base would benefit from more extensive ethnographic studies, at multiple sites and scales, that methodologically recognize surveillance as situated and meaningful everyday life processes and practices, rather than surveillant activities and relationships in settings defined as 'surveillance' in an *a priori* fashion. The article concludes by suggesting that approaches oriented towards empirically understanding surveillance practices as 'everyday life' have a significant future contribution to make, particularly with respect to building and developing our theoretical understandings of surveillant assemblages in everyday life contexts.

## Introduction

This article discusses ethnography with respect to building and extending ethnographic approaches in Surveillance Studies. We pay particular attention to their potentially valuable contributions to an interdisciplinary empirical evidence base, and which can inform the construction of theoretical frameworks to understand surveillance practices as multiply constituted and situated assemblages of practice and meaning in 'everyday life'.

The discussion begins by noting that both 'surveillance' and 'ethnography' are multiply-constituted and contested conceptual terms that could be construed in a number of different ways, and which can potentially come together in a range of different ethnographically-oriented methodological strategies and techniques in empirical research design. The discussion evaluates the variously inductive and deductive emphases of these different conceptual combinations and orientations (and the methodological approaches they imply), and then attempts to critically situate these possible orientations with respect to interdisciplinary research in the existing Surveillance Studies evidence base (in its broadest sense), and then with specific attention to more qualitative research, and existing ethnographic research in particular. In doing so, the paper seeks to highlight different trends in ethnographic methods in surveillance research. In particular, the discussion seeks to establish the central importance of ethnographic research practice (broadly construed) in Surveillance Studies research—not as a single approach or methodology, but rather as a range of approaches, strategies and techniques, some of which are relatively familiar, some of which

are emergent, and some of which are relatively under-represented so far in the Surveillance Studies literature.

The discussion goes on to critically evaluate existing ethnographic research in Surveillance Studies with respect to the strengths of the various approaches, research design strategies and data collection methods so far employed, as well as some of the gaps in knowledge and understanding of everyday life contexts (and the conceptualization of them) that various and multi-sited ethnographic approaches might reasonably address into the future. As a part of these considerations, the discussion considers several Surveillance-Studies-constructed narrative scenarios of 'everyday life surveillance'. These narratives are considered within the analysis in order to identify the ways in which Surveillance Studies approaches sometimes describe everyday life surveillance in fictional (rather than empirically-based) narrative form in order to emphasize the validity of existing theoretical frameworks. In doing so, however, we argue that these types of narrative, produced within Surveillance Studies, rely on an *a priori* categorization of what constitutes surveillance, rather than an understanding of surveillance relations derived from the life experiences and categorical meanings empirically investigated via social and cultural members' understandings of what relations constitute surveillant processes. Furthermore, we therefore argue that it is the case that Surveillance Studies research can therefore sometimes potentially, or inadvertently, reproduce dominant understandings and *a priori* definitions of surveillance relations, in a relatively uncritical way.

The discussion then identifies several situated and embedded, yet multi-layered, fields of empirical research where the existing empirical evidence base would benefit from more extensive ethnographic studies—studies which methodologically recognize surveillance as situated and meaningful everyday life processes, rather than surveillant activities and relationships in settings defined as 'surveillance' in an *a priori* fashion. As with other fields of study, ethnography confronts academics with the misrepresentations of the etic-perspective and creates a rich emic-understanding of surveillance in context (cf. Müller 2013: 145). The article concludes by suggesting that approaches oriented towards empirically understanding surveillance practices as everyday life process have a significant further and future contribution to make, particularly with respect to building and developing our theoretical understandings of contemporary surveillant assemblages.

## Situating Ethnography and Surveillance Studies

As a starting point for the exploration and discussion of the relationship between surveillance and ethnography, we would argue that both 'surveillance' and 'ethnography' are multiply-constituted conceptual terms that could be construed in a number of different ways, and which can potentially come together in a range of different ethnographically-oriented methodological strategies and techniques in empirical research design.

One crucial current claim that situates the discussion is that it seems to be a popular 'fact' and well-established academic assumption that we are living in 'surveillance societies' (Murakami Wood et al. 2006). As such, it remains with researchers and theorists of surveillance to investigate the qualities of such a society. Ethnography, as an established—but often either underestimated or overrated—methodology comes into play when an extensively detailed description is needed to explain, illustrate or analyze the modes of social formation, regulation or practical processes that can be used to pay witness to, or challenge, the apparently established fact of the existence of social processes that might be designated as constituting 'surveillance societies', as such.

Despite the widespread acceptance and practice of ethnographic strategies in Surveillance Studies however, some things remain very unclear in empirical ethnographic accounts, not least amongst them the deployment of the term 'surveillance' itself. The term is sometimes used in such a way that seemingly pre-

defines (but might also reflect) some kind of common understanding amongst scholars as to what surveillance 'is'—and such understandings are commonly articulated in the definitions proposed by theoretically-based research on 'surveillance societies'. And yet, a common understanding is sometimes belied by the multiplicity of ethnographically-oriented approaches (amongst others) to have historically emerged in interdisciplinary empirical research. The question is therefore whether 'surveillance itself' is actually a 'field' that can be researched ethnographically—and if so, how? That is, by pre-defining a particular surveillant assemblage as a research 'site', amenable to ethnographic 'field' research, are researchers pre-supposing or assuming what surveillance relations might be or mean for the participants imbricated in those relations? Here (so far) we are using the terms 'site' or 'field' in their quite traditional and historical senses within ethnographic research in anthropology and sociology—that is, geographically, institutionally or community-bounded set of relations, practices, rituals, organization and meaning that can in some way be attributed to a coherent cultural 'way of life'.

Considering this problem from an alternative viewpoint, a related but different question is also whether 'surveillance' itself is simply a dimension of the social, which can be studied as an aspect of everyday life within wider ethnographic research projects. Considered broadly, surveillance can be conceptualized as one form or mode of the social, becoming apparent in other activities and practices, something that is created, performed and perceived as such (in all its technical, discursive and interactional modes)—or not. Walby (2005) and Haggerty and Ericson (2006) point to the fact that the term surveillance is used for quite a wide range of phenomena—activities and technologies, such as; face-to-face supervision, camera monitoring, TV watching, paparazzi stalking, GPS tailing, cardiac telemonitoring, the tracking of commercial/internet transactions, the tracing of tagged plants and animals, etc.' (Walby 2005: 158). The term surveillance is used here to conceptualize these activities as if they may share a basic feature: that in each case a binary between two parties has been established—between watcher and watched—the position of watching acting as placeholder for all kinds of senses and recording or monitoring techniques. This necessarily implies that there cannot be one overarching method for the research of surveillance, whatever is understood by the term in a particular case.

We want to argue for a perspective that does not conceptualize surveillance as a normative, *a priori* fact, which is used to classify diverse phenomena as forms of surveillance *per se*—for example, the techno-social assemblages of cameras, biometrics, or identity cards. We would rather argue that such forms of classification be based on the empirically-based understanding of the contexts, settings, and techno-social relations in which surveillant relations are emergent as such, for the participants concerned. Our argument is that what may be classified as 'surveillance' is created and produced within social interactions in everyday life, as much as it is located by particular socio-technical networks or organizational institutions—and hence we also need to look at those everyday life relations as processes and practices, in contrast to a normative understanding of surveillance.

If the term 'surveillance' is at issue in contemporary empirical accounts, the term 'ethnography' is equally difficult, and sometimes seems to be used quite generously to underpin particular modes of qualitative research that simply engage with their subject of study in a non-normative, deeper and somewhat more holistic way than is accessible via quantitative approaches. However the central argument here is that ethnography should not be understood as a way to describe and explain how people act in a surveillance setting that has been identified as such. It is certainly possible for ethnographic researchers to formulate relevant research questions, and to test them in relatively more deductive and directed ways, but such approaches run the risk of failing to appreciate the emergent aspects of ethnographic research—that is, those points in the qualitative, participatory, reflexive and recursive research process, where an understanding of the deeper meanings of particular aspects of everyday life and its mundane activities are achieved through their emergent revelation. This paper argues that such understandings might instead be fruitfully generated via multiple and layered ethnographic explorations that pay attention to the various dimensions of everyday life discussed throughout the different sections of this paper.

There therefore seem to be at least two underlying epistemological approaches that constitute different ways of looking at surveillance ethnographically—one more deductive, one more inductive. On the one hand, surveillance is a field with assumed boundaries, which can be identified in order to conduct research—and, on the other hand, is something that comprises social relations that can be studied ethnographically in their contexts and processes, and that therefore actively *constitute* surveillance in practice. Of course, there are further and more multiple ways of approaching ethnographic research—which we will address further below—but the point is one of relative inductive and deductive orientation in research practice: do we assume that surveillance is occurring in any particular contextual configuration, or do we deeply describe the everyday social practices from which surveillance emerges and comes to be defined?

It is the latter that we are arguing for here. Ball and Haggerty (2005) suggested a similar point when they argued for a broad research approach in Surveillance Studies that does not investigate surveillance defined as a set of 'things'. Rather, research would always begin from the intention to explain surveillance and how it may be empirically constituted, so it can be termed 'surveillance' in comparison to other aspects of social, political, economic or cultural life. At the time, their analysis suggested that not enough work in Surveillance Studies, if any, had attempted to identify and confirm what the observable elements of surveillance might be across empirical contexts. This is certainly different almost ten years on. There remain few ethnographies, however, that focus on whether a particular set of socio-technical relations constitute surveillance, where various observable elements might need to be present (Ball and Haggerty 2005). It is this latter form of ethnography that is largely absent from the current surveillance evidence base, and more extensive ethnographic work in this area might address this gap in empirical research.

What such an approach implies is that surveillance as a field cannot be 'placed', locally or conceptually. Ultimately the question remains whether it is a 'field' as such, something that would lend itself to traditional ethnographic research—or whether it is simply a way of describing multiple and diverse aspects of many human experiences that share some relation to forms of monitoring or control—i.e. the sometimes purposeful, sometimes mutual (mediated) observation of people by other people. To secure any definition for 'surveillance' of course exceeds the scope of this article (should that indeed be possible), but to articulate a set of problems attached to the term seems necessary to contextualize our intent regarding ethnographies and their contribution to the interdisciplinary evidence base.

## Research Approaches in Surveillance Studies

Surveillance Studies is constructed as an interdisciplinary field—it bundles theoretical approaches and makes sense of wide and diverse phenomena. Like other fields or disciplines it does not follow a fixed methodology, nor any one particular theoretical framework. Legal studies and STS stand beside political analysis or sociological reasoning, which is why it is difficult to characterize its diversity. Statistical and quantitative analysis make up a large part of surveillance research (e.g. Zureik et al. 2010)—together with theoretical approaches that use this data to develop new perspectives and concepts with which the phenomena of surveillance can be explained or framed for further research.

The latter is well represented by the work of Lyon (2003, 2006) or Haggerty and Ericson (2000), while more statistical approaches might include any research on surveillance that empirically quantifies objects/technologies, people, data or texts—much of the work on CCTV employs such approaches, for example (Gill 2003; Helten and Fischer 2004; Hempel 2007; Norris, McCahill and Wood 2004; Webster et al. 2011/2012). Analyzing surveillance from a political and/or regulatory perspective, and using surveillance as a set concept that can be studied through statistics, rules and the analysis of power (cf. e.g. Fijnaut and Marx 1995; Goold 2004), is also linked with the legal comparison and analysis of surveillance. Sometimes this research addresses issues of data protection or privacy (Rule and Greenleaf

2008; Bennett 2008), and although both are intimately related to surveillance, Marx (2012) points out that the former two are not necessarily congruent with surveillance. Another approach is historical analysis—and while this cannot be linked to a particular field or practice of surveillance, it often involves the historical evolution of a specific technology—such as RFID (Rosol 2010), algorithms (Graham and Wood 2003), or CCTV (Kammerer 2009)—or the history of a particular practice, e.g. the administrative surveillance of alcohol consumption in Ontario (Genosko and Thompson 2006, 2009). There have been combinations of these approaches as well, such as comparative research using one or more method—e.g. large studies on CCTV in Europe (Hempel and Töpfer 2003)—or on privacy legislation or identity management (Lyon and Bennett 2008).

What emerges from an overview of the surveillance evidence base, however, is a fairly common emphasis on structures, rules and systems (despite their different foci and epistemological perspectives). This emphasis constructs a meta-framework that views surveillance as so large, and such a complex set of processes, that it can best be researched and understood through its systems and structures, at the expense of attention to embeddedness in everyday life.

Although a number of studies have been conducted on a micro-level and represent in-depth studies, few also address the proposition that surveillance as a field is diffuse, and the practice of empirical research itself may therefore conceptualize and construct the field of study in the first instance. We argue that as surveillance is one aspect of human life (although one which is present continuously in multiple forms), its impact, meaning and consequences for human societies can only be fully understood if the complex interactions between social life, technology as the practical application of knowledge (Vannini 2009a), and the resulting constructions, collectivities and political strategies, are viewed as interlinking, and not as solitary building blocks.

## Qualitative and Ethnographic Methods in Surveillance Studies

Many significant insights have been generated through technologically-focused work, or through the quantitative analysis of objects, people or data. More qualitative and ethnographic social science approaches have also played their role across the different disciplines that constitute Surveillance Studies. Qualitative approaches tend to cut across a number of disciplines, and may include a number of strategies: we have already seen the extent to which the historical, legal and policy oriented projects outlined above employ the extensive use of documentary or other textual analyses, for example.

In addition to techniques such as documentary analysis, interviewing is a particularly favoured approach amongst disciplines within the social sciences, organizational studies, and policy studies. Interviews lend themselves to a focus on how particular individuals and groups experience and understand the surveillance processes in which they are imbricated—for example, the experiences of surveillance amongst children and teachers in school contexts (Taylor 2011), the experiences of workplace monitoring and surveillance amongst call-centre workers (Ball 2010; Ball, Daniel and Stride 2013; Ball and Margulis 2011), or the use of loyalty cards by consumers (Pridmore 2008; Zurawski 2011). Such methods do produce in-depth understandings of participants' attitudes and perceptions, providing extensive subjective narratives of experience. They present important opportunities to explore single issues in depth (such as everyday surveillance in internet or location-based systems [Green 2002]), whether that is in data collection amongst a single group, or a comparative orientation between groups. The subjective narratives that interviews derive are, however, largely dislocated from the 'culturally or socially manifested contexts and actions' (Zurawski 2011: 509) that similarly constitute surveillance relations. To bring the discursive and the materially manifest into qualitative dialogue within Surveillance Studies, other scholars have pursued multiple methodologies in case studies or ethnographies— e.g. William Staples' inquiry into the meticulous rituals of surveillance in everyday life (Staples 1998, 2013), John Gilliom's research on 'the

poor' and their welfare-surveillance experiences (Gilliom 2001), or Gavin Smith's study on the work of watching in more general terms (Smith 2014).

Ethnographic research has a significant history in Surveillance Studies, yet its importance to us seems sometimes marginalized or misunderstood. Ethnography, at least in part, cuts across most social science disciplines, and is often used in research literature to describe a process of fairly intense observation, in addition to interviewing or other qualitative empirical research (wherever it is 'located', such as in the case of 'virtual' ethnography [Hine 2000]). On the one hand, ethnographic methods are central to some approaches in surveillance research, yet are not necessarily recognized as such. On the other hand, claims are sometimes made to having used ethnography in surveillance projects, where the methods employed are not necessarily recognizable as 'ethnographic' in the strictest or most traditional sense. Far from trying to judge research work on the fact whether or not it conforms to 'a' particular definition of ethnography, it nevertheless seems important to discuss ethnographies' possibilities, especially in terms of their theoretical contribution beyond their empirical value. We would like to argue that ethnographic research that focuses on (what can be described as) everyday life contributes to an analytical perspective on surveillance, one that concentrates on the making of it through performance, and eventually its normalizing effects (cf. Vannini 2009b): in the end to inform what could be an anthropology of surveillance similar to what Maguire et al. (2014) have demonstrated for the phenomenon of security.

Ethnography—classically meaning 'writing people'—entails the intensive description of a particular society, culture or group in full detail and every aspect. The term ethnography (and its attendant ethnographic fieldwork methods) is most often used to describe combined processes of reflexive participation in grounded and empirical social worlds, and intensive observation of them—often also including extensive formal and informal interviewing in the course of the everyday life of that social world, as well as other, for example, materially or textually-based analytic strategies. On a very basic level, ethnography attempts to portray the world as seen from a 'native's' point of view (cf. Mitchell 2011), or to understand the realities of those being studied. These general aims could, however, be carried out via a range of different approaches, and with very different foci.

Ethnographies attempt to be open, inductive, and focusing towards researching a whole 'field' rather than a single phenomenon within that field, site or institution. Ethnography therefore offers the opportunity to study multiple, interlinked phenomena. While much is informed by a 'traditional' understanding of what ethnography could be, epistemological problems, as well as a broadening of the fields in which ethnographies are employed, have recently called for reflection on the method. The internet, as an example, has deeply challenged the notion of 'the ethnographic field' and the possibilities of ethnographic research. Hine introduced a transformative debate with *Virtual Ethnography* (2000, see also 2005), demonstrating what such a methodological approach could look like, and why is quite distinctively a mode of ethnography in its own right. Beaulieu argues in this regard that the notion of fieldwork has to be altered from co-location to co-presence (cf. Beaulieu 2010, also 2004; see also Pollock and Williams 2010). What unites these approaches is the impulse to adapt ethnography to yet further new technologies in which social life is itself again reproduced, is established or maintained, in different and evolving forms—i.e. something that resembles the world, up until then considered to be the 'real' one. Discussion around the notion of the 'virtual' as opposed to (or in juxtaposition with) the 'real' have not ceased, but ethnography has quite comfortably been used to ease this tension, or to render it practically obsolete in a research context.

Technology in general—its uses, its emergence, and surrounding infrastructures—have become the focus of ethnographic inquiries beyond Surveillance Studies for quite some time, not least in Latour and Callon's research on scientific and technical knowledge (Callon 1987; Latour 1987), and the subsequent emergence of a research strategy named 'Actor Network Theory' (ANT). Such research has been instrumental in introducing ethnographic methods in a field, a realm of society (named as 'scientific' or

'technological'), which had not previously been approached from such a perspective. Although there had been an interest in 'things' (and technology as such), the value of ethnographic exploration beyond technology's status as 'tools' had previously been relatively underdeveloped. The same could be said for a social science approach to 'infrastructures'—i.e. frames of references, lists of categories, data in more general terms—that are an expression of knowledge: indeed, the very boring result of constructed knowledge in context. Bowker and Star therefore introduced an 'ethnography of infrastructures' (cf. Star 1990, 2002; Bowker and Star 1999), which are of interest to Surveillance Studies: considerations of systemic practices and activities that are nevertheless conceived, articulated and made meaningful in everyday life practice. Considering infrastructures as relational, and as part of human organization, Star discusses the implications of ethnographic research that yet again advanced ethnographic fields, and stripped them of their locational and epistemological limitations. Surveillance Studies has since been benefitting significantly from the development of these approaches, as much of surveillance research has in practice been research on technology, infrastructures and the multitude of relations that exist between things, infrastructures and humans. Science and Technology Studies has therefore indeed had a significant impact in introducing ethnography to issues of surveillance at large.

Surveillance Studies has also seen a number of relevant works that have used ethnography to intensively explore the social worlds of those positioned by practices and relations of surveillance. Some have been cast in terms of case studies (cf. Ball, Daniel and Stride 2013), while others are more explicit about their specifically ethnographic orientation. CCTV has been one area particularly amenable to ethnographic approaches. Norris and Armstrong's (1999) work on 'the maximum surveillance society', McCahill and Norris' 'Urbaneye' research (2003), or Smith's research on the work of watching (2014), should be specifically noted here. Such projects have examined, for example, the work of CCTV control room operators as 'expert' practitioners in surveillance via extensive ethnographic observation of their working practices. Other examples would include Walby's (2005, 2006) work on CCTV. Walby in particular characterizes his work as 'institutional ethnography'—that is, an ethnographic approach that recognizes the ways that institutions interpellate individuals—a 'method of inquiry that problematizes social relations at the local site of lived experience, while examining how sequences of texts coordinate actions, consciousness, and forms of organization extra-locally' (Walby 2005: 159). Surveillance is often connected to some form of institution—i.e. it happens through, is mediated by, or is an integral part of institutions. Institutional ethnography therefore necessarily pays attention to the processes that lie below the surfaces of formal organizations (Webb and Palmer 1998: 614). Durão and Lopes (2011) in particular highlight the importance of research into institutions—they argue that institutions generate systems to classify both types of people, and the relationships between them. After Lyon's (2003) focus on social sorting, surveillance scholars are quite aware of the ordering and categorizing preconditions or effects of surveillance—which implies the need to 'follow' these relations in their contexts, and understand the contextual meanings within a larger social setting. The ethnography of infrastructures seems especially appealing in those cases.

Walby (2005) remarks that approaches such as institutional ethnography should ideally be concerned with both the subjects and the agents of surveillance (amongst other textual and material elements of a circuit of surveillance). One result of concentrating on a single substantive area, institution, organization or site, however, appears to be a tendency towards concentrating on the production side—i.e. the everyday labours of the agents of institutionalized surveillance, whether at a local level, or systemically. A corollary of this tendency is that the relations of surveillance under scrutiny again become defined by the design of the ethnographic research and its assumptions about what constitutes surveillance—surveillance becomes characterized by what surveillance scholars (or surveillant organizations) deem it to be in a pre-determined way. We consider this, in a reflexive way, to be a relative potential shortcoming of much of the ethnographic research currently concerned with surveillance issues.

Institutions may indeed be sites through which activities between human beings are mediated and through which control is constructed (wilfully, or as a side-effect). Institutions seem to lend themselves to research into surveillance practices and relations, but are certainly not the only way to 'follow a process' or research something in which control, purposeful observation, managing populations and power play a role. And it may not be the only perspective to examine how surveillance is established or maintained through the structures of institutions—this would rather neglect a perspective where researchers could assume their subjects as interpreters and makers of their own contexts (Fortun 2009). Only a small proportion of research within Surveillance Studies is paying attention to this alternative orientation. By way of contrast, we would like to take as an initial proposition that ethnographic practice in Surveillance Studies might instead proceed with the assumption that the 'fields of surveillance' are instead constituted as:

> open systems—systems that are continually being reconstituted through the interaction of many scales, variables and forces. Whether the system of concern is the global economy, an organization, or an individual subject, the task is in mapping an array of constitutive dynamics—including, but not limited to, dynamics at the local level.
>
> (Fortun 2009: 169)

Such conceptualizations of the ethnographically amenable social world are hardly new in the social sciences—for at least the last decade many approaches to the ethnographic enterprise have sought to 'decenter and defetishize the concept of the field' (Gupta and Ferguson 1997: 5). Such approaches focus particularly on disrupting the spatial metaphor of 'the field', and seek to emphasize the degree to which the field itself is constantly reconstituted—both through ethnographic knowledge construction, but also through the framings, understandings and actions of those in 'the field' itself. This disruption of the field (Green 1999) is particularly important for Surveillance Studies, as the fields of surveillant relations are not particular places, nor are they necessarily fixed actions or technologies. 'Following' processes, as Mitchell (2011) points out, is a way of doing ethnography without becoming fixated on a static place or one particular form of technology, relation or text. The essence of ethnography (i.e. to translate meaning from one culture to another, to view the world or part thereof as unfamiliar) remains. But how to engage with this essence in actual research, and how to frame this methodologically? Thus, we would like to argue for an open, and yet more basic approach ethnography, one that is paying attention specifically to everyday life—i.e. taking into account context, the agents involved (human and non-human), their purposes, and all the contingencies surrounding their interactions (cf. Vannini 2009a: 8). This is what he refers to as an 'ethnographic spirit', an attitude to research in everyday life that is as naive, as inquisitive, as involved, as unpredictable, as everyday life itself.

Taking the proposition that to engage in ethnographic practice entails 'following' processes—across multiple sites (Marcus 1995), with a particular focus on everyday life (in its many aspects such as material culture, technology, stories, infrastructures or social relations)—the field of surveillance would be constructed not only by the researcher, but by the (individual, group, organizational, infrastructural) people, things, texts, discourses, events, processes and activities that are followed—on their own terms, and in their own understandings.

Thus we are less concerned with surveillance theories as guiding principles of research, but more with performativity—within contexts, normalizing processes, and lived experience—out of which surveillance is constituted, constructed and hence objictified as a focus of research in the first place. As much as this helps to generate empirical data, it also impacts on how we understand or explain surveillance 'itself'. The implication is that to be in the field of surveillance then means as much to interrogate the field itself, as it is to follow a process that is, in some predefined way, attached to surveillance, or in which surveillance may play a role. For example, it may sometimes be more effective to follow a community in its quest for means to better crime prevention, than to look at how surveillance works in the form of CCTV or

Neighbourhood Watch. The field of surveillance would be the narrations of such a community around their social relations, their views towards and uses of technology, their practices and actions, and the resulting dynamics emerging from those interconnections and relations. Surveillance would be viewed as one form or mode of the social becoming manifest in other activities and practices, something that is created and/or perceived as surveillance. Thus, a normative description will only provide a limited classification of surveillance, whereas alternative classifications are based on understandings of the contexts, settings, techno-social relations in which things take place. Gad and Lauritsen (2009) provide an excellent example of how to engage ethnography in surveillance research, when exploring fisheries inspection in Denmark. Friesen et al. (2009) have also proposed a return to a specifically phenomenological approach to the study of surveillance as a way to explore alternative ways to theorize the subject-forming powers of politically-inflected socio-technical systems. Although they do not mention 'ethnography' *per se*, the method is implied, and they refer extensively to lived experience and individual agency as the starting points of inquiry, as 'such an articulation would involve consideration not only of the subject-forming powers of the mechanisms of surveillance and dataveillance, but also of the interiority of the corresponding forms of subjectivity' (Friesen et al. 2009: 84). In starting from the empirical formations themselves, ethnography could produce extensively rich material on how, when and where surveillance is performed, constructed, 'made' in the broadest sense; and therefore reflect on the subject of Surveillance Studies itself.

## Surveillance and Research Blind Spots

The above theoretical discussion is open to many interpretations, and from discussion alone it does not necessarily become clear how an open ethnographic approach would deliver enhanced understandings of surveillance relations. To explore this question in more detail, however, we propose to demonstrate how ethnography of a certain kind could change perspectives on 'surveillance societies' and enhance an empirical evidence base (albeit in a somewhat diluted way given its ex-post—rather than embedded and inductive—approach and analysis). For the sake of argument, however, we contend that these are currently reasonable thought experiments. Throughout the discussion below, we therefore take as our starting point a number of illustrative (and fictional) narrative scenarios derived from a report on The Surveillance Society (commissioned by the UK Information Commissioner). In this report, the Surveillance Studies Network (2006) used a series of such scenarios to illustrate a typical 'Week in the Life of the Surveillance Society 2006' (2006: 49). The scenarios included many different aspects of everyday social life—from scenes at the airport or in the city, to activities at work and school, to consumption, leisure and family life, communications, health, or crimes such as fraud. We have focused on a few of these scenarios here in order to draw out whether the use of these types of imaginative, illustrative or visualizing techniques might actually express (or make meaningful) some underlying assumptions about what particular fields or sites actually constitute 'surveillance', or 'the surveillance society' in everyday life—and thereby whether our creativity in ethnographic research designs might actually be hampered or constrained by such assumptions. We have also deliberately used fictional narratives, rather than excerpts from ethnographies conducted within Surveillance Studies—because they are more likely to resemble the descriptive fieldnotes an ethnographer might make in the field, before multiple layers of interpretation are applied in published accounts of ethnographic research projects.

The background for the everyday life situations in the Surveillance Studies Network Report (2006: 49) was explained as follows:

> 12.1. It is London in 2006. The Jones family are returning from their holiday in Florida. Dad, Gareth is a manager in a call centre, and mum Yasmin is a social worker... [and] originally from Pakistan... Her mum, Geeta… is with them too, as are their three children, 18 year old Ben, 14 year old Sara and 10 year old Toby.

12.2. The Jones family are citizens in the surveillance society. Throughout the week following their return, sometimes unwittingly, and sometimes with complete awareness, their lives interact with and are shaped by surveillance systems. In the following pages we show how their everyday activities are now embedded within surveillance systems, and how surveillance affects their actions and relationships.

With small episodes from everyday life, the authors of the report make their case to demonstrate the effects of surveillance, often hidden, sometimes obvious, but which are seemingly ubiquitous features of contemporary surveillance societies. They also extrapolate to take a view into the future of 2016. In their conclusions the authors of the study state that what they have envisioned and described is already part of the everyday life of a British citizen (and indeed the everyday life of a citizen elsewhere in Europe or around the world).

But do these examples actually demonstrate the embeddedness of everyday life in surveillance (or vice versa)? To argue why these scenarios are only half of the story, we will use the following as an example (2006: 53-4):

16.1. Toby doesn't start back at school for another day and Gareth has taken an extra day off. It is a day full of chores;… and they have also planned to visit his mother, take her for lunch and shopping. Gareth's mother lives on the other side of the city.

16.2. This means going through the Congestion Charging Zone… Their number plate… is read by the ANPR system, however some mud on the registration plate means a '5' is recognized as a '6' and their details are entered incorrectly into the database. Leaving the CCZ… Gareth is unaware that another, police-operated, ANPR camera has read his number plate—this time correctly. Had he known, he would have been concerned to note that his vehicle was positively flagged to a mobile team of intercept officers positioned a few hundred yards down the road.

16.3. …Gareth is pleased that Toby is so anxious for a [mobile] phone because, now that he is travelling to and from school by himself, Yasmin wants to be able to keep in contact. What they haven't told Toby was that they also plan to register the phone with 'Trace a Mobile.com' which will enable them to keep track of their son's whereabouts without him knowing....

This narrative is compelling and intriguing, if not frightening—the scenarios very well indicate where surveillance is affecting our lives on a day to day basis without us necessarily knowing exactly when, where and for what purpose. It is also a very creative use of narrative form, as the reader does, cumulatively throughout the presentation, get some initial sense of everyday life as (fictionally) 'lived'—with all of the materially embodied and emotionally inflected subjectivity that entails.

What such compelling scenarios nevertheless fail to do, is to reflect the 'objectification' of surveillant systems and technologies back toward the 'subjective' sense of surveillant experience, as it is practiced in an ongoing way. Although we are promised a further understanding of 'how surveillance affects their actions and relationships' (2006: 49), we largely learn only about the possible effects of technological systems deployed by civil institutions, businesses or the state. We learn very little about the family—which does not seem to act, but rather to react to institutional demands and needs.

Surveillance in these scenarios is presented as an *a priori* fact. In such a perspective there are many stories or narratives that remain untold—i.e. things such a perspective cannot and does not examine. So what could an alternative approach to a typical 'Week in the Life of the Surveillance Society' look like? What

requires our attention if we really want to learn about the relations between the family members and how surveillance is imbricated in those—if that may indeed be the case? Or should we also ask how, within the relations described, surveillance is negotiated, resisted, learned, not recognized as such, or actually constituted in the first place?

To do so, we would need to observe not simply a socio-technical assemblage, but rather the life of the family as it is unfolding *from within their status as a family*. The context of the family in this case is where all these activities take place, are given meaning, and are part of the social cohesion of that social group. Families can be conceptualized as social institutions as much as organizations can be, and their 'constitutive dynamics' should therefore be explored. This, we would argue, conceptualizes the focus of an ethnographic enterprise as *the surveillance social*, rather than *surveillance societies*.

If we take the second example of the phone purchase (16.3 above), the issue of technological surveillance is obvious—but is it also so obvious to the people involved—to Gareth, Yasmin and Toby? The situation seems to be a win-win situation for all three: Toby gets a phone, and his parents are happy to be equipped with an instrument of mobility monitoring (if we were to play the devil's advocate here, we could hint at the fact that only the phone's whereabouts are monitored, not necessarily Toby's). So actually, we need to inquire about the use of the phone by Toby, the meaning he may attribute to having this phone, and what he would say if he learned about his parents' 'secret' measures to track his mobility. Does he feel safe? What about the social relations within which this all happens—does social trust, or measures of cohesion among the family members, already exist? How are they built? What forms of social control, observation, monitoring or care are already extant?

An interesting point might be the fact that it is not only about the technology of the phone, or the possibility of tracking the phone via cellular infrastructure (and the communication of its movements online), but that through the phone, new interactions may be initiated, interactions that constitute dynamics going beyond the simple assumption that a phone means the possibility of surveillance (which could have a set number of consequences). From a slightly different perspective, attempts to resist control could be studied if we were to follow Toby's technological education, the uses of the devices he has—computer, phone, internet—the meaning he is giving them, and how he interprets aspects of their possible use: such research would extend approaches that focus particularly on 'the gaze' as a particular mode of social interaction (Murtagh 2002), and enhance understanding of what and how surveillance is constituted in what kinds of networks or relations in everyday life. This would also probably extend a research field to a wider network of Toby's friends—under these conditions, surveillance becomes an aspect of everyday life, of social networks among those people that in many other studies are rather part of surveillance's structure, unable to act, but forced to react.

The openness to what one encounters in the field (Fortun 2009: 171) would in this case add to an understanding of what life in a 'surveillance society' actually means, if we do not take the field as given and fixed. An open ethnographic approach might have discovered that 'surveillance words' are never mentioned by the Jones in their talk, nor is the phone monitoring problematized in any way in their practice. We may learn something about trust, family safety, and eventually about control—not as an *a priori* fact, but from the relations and narratives of everyday life: surveillance is manifested, even when it is not identified as such. Hence we may learn something about how surveillance works in society, even though the term surveillance is never invoked. Finding new descriptive categories for surveillance practices may itself result from such an approach, but more importantly, our understandings of 'surveillance societies' could become ones that are not accounts of *a priori* systems, moulding the lives of citizens, but rather ones that are made through the lives of those citizens in everyday practice.

Ethnographies of surveillance may shift in focus, location or processual attention: but is always interested in both the production of surveillance through organizational practices and the performance of legal

governance or politics, as well as the everyday social interactions of actors with each other, dealing with such rules, institutions, technologies and the surrounding discourses—thereby establishing or altering meanings, sustaining or creating networks. To that degree, the particular shape of any ethnographic project will of course depend on the research questions being asked. What we are attempting to address in the discussion here is therefore at least in part a proposal for a shift in focus—to ask slightly different research questions, in a somewhat different way than has heretofore been the case, in order to open up Surveillance Studies' approaches to ethnographic research designs that capture multiplicity and complexity in everyday practice. In studying the ethnographic dynamics of social interactions and the meanings that are understood or attributed to them, research on surveillance will profit significantly, because some deeper understanding of processes leading to surveillance practices and how they are addressed, accommodated, or resisted, will be generated. Researchers will be able to pay attention to more than just a relation of some sort that seems to be pre-conditioned by a technology, institution or gaze of whatever kind.

This proposition begs the question as to whether there is an additional value to the empirical evidence base in Surveillance Studies to be generated from the more open ethnographic approaches described and discussed so far. If there is such additional value, how could this be described, and how could this be recognized and identified in research?

## The Value of Ethnographic Approaches in Surveillance Studies

Ethnography, understood as a multi-sited approach amenable to the investigation of flows and processes in human action, would need to systematically concentrate on a number of areas to usefully extend existing research on the constitution of surveillance relations and processes in everyday life, in order to demonstrate where they are manifest. Such projects might make use of a number of multiple and layered strategies already identified throughout the discussion here—while ANT, for example, provides one approach to ethnographic research that might be mobilized by Surveillance Studies in some respects, we feel that further extension or discussion is also deserved. The same is the case for institutional ethnographies, or ethnographies of infrastructure or 'the virtual'. In the discussion below, we therefore concentrate on domains of attention or focus, rather than on specific strategies, techniques, or labels for different approaches—the intention is to make some initial suggestions as to some arenas in which the focus of ethnographic research (in all its multi-sited forms) might shift or alter in various ways, in order to capture surveillance as process and relation in everyday life. This list is far from complete, and we hope the discussion will continue far more extensively into future work. Thus, we have grouped some thoughts into categories to highlight a variety of fields, foci or contexts.

*Materiality*
Paying attention to materiality focuses on the things people engage with, simultaneously inquiring into the meanings that may be attached to them. Following Miller (2005), this implies the study of material culture to understand power and the making of persons through the objects themselves. For many studies of surveillance, this could imply a view of technology not so much as a tool through which humans act, but more as something *through which social relations are objectified*—as objects themselves are always political (Winner 1980; Vannini 2009b). With reference to the example used in the scenario above, therefore, we would argue for a closer examination of practice, the relevant associated stories of consumption and consumer culture, as well as relevant identity constructions, in relation to the networks, relations and monitoring practices of surveillance via communications technologies. From such a perspective, technology ceases to be a normative, undefined mass of things that seem to work independently of their users or subjects.

*Knowledge*
As Walby (2005) has pointed out, the social organization of knowledge is an important aspect in the construction of social life. As Durão (2011) and Purenne (2012) have demonstrated, the study of

knowledge production in a bureaucracy may generate new insights as to how surveillance practices come to life or are managed through work and the individual negotiation of management procedures. Hence, the focus of such ethnographies may be to gather information on the subjects' knowledge of technologies or surveillance practices, with the goal to reconstruct how knowledge is (socially/culturally) produced. As this knowledge can be identified through narratives about technologies, objects or practices that play a role within a given context (cf. Woodward 2009), the surveillance context may be re-constructed discursively in the process of research.

### Communications/Discourses

Another aspect of researching the production and negotiation of knowledge (/power) involves examining how communication patterns evolve or are part of those processes. Thus, surveillance ethnographies might pay particular attention to patterns of communications through which objects, practices or technologies are contextualized, and are thereby simultaneously produced and reproduced—including communications on wishes, facts, or evidence, or forms of *inability* to communicate. Such an approach might concentrate on the paths of official documents, 'following' fieldwork in bureaucracies and professional routines, or be more orientated towards communication via interactions in day-to-day activities. Webb and Palmer (1998) provide an account of such an approach in their research on surveillance evasion on a factory shop-floor.

### Day-to-Day Activities

Daily or professional routines play an important role in constituting surveillance or resistance towards it (or both). As surveillance is not something that exists in itself—but is rather produced, constructed or perceived through actions, objects, and narrations—it is through the mundane activities of everyday life that all of these become visible and researchable. If ethnographic practice is about understanding the world through a range of members' perspectives, researchers need to understand the building blocks of those perspectives—how they are shaped, how they are expressed, and in which contexts they acquire different meanings.

### Practices

A focus on practices takes into consideration how people act and why, attempting to uncover the complex nature of seemingly mundane actions and interactions in everyday life. This can be seen as an extension of the former category, as the term practice refers to a complex arrangement of routines, activities, and narrative structures in which their motive and enactment can be described and reconstructed, and thus contextualized in regards to other activities. Practices also relate to knowledge or communications processes, so it is a question of the focus through which the ethnographer is making sense of a context, social setting or research field. Each category thereby highlights different aspects of other categories.

### Surveillance Policies, Administrative Models, Institutions and Goals

Research on surveillance has historically paid significant attention to these processes—but often as largely normative aspects of social organization that may impact on everyday life. Some ethnographic research has already demonstrated how these institutions are built, work and are conceptualized in relation to something that might be called surveillance. It is conceivable, however, that surveillance relations also go by different names. The difference is the way the areas are approached—as some studies on police or the workplace have demonstrated, where we learn the *contexts* of law-making, law implementation or resistance to control and rules, they only appear on the surface to be normative and unchangeable. Extending these types of approach would, we argue, undoubtedly enrich our analyses and add complexity to our conclusions.

### Data

When engaging with knowledge production, it seems inevitable to discuss the issue of data as stored knowledge. So far, it has remained relatively unclear what ethnographies of data would look like, particularly if we consider ethnographies of, for example, personal data, or aggregated 'big data' of the

sort that has emerged in recent years (Andrejevic and Gates 2014). This is a slightly different set of questions than those asked by ethnographers concentrating on 'the virtual' as a field site or a component of a field site. For example, can we observe data, and if so, in what context? What is the connection between the 'everyday life of data' and 'everyday life' (whether material or virtual)? These are significant challenges for ethnographic research, as data collection and its role in surveillance measures, practices and strategies become ever more central. Crucially, data could be both an interface for ethnographic research on the production of knowledge, as well as (digitally) materialized practices and forms of communications. Ethnographic research on data and the contexts of data collection have yet to be empirically tested in a systematic way—but it becomes obvious that research that discusses data collection cannot bypass their creation and negotiation within institutional, organizational, interactional and cultural settings.

## Concluding Thoughts on Ethnographic Practice in Surveillance Studies

The discussion throughout this paper has sought to argue that a survey of current ethnographic approaches in the empirical research base of Surveillance Studies—while already multiple and varied—would be enriched via research strategies based not on the identification of research fields or sites defined as surveillance in an *a priori* way (via the identification of, for example, specific technical systems or organizational boundaries), but rather on the emergent properties of field relations as they are enacted and practiced in everyday life.

The paper first situated both 'surveillance' and 'ethnography' as contested concepts in themselves, and discussed some of the various ways in which each might be imbricated in, or related to, the other. These relationships were then located both with respect to the interdisciplinary context of surveillance more generally, and with respect to more qualitative and ethnographic approaches in particular. We then surveyed the many and varied approaches to ethnographic practice that have historically been deployed in Surveillance Studies. In doing so, we suggested that while rich and compelling (as well as often multiple and multi-layered), such work overall remained largely dominated by analytic assumptions that pre-ordained a research focus towards surveillance as socio-technical or organizational systems, rather than a focus towards the mundane and everyday life (where the 'field' of surveillance is constructed rather than 'found'). We further argued that the latter orientation would have further contributions to make towards the empirical evidence base in Surveillance Studies, as well as the theoretical conceptualization of 'surveillance societies' and 'surveillance' itself.

Through a commentary on everyday surveillance scenarios, we then went on to consider what alternative ethnographic approaches to analyzing surveillance practices might be into the future, when examined through a lens directed towards *the surveillance social*—as lived mundane and everyday contextualized relations and practices—rather than *surveillance societies*—the latter shape of which being conceptualized through socio-technical and organizational systems. Throughout this discussion we attempted to communicate an emphasis on multiplicity, complexity and flow in surveillance relations and practices, the lived experience of them, and the shared meanings that are thereby derived. To emphasize how such complexity and flow might be addressed by ethnographic approaches in future, we went on to suggest some particular arenas—in materiality, knowledge and communication, as well as in daily practices, data and institutional relations—that are deserving of our further attention.

Despite the extensive discussion here, however, there is much further scope for reflection on the current and future relationship of ethnographic approaches and Surveillance Studies. One might pause to reflect, for example, on whether there are configurations of institutions, interactions, technologies and discourses that ethnography, as a method, cannot capture in the field of surveillance—this is an increasingly important question in respect of data flows, for example. If a significant number of ethnographic research strategies address themselves to the 'observable', how do researchers address the 'unobservable' in

surveillance practices (e.g. data collection and mining, the mobility of the body/identity's 'data double', or the strategic in/visibility of information flows in late capital)? Current researchers might also address themselves as to whether there are any particular disciplinary-based approaches to Surveillance Studies that are beyond the remit of (diverse and multiple) ethnographic strategies or approaches. We might further reflect on whether there are particular kinds of research questions in Surveillance Studies that ethnography, as an approach, could not hope to address. Via such further reflections and deliberations, our ethnographic research practices can only be enriched and develop.

## Acknowledgements

## References

Andrejevic, Mark and Kelly Gates. 2014. Editorial: Big Data Surveillance. *Surveillance & Society* 12(2): 185-196.

Ball, Kirstie S. 2010. Workplace surveillance: an overview. *Labour History* 51(1): 87—106.

Ball, Kirstie S., Elizabeth Daniel and Chris Stride. 2013. Dimensions of employee privacy: an empirical study. *Information Technology and People*. In Press.

Ball, Kirstie S. and Kevin D. Haggerty. 2005. Doing Surveillance Studies. *Surveillance & Society* 3(2/3): 129—138.

Ball, Kirstie S. and Stephen Margulis. 2011. Electronic monitoring and surveillance in call centres: a framework for investigation. *New Technology, Work and Employment* 26(2): 113—126.

Beaulieu, Anne. 2004. Mediating ethnography: objectivity and the making of ethnographies of the internet. *Social Epistemology* 18(2-3): 139-164.

Beaulieu, Anne. 2010. From Co-location to Co-presence: Shifts in the Use of Ethnography for the Study of Knowledge. *Social Studies of Science* 40(3) June: 453-470.

Bennett, Colin. 2008. *The Privacy Advocates: Resisting the Spread of Surveillance.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Bowker, Geoffrey and Susan Leigh Star. 1999. *Sorting Things Out: Classification and Its Consequences.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Callon, Michel. 1987. Society in the Making: The Study of Technology as a Tool for Sociological Analysis. In: *The Social Construction of Technological Systems: New Directions in the Sociology and History of Technology*, eds Wiebe Bijker, Trevor P. Hughes and Trevor Pinch. London: MIT Press.

Durão, Susana. 2011. The police community on the move: hierarchy and management in the daily lives of Portuguese police officers. *Social Anthropology* 19(4): 394–408. DOI:10.1111/j.1469-8676.2011.00178.x.

Durão, Susana, and Daniel Seabra Lopes. 2011. Introduction: institutions are us? *Social Anthropology* 19(4): 363–377. DOI:10.1111/j.1469-8676.2011.00170.x.

Fijnaut, C. and Marx, Gary T. 1995. *Undercover: Police Surveillance in Comparative Perspective.* Norwell: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Fortun, Kim. 2009. Figuring Out Ethnography. In *Fieldwork Is Not What It Used to Be: Learning Anthropology's Method in a Time of Transition*, eds James D. Faubion and George E. Marcus. Ithaca/London: Cornell University Press.

Friesen, Norm, Andrew Feenberg and Grace Smith. 2009. Phenomenology and Surveillance Studies: Returning to the Things Themselves. *Information Society* 25: 84–90.

Gad, Christopher and Peter Lauritsen. 2009. Situated Surveillance: An Ethnographic Study of Fisheries Inspection in Denmark. *Surveillance & Society* 7(1): 49-57.

Genosko, Gary and Scott Thompson. 2006. Administrative surveillance of alcohol consumption in Ontario, Canada: pre-electronic technologies of control. *Surveillance & Society* 4(1/2): 1—28.

Genosko, Gary and Scott Thompson. 2009. *Punched Drunk: Alcohol Surveillance and the LCBO 1927-1975.* Nova Scotia: Fernwood Publishing.

Gill, Martin, ed. 2003. *CCTV.* Leicester: Perpetuity Press.

Gilliom, John. 2001. *Overseers of the Poor: Surveillance, Resistance and the Limits of Privacy* Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Goold, Ben. 2004. *CCTV and Policing: Public Area Surveillance and Police Practices in Britain.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Graham, Stephen and David Wood. 2003. Digitizing Surveillance: Categorization, Space, Inequality. *Critical Social Policy* 23(2) May: 227-248.

Green, Nicola. 1999. Disrupting the Field: Virtual Reality Technologies and 'Multi-Sited' Ethnographic Methods. *American Behavioural Scientist* 43(5): 409—421.

Green, Nicola. 2002. Who's Watching Whom? Surveillance, Regulation and Accountability in Mobile Relations. In: *Wireless World: Social, Cultural and Interactional Issues in Mobile Communications and Computing,* eds Barry Brown, Nicola Green and Richard Harper, 32-44. London: Springer Verlag.

Gupta, Akhil and James Ferguson. 1997. *Anthropological Locations: Boundaries and Grounds of a Field Science*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Haggerty, Kevin D. and Richard V. Ericson. 2006. The New Politics of Surveillance and Visibility. In: *The New Politics of Surveillance and Visibility*, eds Kevin D. Haggerty and Richard V. Ericson. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Haggerty, Kevin D. and Richard V. Ericson. 2000. The Surveillant Assemblage. *British Journal of Sociology* 51(4): 605—622.

Helten, Frank, and Bernd Fischer. 2004. Reactive Attention: Video Surveillance in Berlin Shopping Malls. *Surveillance & Society* 2(2/3): 323—345.

Hempel, Leon. 2007. Zur Evaluation von Videoüberwachung. Methoden, Standards und Beispiele aus der Bewertungspraxis, In Ed. Nils Zurawski. *Surveillance Studies. Perspektiven eines Forschungsfeldes*, Opladen: Budrich: pp. 117-148.

Hempel, Leon, and Eric Töpfer. 2003. On the Threshold to Urban Panopticum: Objectives and Results of the 'Urbaneye' Project on the employment of CCTV in Europe. Discussion Paper Number 06/03. April. Centre for Technology and Society, Technical University of Berlin. http://www.tu-berlin.de/fileadmin/f27/pdfs/discussion_Papers/urban.pdf

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

Hine, Christine. 2005. *Virtual Methods: Issues in Social Research on the Internet.* Oxford: Berg.

Kammerer, Dietmar. 2009. Police use of public video surveillance in Germany 1956: management of traffic, repression of flows, persuasion of offenders. *Surveillance & Society* 6(1): 43—47.

Latour, Bruno. 1987. *Science in Action: How to follow scientists and engineers through society.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Lyon, David. 2003. *Surveillance as Social Sorting: Privacy, Risk and Digital Discrimination*. New York: Taylor and Francis.

Lyon, David. 2006. The search for surveillance theories. In: *Theorizing Surveillance: the Panopticon and beyond,* ed. David Lyon. Cullompton: Willan Publishers.

Lyon, David and Colin Bennett. 2008. Playing the ID Card: Understanding the significance of identity card systems. In: *Playing the Identity Card: Surveillance, Security and Identification in Global Perspective,* eds Colin Bennett and David Lyon, 3—20. London: Routledge.

Marcus, George. 1995. Ethnography in/of the World System: the Emergence of Multi-sited Ethnography. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24: 95—117.

Marx, Gary T. 2012. Foreword: Privacy Is Not Quite Like the Weather. In *Privacy Impact Assessment*, eds David Wright and Paul de Hert. London: Springer.

Maguire Mark, Catarina Frois and Nils Zurawski, eds. 2014. *The Anthropology of Security: Perspectives from the Frontline of Policing, Counter-terrorism and Border Control*. London: Pluto Press.

Miller, Daniel, ed. 2005. *Materiality*. Durham: Duke.

Mitchell, Jon P. 2011. Introduction. In *Ethnographic Practice in the Present*, eds. Marit Melhuus, Jon P. Mitchell and Helena Wulff. New York/Oxford: Berghahn.

Müller, Thaddeus. 2013. In Praise of Ethnography. Towards a Rich Understanding of Crime and Deviance. *Kriminologisches Journal* 45 (2): 144-159.

Murtagh, Ged M. 2002. Seeing the "Rules": Preliminary Observation of Action, Interaction and Mobile Phone Use. In *Wireless World: Social, Cultural and Interactional Issues in Mobile Communications and Computing*, eds Barry Brown, Nicola Green and Richard Harper, 81-91. London: Springer Verlag.

Norris, Clive, and Gary Armstrong. 1999. *The Maximum Surveillance Society: The Rise of CCTV*. London: Berg.

Norris, Clive, Mike McCahill and David Wood. 2004. The Growth of CCTV: a global perspective on the international diffusion of video surveillance in publicly accessible space. *Surveillance & Society* 2(2/3): 110—135.

Pridmore, Jason. 2008. *Loyal subjects*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis. Queens University, Kingston.

Pollock, Neil and Robin Williams. 2010. The business of expectations: How promissory organizations shape technology and innovation. *Social Studies of Science* 40 (4): 525-548. DOI: 10.1177/0306312710362275.

Purenne, Anaïk. 2012. Police and surveillance in Paris. Are the French police becoming knowledge workers and risk managers? In: *Crime, Security and Surveillance*, eds Gudrun Vande Walle, Evelien van den Herrewegen and Nils Zurawski. The Hague: Eleven.

Rosol, Christophe. 2010. From Radar to Reader: On the origin of RFID. *Aether: The Journal of Media Geography* 5(1): 37—49.

Rule, James B. and Graham Greenleaf, eds. 2008. *Global Privacy Protection: The First Generation*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Smith, Gavin J. D. 2014. *Opening the Black Box: The Work of Watching* Oxford: Routledge.

Staples, William G. 1998. *The Culture of Surveillance. Discipline and Social Control in the United States*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Staples, William G. 2013. Everyday surveillance: vigilance and visibility in Postmodern Life. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Star, Susan Leigh. 1990. Power, technology and the phenomenology of conventions: On being allergic to onions. *The Sociological Review* 38: 26-56. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-954X.1990.tb03347.x

Star, Susan Leigh. 2002. Infrastructure and ethnographic practice: Working on the fringes. *Scandinavian Journal of Information Systems* 14 (2): 6.

Surveillance Studies Network. 2006. *A Report on the Surveillance Society: For the Information Commissioner by the Surveillance Studies Network September 2006*. Office of the Information Commissioner: UK.

Taylor, Emmeline. 2011. Awareness, understanding and experiences of CCTV amongst teachers and pupils in three UK schools. *Information Polity* 16 (4): 303—318.

Vannini, Phillip, ed. 2009a. *Material culture and technology in everyday life: Ethnographic approaches*. New York: Lang.

Vannini, Phillip. 2009b. Material Culture Studies and the Sociology and Anthropology of Technology. In: *Material culture and technology in everyday life: Ethnographic approaches,* ed. Phillip Vannini. New York: Lang.

Walby, Kevin T. 2005. Institutional ethnography and surveillance studies: An outline for inquiry. *Surveillance & Society* 3(2/3): 158—172.

Walby, Kevin. 2006. Little England? The Rise of Open-street Closed Circuit Television. *Surveillance & Society* 4(1): 29-51.

Webb, Mike and Gerry Palmer. 1998. Evading Surveillance and Making Time: An Ethnographic view of the Japanese Factory Floor in Britain. *British Journal of Industrial Relations* 36 (4): 611—627. DOI: 10.1111/1467-8543.00110.

Webster, William C.W.R., Francisco R. Klauser, Eric Töpfer and Charles D. Raab. 2011/12. Revisiting the surveillance camera revolution: Issues of governance and public policy. *Information Polity* 16(4) & 17(1).

Winner, Langdon. 1980. Do artifacts have politics? *Daedalus* 109(1): 121–36.

Woodward, Ian. 2009. Material Culture and Narrative: Fusing Myth, Materiality, and Meaning. In: *Material culture and technology in everyday life: Ethnographic approaches*, ed. Phillip Vannini. New York: Lang.

Zurawski, Nils. 2011. Local Practice and Global Data: Loyalty Cards, Social Practices, and Consumer Surveillance. *The Sociological Quarterly* 52(4): 509—527.

Zureik, Elia, L. Lynda Harling Stalker, Emily Smith, David Lyon, and Yolande E. Chan. 2010. *Surveillance, Privacy, and the Globalization of Personal Information: International comparisons*. Montréal/Ithaca: McGill-Queen's University Press.