Journal of Organizational Ethnography

Polyphonic sound montages: A new approach to ethnographic representation and qualitative analysis

Morten Arnfred

Received 2 October 2014
Revised 2 October 2014
20 May 2015
Accepted 24 July 2015

Polyphonic sound montages

A new approach to ethnographic representation and qualitative analysis

Morten Arnfred
Department of Organization, Copenhagen Business School, Frederiksberg, Denmark

Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this paper is to discuss the methodological aspects of analyzing and editing recorded qualitative interviews into polyphonic sound montages, which can then be played in a workshop and facilitate reflection, discussion and co-analysis.

Design/methodology/approach – The paper outlines the two elements of the method: editing and co-analysis. It uses empirical examples from a specific project where polyphonic sound montages were edited from interviews with patients at a cardiology department and played in a workshop for a multidisciplinary group of doctors, nurses, technicians, secretaries and managers.

Findings – It is argued that working with polyphonic sound montages is an engaging and fruitful way to present qualitative findings enabling the researcher to include more people in the analysis of the material.

Originality/value – The crafting of polyphonic sound montages and the process of co-analysis, as described in this paper, is a new approach to ethnographic representation and qualitative analysis. The paper may inspire researchers or consultants who want to experiment with a new way of involving user perspectives.

Keywords Representation, Ethnography, Co-analysis, Montage, Polyphony, User-centred innovation

Paper type Research paper

In a series of online videos[1] the host of the American public radio program This American Life, Ira Glass, talks about the building blocks of storytelling in radio documentaries. In his view, there are two elements: "The anecdote" and "the moment of reflection." The anecdote is a telling of a series of events. This happened, then this happened, and then this happened, etc. You create suspense by having forward motion. You pull people in because they wonder what will happen next. The moment of reflection is when you take a step back from the anecdote and ask: what does this mean? Glass says that these two elements should support each other so they become more than the sum of their parts. The documentary should take you into a world. A world you might think you know, but then the documentary gives you a fresh perspective. When it works, it makes it possible to experience what it is to be someone else. How does it feel? What would happen? What would you think?

In this paper, I will introduce and discuss a new ethnographic method, which shares certain characteristics with the radio documentaries described by Glass. The method is to edit polyphonic sound montages from recorded qualitative interviews and play them in a workshop for relevant participants, who contribute to the analysis of the montages. The method thus contains two main elements: a format for presenting qualitative research in the form of polyphonic sound montages and a strategy for analyzing these montages through a process of "co-analysis." I define co-analysis as a co-operative retroductive process where empirical material is discussed and analyzed with the aim of proposing possible social structures

Journal of Organizational Ethnography
Vol. 4 No. 3, 2015
pp. 356-366

2046-6749
DOI 10.1108/JOE-10-2014-0034

and mechanisms, which can explain apparent social patterns. The paper will illuminate how the polyphonic sound montages can be crafted and how the process of co-analysis can be structured.

The method was developed in the context of organizational consulting with a focus on innovation and change processes and was originally designed as a way to provide user feedback to the employees of an organization in a way that is engaging and makes the users visible as individuals to the employees[2]. The method was first used as part of a user-centred innovation project at a cardiology department at a public hospital and since developed in similar projects at the same hospital department. I will include examples from one of these projects to illustrate how the method works in practice. This particular project focussed on the department's pacemaker out clinic ("pace-clinic" from now on) where patients with pacemakers and Implantable Cardioverter Defibrillators (ICDs)[3] come to get their device[4] checked regularly. The overall aim of the project was to help the staff generate new ideas for organizing the pace-clinic by involving the patients' perspectives.

From a more research-oriented perspective, I propose that the method can be applied in two ways. First, the researcher could align his or her analytical interests with the interests of the employees in the organization. This is the approach described by Holmes and Marcus (2005) where the researcher does fieldwork among people who have well-articulated analyses and opinions about the subject under scrutiny. Holmes and Marcus propose the term "para-ethnography" to describe these analyses. In this perspective, informants become intellectual partners "who share the same world of representation with us, and the same curiosity and predicament about constituting the social in our affinities" (p. 250), as Holmes and Marcus put it. The second approach would be to instead focus on the way the sound montages are analyzed by the employees and use this process as data for analysis. From the researcher's perspective, the co-analysis workshop would then double as a focus group, which could provide insights into the employees' behavior, interpretations, interactions and norms as a group.

Meinert *et al.* (2014) discuss a project where qualitative interviews were used in a similar way as the one that will be outlined here. Focussing on the repercussions of the civil war in northern Uganda, the researchers collaborated with an artist in collecting and editing what they call "forgiveness accounts." They did in-depth interviews with people focussing on instances where they had either forgiven someone, or asked for forgiveness themselves. The interviews were edited extensively and the accounts were then played in villages, drawing large crowds, joined in intense listening. The aim of the project was to "inspire individuals to reflect on the subject of forgiveness by contextualizing [the account] in relation to their own experiences" (Meinert *et al.*, 2014, p. 3). There are some noteworthy differences to the method presented here, however. The accounts discussed by Meinert *et al.* are not edited as polyphonic montages. Instead every informant's forgiveness account is edited and shortened, but is kept as a separate narrative and the overall theme of forgiveness was given beforehand. With polyphonic montages all of the interviews are analyzed, divided into short sound clips and then rearranged. The result is a highly edited collection of voices from the field, which are united by a common theme determined by the researcher through systematic analysis.

The paper is structured in two parts. The first part outlines the process of crafting the montages through fieldwork, interviews and editing and briefly

discusses the montage editing technique. The second part outlines the process of co-analysis and discusses the ontological and epistemological underpinnings of the method.

Crafting the montages – the ethnographer as editor

Before any editing can begin, the raw material – in the form of recorded interviews – needs to be generated. Although the method focusses on the kind of empirical data, which can be "captured on tape" it is still vital to spend time in the field observing the everyday activities. In the pace-clinic project, which will be used to illustrate the method, I followed the work of the technicians, secretaries and doctors to get an impression of what the patients had to go through. These observations were supplemented by interviews with key employees to get a nuanced impression of the work at the clinic. Following this initial fieldwork, I recruited patients for interviews. These were scheduled immediately after a consultation, and patients were briefed that the interview would be about their personal experiences of living with a device, and how they experienced their visits and general contact with the pace-clinic. All the informants had at least one thing in common: they had to live with a small machine under their skin, which connected to small wires that went into their heart. To make sure this machine operated ideally, they had to visit the hospital on a regular basis. In total, 32 interviews were conducted resulting in a total of 15 hours of recorded conversation.

Because the material will be edited and played back to an audience, there are a few things the researcher should consider when interviewing. It is important to encourage the informants to be as concrete as possible – for example by describing specific situations. This way the people listening to the montages are better able to understand what the informant thought in different situations and what actually happened. Apart from opening up the process, these step-by-step descriptions or anecdotes also make it fundamentally more captivating and interesting to listen to the accounts. As we learned from Glass in the beginning of the paper, anecdotes draw us in as listeners and activate our empathy for the informant's perspective. Anecdotes also have the advantage of being able to stand on their own. When you are writing ethnography, it is easier to contextualize and fill in the gaps of a conversation, whereas, with the sound montages; you can only use what you actually recorded.

The next step is to transform the recorded material into polyphonic sound montages. Here, the aim of the researcher is not to analyze the material in order to formulate a theory, but rather to categorize it in a way that creates a loyal overview of what the informants have said. This can then be presented to the employees in the organization who partake in the analysis with the researcher. The main criteria guiding the researcher in the editing process will therefore be how to best represent the most important trends and perspectives in the experiences of the informants relating to the specific focus of the given project.

On a practical level, the recorded material is imported into a sound-editing program and the researcher listens through all the interviews. The material is then edited into shorter sound clips, coded and rearranged into montages. All this is done through an iterative process of continued re-interpretation. The aim is to find trends and currents in the material, bearing in mind that conflicting, or even contradictory, trends often coexist in a complex world. Tanggaard and Brinkmann (2010) have described this type of qualitative analysis very aptly as an oscillation between analyzing (breaking down, focussing) and synthesizing (building up, putting together) to produce an overview of

the material that reveals a new set of connections (p. 10). The process is similar to "open coding" in grounded theory which tries to answer the question "what is going on?" by identifying categories, concepts and dimensions in the material (Strauss and Corbin, 1998, p. 119). Unlike grounded theory, however, where the researcher would go on to use other coding strategies as well in order to discover or develop a theory from the data, with polyphonic sound montages the researcher leaves the final analysis to the group.

Boswell and Corbett (2015) argue that interpretive research should be viewed as an "impressionistic" rather than a "systematic" process. Instead of the analysis springing from an ordered, systematic process of coding and constructing categories, they argue that actual interpretive research is often much more messy and arbitrary (Boswell and Corbett, 2015, p. 4). Here, I side with Yannow (2012) and those who argue for a systematic approach to the analytical process. Even though the process is certainly iterative, the final categories are not arbitrary, as Boswell and Corbett write (Boswell and Corbett, 2015, p. 4). I would argue that it is ultimately more fruitful to nurture a systematic approach because it keeps a strong focus on the informants' perspectives rather than the term impressionistic, which leads to a greater focus on the researcher and his or her subjective impression.

After analyzing the material and identifying a number of themes, the next step is to structure all the sound clips according to these themes. Again, this is a very iterative process. As Høgel (2013) writes in his discussion of montage techniques in film documentary editing: "It is possible to work with categorizations that are not uniform, i.e., elements can belong to many categories and every element can have any number of categorizations […] Meaning can be reached by slowly prying out connections, contrasts, causalities, congruencies, and other relations" (p. 224). The resulting montages are often very long and therefore need to be trimmed down. All the individual sound clips are carefully edited, so they are as short as they can possibly be without loosing their meaning. The researcher's questions can be cut out, to give more focus to the voices of the informants. Same with long pauses in the informants' answers and even interposed sentences that do not add to the specific point that has been selected. In this way the montages can be shortened somewhat, but ultimately most of the sound clips have to be left out of the final montages[5]. First and foremost the sound clips that are kept in the montages are the ones that somehow best capture the theme of each montage. However, two additional considerations contribute to the exact composition of the final montages. These are entertainment value and ethical considerations.

First, in the editing process, the montages are also viewed as "experiences" that should be engaging. Effort is devoted to finding catchy titles for the montages, and there is some consideration as to which of the sound clips are the most engaging or perhaps even the funniest. The rationale is that the more engaging the montages are, the more the listeners will be motivated to discuss the issues they highlight. This criterion also drives the way the individual sound clips in the montages are edited, where excessive pauses are cut out to keep the clips short and pointed. In this way each clip is "distilled" down to its essence.

Second, there are ethical considerations when deciding how exactly to compose the montages. For example, it is important to be aware of how sensitive it can be for the staff to be presented with user feedback on the care or service they provide. The researcher should be careful that the montages do not become counterproductive by leaving people feeling exposed and therefore, perhaps, trying to dismiss the feedback in order to protect themselves. This is where the knowledge that the

researcher attains through the initial fieldwork becomes important. Generally one should try, both in editing and in interviewing, to make it about the organization or the topic and not about specific individuals. To sum up, the most important criterion when crafting the montages is to present the trends and most important perspectives in the material recorded, but entertainment value and ethical considerations factor in as well.

In the end, each montage appears as a collection of voices – fragments of interviews – tied together by an overarching theme. Polyphony is prioritized over narrative arch. The listener does not get to linger with each of the informants, but is instead presented with different perspectives revolving around a theme. Barbara Czarniawska (1999) writes that as ethnographers we act as spokespersons for others, and we "translate" their speech into what we think, they mean (p. 107). With the montage technique, however, the researcher takes on a role more as editor than as translator. Instead of adding layers of interpretation you add a thematic structure, letting the informants "speak for themselves." The researcher acts, as an intermediary between the informants and the listeners and the task is essentially one of communication: to accurately and fairly structure and convey the most significant perspectives from the users to the employees. Meinert *et al.* (2014) liken this way of editing, where the researcher's interpretation is implicit, to artistic work. The artist's interpretation is inherent in the artifact, but not made explicit. This makes the interpretation of the work open-ended and encourages the audience to make their own associations and conclusions. As they write: "The effect sought is affect in the sense of moving someone else to reflect or feel or make meaning" (Meinert *et al.*, 2014, p. 4).

The concept of montage is not new to ethnography. It is not an unambiguous term, however. Art historian Jeff Collins (2006) even calls it a "disastrous, ruined term, resistant to monosemy or univocality" with an "erratic application across heterogeneous fields" (p. 58). Anthropologist George Marcus who had been a defining figure in the 1980s representation debate (Marcus and Fischer, 1986; Clifford and Marcus, 1986), evoked montage (see Marcus, 1990, 1992) as a possible strategy for facing some of the problems he saw with ethnographic method. By outlining what he called modernist ethnography, and critiquing traditional realist ethnography, Marcus wanted to modernize ethnography's "apparatus of representation" (Marcus, 1990, p. 3). He highlighted that moves away from realist representation at the time had been done in the name of montage. Montage, according to Marcus (1990), is a way to break with undesired rhetorical conventions and narrative modes because it exposes their artificiality and arbitrariness (p. 4). In other words, Marcus views montage as a way to challenge a coherent finished narrative. Anthropologists Suhr and Willerslev (2013) have recently re-vitalized the idea of montage based on Marcus' original articles. They praise montage as a tool for "the destabilization and rupture of our common-sense perception" (Suhr and Willerslev, 2013, p. 2). Suhr and Willerslev (2013) define montage in its broadest sense as "the joining together of different elements in a variety of combinations, repetitions, and overlaps" (p. 1) and note that it is a technique customarily associated with cinematic editing. For the particular approach outlined in this paper, I add "polyphonic[6]" to indicate the focus on multiple voices and "sound" to specify the medium. Polyphonic sound montages are thus defined as distinct voices recorded and reorganized by the ethnographic fieldworker into a themed collection of sound clips.

Like Marcus, Suhr and Willerslev position themselves against what they call "realist schools of anthropological writing," and claim that this orientation sees montage as a disruptive principle that pollutes the representation of the social world. I will argue that even though montage techniques have traditionally been associated with these social

constructivist positions, they do not have to be. From a critical realist (Bhaskar, 1975, 1979) perspective montage is an interesting approach to ethnographic representation, because it highlights the complexity of the multicausal open system of social reality and the possible co-existence of conflicting and contradicting social trends and currents. I will pursue this idea further in the second part of the paper, which will discuss how the montages can facilitate a process of co-analysis.

Co-analysis

In this section, I will discuss the second element in the method: how the sound montages can be used to facilitate a process of co-analysis. As demonstrated in the previous section, the montages structure the data, but they do not present a finished analysis – they are open to interpretation. I will start with an example from the pace-clinic project to illustrate how the employees of an organization can be included in the interpretation of the montages.

In the pace-clinic project, the montages were played one by one in a workshop and the participants were asked to silently reflect and write down any thoughts and associations they might have listening to the voices of the patients. Between each montage, they shared and discussed these reflections. One of the montages had been given the title "half robot" because the clips in the montage referred to the experience of living with a piece of electronic equipment inside your body. In the montage, a patient had the following to say about his experience with telemedicine[7]:

> In the beginning, I got a letter every time – I think it is every third months, I send these data via telemedicine – then I got a letter 3 or 4 days after, in which it said: "We can confirm that the technology works". And then I thought: "the technology works […] How do I work? Has there been any episodes[8] where it [the device] has been active?" To find out, I had to call the clinic. But the fact that the technology works is no surprise to me. It would be horrible if it didn't work […] When the letter about the technology then stopped coming, I nevertheless thought: "that's strange […] I've send these data […]" No reaction was almost worse than irrelevant information […] and that's a little peculiar.

After this montage had been played in the workshop one of the technicians commented:

> I think it reflects a technology-focus […] But we have to have a patient-focus. That's what they're saying. We have to make sure the technology is a 100% all right, but we also have to see the whole picture. We have to become better at that, I think.

One of the groups in the workshop discussed the difference between anxiety and fear. Anxiety must be when you are not necessarily sure about what you are afraid of? Was that the issue underlying some of the patients' perspectives? The staff supplemented the anecdotes and perspectives from the montages with their own everyday experiences from the clinic, to try to figure out why the patients felt like they felt or experienced the consultations the way they did. After the workshop one of the doctors reflected on the process: "[the montages] caused surprise: "is it really perceived like this?" And then a lot of discussion: "How can we avoid it?" and "How and why is it like that – what do we do wrong?" So they introduced some challenges that was then explored and then we started to think: 'how can we make this better?"

Based on the discussions, the groups formulated a problem or challenge they wanted to explore further. One of the groups formulated the following problem: "The patients feel they loose control over their own life." The group then tried to come up with some possible consequences and some possible causes or explanations for this.

As consequences they wrote: "Need for more control," "denial," a lack of motivation to come to all the appointments at the clinic," "a need to be recognized." As causes they proposed: "A lack of focus on the psychological aspect," "fear of dying," "lack of continuity," "experts have more knowledge about your illness than you do yourself," "incomprehensible technology," "lack of inclusion."

The polyphonic sound montages raise a lot of questions and as a listener you need to talk to somebody after you hear them. You need the "moment of reflection" mentioned by Glass in the introduction. But this moment of reflection is focussed. In a co-operative process, the participants in the workshop start with the anecdotes and perspectives from the montages and try to illuminate structured social relations. In this way the analysis of the qualitative data becomes a collaborative, multidisciplinary project. The aim is to identify some possible social structures or mechanisms in order to possibly be able to modify the status quo.

This analytical approach resembles the retroductive approach applied in the philosophy of science known as critical realism (Bhaskar, 1975, 1979). The focus in critical realist social science is on identifying and describing mechanisms and social structures – understood as systems of social relations – that can help explain social phenomena. In this sense it has a slightly different focus than the interpretive or social constructivist approaches usually adopted as the philosophical underlabourer for ethnographic work, where focus typically would be on the negotiation of meaning among the informants. As Bhaskar writes:

> […] the existence of social structure is a necessary condition for any human activity. Society provides the means, media, rules and resources for everything we do […]. It is the unmotivated condition for all our motivated productions. We do not create society – the error of voluntarism. But these structures, which pre-exist us, are only reproduced or transformed in our everyday activities; thus society does not exist independently of human agency – the error of reification. The social world is reproduced and transformed in daily life (Bhaskar, 1989, pp. 3-4).

Critical realism maintains an ontological realism by claiming that reality exists independent of our knowledge about it, but at the same time it upholds epistemological relativism by acknowledging that all knowledge is socially produced, fallible and partial. The epistemological relativism does not, however, lead to a general relativism, because critical realism upholds the possibility of rationally judging the arguments for different statements about reality.

The analytical approach in critical realism is retroduction. Instead of deducing the conclusion from the premises, the task is to find the premise when the conclusion is given. In other words, the starting point is a given trend, action, phenomenon or event, and the aim is to describe social structures and mechanisms that would explain it. In the pace-clinic project, the sound montages identified and represented some trends or themes in the patients' experiences. These then had to be described and understood. And then they had to be explained. As Sam Porter (2002) points out, the role of ethnography, in this worldview, becomes to describe the manifest interactions of the social world and then subject these to the transcendental process of generating theories about the structural premises of those interactions and subsequently to test these theories. Critical realism, then, is not confined to a focus on individual experience, but uses ethnographic material to illuminate structured social relations. Furthermore critical realist scholarship will often try to point to actions that can be taken to make these relations less oppressive (Porter, 2002, p. 65).

But why use sound recordings to facilitate this collaborative retroductive process? Instead you could imagine a scenario where informants were actually invited to the workshop to tell about their experiences. Some concerns quickly arise in this thought experiment, however. It would not be possible to include more than a few informants before it would take up too much time. Furthermore, most informants would probably be nervous, if they had to tell their story in front of a room full of people. They would also not be able to be anonymous, which would probably put a damper on what they felt they could say. By using the sound montages as mediator, it is possible to do a lot of work before you reach the workshop and thereby present concentrated excerpts of the most significant perspectives. The montages make it possible to have a very focussed workshop.

Instead of just using audio, it is of course possible to add the visual dimension and do video montages instead. Just using audio, however, has a number of advantages. First, most informants will be more comfortable and relaxed, if they are just talking to the interviewer and an audio recorder on the table instead of a video camera. Second, there is the issue of anonymity again. In an organizational setting, the informants are more likely to be honest, and perhaps critical, if they know the staff will not be able to easily recognize them, next time they visit the organization. Third, it might shortchange some of the listeners' prejudices if they cannot see the user, nudging them to listen more to the content of what is actually being said.

The sound montages work partly because they activate the listeners' emotions. As one of the doctors said in the pace-clinic case: "They work because they hurt. There is a self-image among the staff that we deliver the highest possible quality, and the montages challenge this a little. Therefore you take it in." Kotter and Cohen (2002) pinpoint this when they write "People change what they do less because they are given analysis that shifts their thinking than because they are shown a truth that influences their feelings" (p. 1). By hearing their actual voices the listener experiences a relation to the informants. Anthropologist Karen Lisa Salamon (2013) supports this claim in her discussion of montage, when she argues that montages can invoke a kind of intimacy because the direct authorial voice of the ethnographer is peeled away and the informants' voices are kept relatively intact, speaking directly. The listener therefore feels a more powerful connection and relation to the informants (Salamon, 2013, p. 154). Of course the ethnographer lurks behind the curtains having orchestrated the voice fragments, but the montages preserve much of the identity of the informants (Salamon, 2013, p. 146). Even though it might be a contested term, the montages give the representation a touch of authenticity. You clearly feel the human being behind the utterances and perspectives, making the process more engaging and moving.

In his discussion of montage, Marcus argued that ethnography should focus on voices and discourse rather than structure. Instead of seeing voices as the products of local structures or as privileged sources of perspective on a structure, they should be seen as "products of the complex sets of associations and experiences which compose them" (Marcus, 1992, p. 318). Marcus identified montage as a tool to highlight this. From a critical realist perspective one of the main tasks of social science should be to identify and describe social structures and mechanisms that can explain social phenomena. I propose that montage can also be a fruitful technique in this endeavor. This position differs from both Marcus and Suhr and Willerslev who do not seem to think that anthropology should strive for more and more accurate descriptions of the social world. Suhr and Willerslev (2013) argue that such a project is "not only impossible, but also unwanted" (p. 6). Like Marcus, they want to shatter the idea of coherent wholes. They argue that montage achieves this by a process of

denaturalization, where the first sense of a given object is altered or challenged by combining it with a new element or perspective, thereby questioning our perception of what reality is (Suhr and Willerslev, 2013, p. 12). The idea seems to be, that because we can never attain what they call a "view from everywhere" (p. 3), we should abandon the attempt to make better and better cross-cultural models altogether. I find this unnecessarily drastic and agree with Porter (2002), who argues that while phenomenology highlights the importance of subjective meanings as the basis for social action, and postmodern thought highlights the dangers of making absolute claims about such subjective understandings, an adequate ethnographic model needs to incorporate, but also go beyond these insights, and focus on patterns in social behavior (p. 59). Not in the form of everlasting panhuman social laws as some positivists would have it, but as something more modest. As trends and tendencies, which are the result of an interweaving complex of social structures and mechanisms.

Conclusion

The method outlined in this paper is a unique approach to ethnographic representation and qualitative analysis. To use polyphonic sound montages is about communicating an experience more than it is about communicating an assessment. Like all qualitative research, the method is not representative, but explorative. It identifies certain trends and novel perspectives, but does not indicate exactly how many hold these beliefs or share these experiences. Compared to a quantitative survey that can say something about the satisfaction of an (non-existent) average user, the montages deal in insight: to understand how things look and feel from another point of view. They can act as "eye-openers" – pose new questions and show people new perspectives on their social reality. In the pace-clinic case the montages gave you an idea of what it would feel like to live with a pacemaker. What you notice when you come to the clinic for a control. What you think. The staff heard the patients' honest perspectives and the format helped them to see the world through the patients' eyes and thereby to see themselves and their everyday routines in a new light. It made them aware of some of the conditions and practices they no longer noticed themselves and how some of the things they said could be perceived in a very different way than intended. Because it is engaging to hear the montages, the employees become more invested in trying to figure out what is behind the perspectives they are hearing. They feel a relation to the informants and become motivated to identify possible causes for any problems or issues.

Finally, using polyphonic sound montages in an organizational setting might facilitate an emancipatory project by giving a voice to users of an organizational service. The method is based on the basic premise that the organization is there to service its users and that they should be given a voice. It is a way of including their perspectives and using them as the starting point for re-organization. The montages can work as what Czarniawska (1999) calls "speaking platforms": "If rendering these voices to a wide audience is our goal, the way to go about it is to silence our own voices and to engage in the political activity of creating speaking platforms for those who are not heard" (p. 107). The employees have been gathered and are asked to devote their full attention to listening to the users who, in turn, have been given a chance to tell their side of the story at length to someone who is impartial.

Notes

1. www.youtube.com/watch?v=loxJ3FtCJJA
2. The method was developed in collaboration with the Danish cross-governmental innovation unit MindLab.

3. Just like a pacemaker the ICD is implanted under the patient's breast muscle. Simply put, the pacemaker assists a heart that is beating too slow whereas an ICD stops a heart from beating too fast. The ICD can ultimately administer a concentrated burst of electricity in order to "reset" the heart.
4. A term for both pacemaker and ICD.
5. In the pace-clinic project I eventually settled on five themes. These montages were shortened to about two minutes each.
6. Polyphony, here, is merely used in the sense "multiple voices."
7. Patients with ICDs have a transmitter in their home that sends data from their device to a database at the hospital that is checked by the staff at the pace-clinic.
8. An instance when the heart has been beating too fast is called an episode. These are not necessarily felt by the patient.

References

Bhaskar, R. (1975), *A Realist Theory of Science*, Routledge, London.

Bhaskar, R. (1979), *The Possibility of Naturalism*, Routledge, London.

Bhaskar, R. (1989), *Reclaiming Reality: A Critical Introduction to Contemporary Philosophy*, Verso, London.

Boswell, J. and Corbett, J. (2015), "Embracing impressionism: revealing the brush strokes of interpretive research", *Critical Policy Studies*, Vol. 9 No. 2, pp. 216-225.

Clifford, J. and Marcus, G. (1986), *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*, University of California Press, Berkeley.

Collins, J. (2006), "The genericity of montage: Derrida and Genre theory", in Dowd, G., Strong, J. and Stevenson, L. (Eds), *Genre Matters*, Intellect Books, Bristol, pp. 55-68.

Czarniawska, B. (1999), *Writing Management: Organization Theory as a Literary Genre*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, New York, NY.

Høgel, J.K. (2013), "Montage as analysis in ethnographic and documentary filmmaking: from hunting for plots towards weaving baskets of data", in Suhr, C. and Willerslev, R. (Eds), *Transcultural Montage*, Berghahn Books, New York, NY, pp. 213-225.

Holmes, D. and Marcus, G. (2005), "Cultures of expertise and the management of globalization: toward the re-functioning of ethnography", in Ong, A. and Collier, S.J. (Eds), *Global Assemblages: Technology, Politics, and Ethics as Anthropological Problems*, (1st ed.), Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 235-252.

Kotter, J.P. and Cohen, D.S. (2002), *The Heart of Change: Real-life Stories of How People Change Their Organizations*, Harvard Business Press, Boston.

Marcus, G. (1992), "Past, present and emergent identities: requirements for ethnographies of late twentieth-century modernity worldwide", in Lash, S. and Friedman, J. (Eds), *Modernity and Identity*, Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 309-330.

Marcus, G.E. (1990), "The modernist sensibility in recent ethnographic writing and the cinematic metaphor of montage", *SVA Review*, Vol. 6 No. 1, pp. 2-12.

Marcus, G.E. and Fischer, M.M.J. (1986), *Anthropology as Cultural Critique: An Experimental Moment in the Human Sciences*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.

Meinert, L., Obika, J.A. and Whyte, S.R. (2014), "Crafting forgiveness accounts after war: editing for effect in northern Uganda", *Anthropology Today*, Vol. 30 No. 4, pp. 10-14.

Porter, S. (2002), "Critical realist ethnography", in May, T. (Ed.), *Qualitative Research in Action*, Sage, London, pp. 53-72.

Salamon, K.L. (2013), "Mind the gap", in Suhr, C. and Willerslev, R. (Eds), *Transcultural Montage*, Berghahn Books, pp. 145-158.

Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. (1998), *Basics of Qualitative Research*, Sage Publications, London.

Suhr, C. and Willerslev, R. (2013), *Transcultural Montage*, Berghahn Books, New York, NY.

Tanggaard, L. and Brinkmann, S. (2010), *Kvalitative Metoder*, Hans Reitzels Forlag, København.

Yannow, D. (2012), "Organizational ethnography between world-making and toolbox", *Journal of Organizational Ethnography*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 31-42.

Further reading

Glass, I. (2007), "Ira Glass on storytelling, part 1 of 4", Public Radio International, Youtube.com, August 18 available at: www.youtube.com/watch?v=loxJ3FtCJJA (accessed September 18, 2015).

Corresponding author
Morten Arnfred can be contacted at: mail.mortenarnfred@gmail.com