

Ehn, Billy. (2011). **Doing-it-yourself : autoethnography of manual work.**
I: *Ethnologia Europaea*, 41(1), 53–63

Autoethnography is a method for cultural research where you are using your own experiences, as a starting point or as examples of more general conditions. You are both the subject and the object of observation. Recently I tried a variant of this method in a Do-It-Yourself project, writing field-notes while working as a home fixer with hammer, screw driver and other tools. I found it rather tricky to describe manual work with regard to both body and mind. I also reflected on some differences and similarities between writing and DIY. The purpose of self-narrative experiments like this is to improve fieldwork and cultural analysis. By practicing autoethnography you may learn more about the research process and become more conscious of what is going on when you are doing observations and interpreting them.

Keywords: autoethnography, non-verbal experience, observation, reflexivity, self-narratives, working knowledge

Writing this, I'm sitting in the living-room sofa at home, with the laptop on my knee. This is my usual working position in the mornings, especially during summers and week-ends. After some hours I leave my corner in the sofa and with a joyful smile enter the carpenter's shed, a small house I have built for my tools. I change clothes and get ready for today's pursuit as a home improver.

My wife and I live by the sea in two old houses, which late in life have made me a rather accomplished Do-It-Yourself (DIY) man, performing manual work of different kinds. Before we bought the houses thirteen years ago I didn't carry out almost any home fixing (cleaning, cooking and other household tasks left out of account) at all, if I wasn't forced to. And if that happened, I was all fingers and hands.

Now I love to build, improve, repair, modify, paint, dig and do plumbing tasks and even some electrical wiring. In the process I have learnt some of the carpenter's tricks and vocabulary, how to install water pipes and how to find the right things at building markets and timber yards. I have become an enthusiastic part of a widely spread and growing DIY culture.¹

Autoethnography

Switching between writing and manual work can be experienced as moving between two separate realities, where body and mind are used in different ways. Sitting quietly in the sofa seems to be rather different from labouring hard with the whole body. I feel as becoming

somebody else in working-clothes with a tool in my hand. However, in my role change I also experience a happy seamless rhythm.

The alteration between making things, making text and making me in DIY is one topic of this paper. Another one is the use and value of autoethnography as a research method. Whether we are aware of it or not, most cultural analysis means that you use yourself as both a research tool and source of information. Norman K. Denzin (1997: 227), among others, has described autoethnography as “a turning of the ethnographic gaze inward on the self (auto), while maintaining the outward gaze of ethnography, looking at the larger context wherein self-experiences occur”. The ethnographer is treated as simultaneously the subject and the object of observation. Although there is a considerable literature about this method (see for example Reed-Danahay 1997, Frykman & Gilje 2003, Etherington 2004, Meneley & Young 2005, Anderson 2006, Chang 2008 and Muncey 2010), I look for a more detailed discussion of what it means to use it and what kind of knowledge it might produce.

Over the years autoethnography has become a favourite entrance into research for me and some other ethnologists. A recent example of this is a study of waiting, routines and daydreaming that I carried out together with Orvar Löfgren. We wanted to explore “the secret world of doing nothing” (Ehn & Löfgren 2010), looking at activities people often were not aware of or found it hard to verbalize. We soon realized that we ought to use our own experiences as starting points for the ethnographic work. For example, what is going on when I stand in a queue at the supermarket or when I daydream during a train-journey? In a sense the whole book became a dialogue between our experiences and those of other people.

Observing and writing about myself as a DIY'er has inspired me to think more about the importance of the researcher's self in all ethnography and cultural analysis. Participant observation and interviewing are not the only instances where the researcher has to think about the influence of his or her personal presence. Reflexivity has almost become a sine qua non in all social and cultural research, at least in a programmatic way (see for example Davies 1999 and Etherington 2004).

When studying social life on the whole we more or less use ourselves to portray and understand various phenomena, but often without really taking self into fair consideration. An explicit discussion of autoethnography and self-narratives should make us more conscious of the subjective aspects of research. How do our own experiences, interests and emotional life affect the interpretations of other people and their behaviour? By writing about my home fixing I want to raise some more general questions about how to describe ethnographically thoughts and feelings in bodily action.

Describing “non-verbal experience”

Until now I haven't reflected much about my DIY-activities, at least not from a reflexive point of view. They have, at once being leisure and work, been fun to do, although often rather demanding. I experience them as a relaxation from the sedentary academic duties, as an expansion of my practical competence, and as a strengthening of my masculine identity in a stereotypical way.² But DIY shows to be even more complex than that, when you look closer and try to understand what is going on.

For example, how do you describe manual work and skills based on what is called non-verbal experience? As Jonas Frykman (1990: 50) and others have emphasized, the “silent knowledge” in people's lives cannot be transformed into text without losing important dimensions. How can we study something that is intangible and invisible? Words appear to be insufficient.

Accomplishing DIY-projects you need to acquire a tacit knowledge that seems to reside in your body, as when you hit the nail with a hammer or choose the appropriate bits for the power screwdriver. You have to think ahead and plan your work; you have to know what a circular saw is and how to use it, but you also do a lot of things without thinking consciously.

It is this tension or cooperation between hand and brain I have got curious about. Now, when I swing the hammer or start the power saw, I'm also looking at myself doing that, wondering about it.³ But when trying to reconstruct the processes of my different projects it is easier to tell *what* I did, than *how* I did it. The gulf between words and actions is a constant challenge when writing about manual tasks.

Do it by feel

In the same way as I move between writing on the laptop and DIY, I switch between thinking with tools and bodily movements, depending on the senses and tacit routines. How do you account for such oscillations, without necessarily becoming poetic like Gaston Bachelard (1948) or hyper technical like a manual?

One way is to do as the sociologist Douglas Harper (1987). During three years he observed, interviewed and took a lot of photos of Willie, an all-around craftsman that among other things had specialized in repairing old Saabs. Endless and very detailed descriptions of Willie's projects, in his own words and explained by Harper, give profound knowledge of this man's working knowledge, what he thought and actually did when repairing, grinding and welding. In twenty pages you get to know exactly how he built a stove door, after that how he

redesigned a door handle, and so on. Still, many of these descriptions are hard to follow, since they are rather technical, as in this extract from when Willie disassembles a Saab transmission:

When you reassemble it, you've got shim washers at the end of the shafts to make sure your bearings are seated right. Then your pinion shaft has a shim to make sure it sits out in the right position to hit the ring gear. It's a little more technical when you go putting them back together than it is taking them apart. Those gears have to all match up and run true. I do it by feel. (Harper 1987: 124)

When I try to tell about my tackling with tools and building materials it is sometimes tempting to say, like Willie, I do it by feel. Other times the things seem to become animated in their resistance or will to co-operate.⁴ What do I and other DIY-people do, think, feel and imagine when working? How are we learning to use appropriate tools and to solve practical problems of different kinds?

Writing DIY: three versions

Searching answers to those questions I shall try different ways of describing a project, based on my own experience. Among all possible cases, let me choose a rather small one: making duckboards for the shower floor. How many ways of portraying this work process are there? Here I have been inspired by two examples. In his book *Exercises in Style* the French author Raymond Queneau (1979) has written 99 retellings of the same story, each in a different style. In *A Thrice-Told Tale* the anthropologist Margery Wolf (1992) uses three texts developed out of her research in Taiwan—a piece of fiction, anthropological field notes, and a social science article—to explore the same set of events.⁵ Like Wolf I shall write three types of small accounts about the making of duckboards: one specific, one informal and one of a more academic kind. How does the choice of style influence my way of thinking about this activity?

1.

At the timber yard they proposed a water-repellent wood called Cumaro or “Brazilian teak”, but it was rather expensive. My wife asked if I couldn't use some of the spruce wood I already had in the store. Of course these duckboards should not last as long as more water hardy material, but then I could just make new ones.

First I had to measure the floor in the bathroom with the folding rule. The area under the shower was 930 x 800 mm and I decided to make the bars 50 mm broad. Because then I could

use boards that are 22 x 150 mm and make three lengths out of each with the circular saw. I fetched some boards that were planed on the one side and laid them on a saw stand.

I made thirteen bars 50 mm broad and 910 mm in length. I also made four strips of the same wood to keep the bars together underneath. I filed and sandpapered the bars before fastening them with screws on the strips with 15 mm broad openings. In the middle I used the compass saw to make a hole for the washing machine hose (which we take away when the machine is off). The final task was to oil the duckboards several times.

2.

Without any do-it-yourself projects George gets restless. When he had finished glazing the large veranda and making the guest-house fit for winter living there seemed to be nothing more to do. He felt empty and shilly-shally. Luckily his wife found out that they needed new duckboards for the shower floor in the big house. Couldn't you make them, she proposed, seeing him suffer, and he immediately turned on to this idea.

As usual when doing carpentry George didn't take notice of the time. With sweat in his eyes this sunny Saturday he was in a flow of pleasure, having his heart in the work and being occupied by interesting troubleshooting. There was a repeated change between meditative states and more dramatic moments, when all his senses were in suspense. He felt like a moving and thinking part of the tools in his hands. Some of them, as the power screwdriver, pieces of ironworks and the water-level, were close friends helping him solving tricky problems. He was proud of mastering them on different materials, something he had learned late in life, partly by observing his father-in-law in action.

It was both a serious and a playful task to make duckboards. The roaring circular saw ploughed through the boards, the power screwdriver whirled dancing screws one by one down through the solid wood, and the sawdust filled the air like stinging insects. The sky was blue and the radio played Mozart. This radio, another essential device in George's DIY-universe, was always on while he worked, attaching the experience of materials, tools and bodywork with a special piece of music or with somebody talking.

It was a perfect day for outdoor work. The wind was sighing in the trees. The waves from the sea below the houses rolled calmly against the beach. Bent over the saw stand in his working-clothes George felt like being a unity of body and mind, using the tools like musical instruments, not thinking of anything else than how to make fine duckboards, totally immersed in the project.

The hands knew what to do, although his fine motor ability was not always perfect. He dropped things and fumbled with screws. Sometimes he was in a too great hurry, making errors that made him smile embarrassedly, relieved that no one else had seen them. You have to think before you start, he reproached himself. Sometimes he used this internal monologue to remind him of what to do next. But mostly the inner voice was silent and then he was all eyes and body.

When the duckboards were completed George showed the little masterpiece to his wife. She was very satisfied and exclaimed as she usually did when he had accomplished a DIY-task: “Oh, how clever you are, George!” He was pleased of course, but soon the feeling of emptiness returned. What to do now? He entered the carpenter’s shed and looked urgently at the tools, as if they could suggest a new project.

3.

Studying DIY, for example somebody making duckboards for the bathroom, you realize that this is a social and cultural activity, even if you work alone. It is symbolically constructed, learned and communicated. It is permeated by history, ideas and values. In my case I discussed the project with my wife. When I started the circular saw to cut the wood in suitable lengths I was reminded of her father, who has been my personal teacher in doing carpentry, himself also being an autodidact. It was he who showed me how to “let the hammer do the work”, by holding it right out on the handle, instead of in the middle. It was also he that opened my eyes for the potential usefulness of so called junk, all these things and materials that are hoarded up in the backyard or the cellar. I was close on his heels when he went there to hunt for a piece of metal or a tube with the right dimension. In fact, being a self-taught person often means that you in this way have learnt a lot from others by watching them working.

My father-in law has also provided me with the circular saw and other instruments that he no longer needs. These things are of course necessary for my DIY projects. But moreover they have other meanings that are not always evident when using them. Besides containing ready-made answers to practical problems, they have involved you in different kinds of transactions, since you have bought them somewhere or received them from somebody. As Elizabeth Shove et al. (2007: 52) have observed in a study of DIY’ers, they reveal personal histories of inheritance, exchange, gift-giving and attachment. They have a history connected to finished or unsuccessful projects and to situations when they have been broken or when somebody else has borrowed them.

The tools require that you learn how to use them. This competence is at once embedded in humans *and* in things (Shove et al. 2007: 56). The combination of a person and a tool constitutes a human-non-human hybrid. In this dynamic skills and experience develop through using different things. With a hammer or a power drill you have other capabilities for engaging with reality than without.⁶

Another aspect of tools is their ability to communicate: when you hammer or start the circular saw, other people hear or see what you are doing. For example, when I made the duckboards my wife and a couple of friends watched me now and then from the veranda, where they were drinking coffee. When the circular saw got stuck and then jumped backwards, one of the friends noticed that; afterwards he told me it had looked dangerously.

Then we also have the aesthetics. When I filed and sanded the bars and the strips, I wanted the surface to be soft and smooth mainly for my wife and others who shall stand on them in the shower. Many carpentry projects are in the same way guided by care for other people. The result shall be nice to look at, it shall work well, and it shall protect against cold and winds. The question of aesthetics is often as crucial as the question of function. Even if no one else should notice my errors or my dirty and quick solutions, I may spend many hours redoing the work, because I want it to be as perfect as possible. Sometimes you have to create optical illusions to hide irreparable errors. The look of the completed work, in this case the duckboards, becomes a mark of the identity as (an amateur) carpenter.

Working knowledge

These three ways of telling the story about the coming into being of duckboards demonstrate different kinds of working knowledge. The first version is like a manual, you can use it for making duckboards yourself. In its exactness it is also a kind of bragging about my new technical competence. The second account allows me to write about emotions and sensuality that are involved in working with your hands. I use an alter ego to tell about this multisensory experience. The third text is very much like the rest of this paper, using analytical concepts, generalizing and referring to other researchers. This means that you observe and think about other things when you intend to describe exactly how duckboards are made, than when you use empathy to tell a story of a DIY'er in action or when you analyze him from a distance.

Most of all I enjoyed to write about George. I was free to tell what he felt and thought, as if I could read his mind. I really didn't make up anything, but followed my memory and imagination when choosing words and metaphors, picturing the situation rather than only using controllable facts. Writing the story⁷ helped me to see the inner life of DIY. But when I

continued the paper I left George and returned to the more conventional style of the third version, trying to sum up my main thoughts, as an ethnologist, about DIY: the involvement, intimacy, intelligence and sensuality that are brought to the fore when trying to solve practical problems.

Involvement. Using autoethnography as a starting point, I think I have a lot in common with other DIY'ers of both sexes. In the work process we are consciously more or less present and involved. We are planning our work, but also dreaming and fantasizing about it. Mostly we are very concentrated as the tasks implicate different kinds of troubleshooting, where you have to think and measure carefully. For my part, the work means a lot of staring and figuring out how to do. You can often see me just standing immovable in front of a wall or a piece of wood, gazing intensively at it.

The topic of concentration is a reminder of the significant difference between learning and routine, doing something the first time and doing it again, the second, third, fourth time, and so on. The first time you are as a beginner insecure, you don't know if you are doing the right things and if the result will be good enough. You must think and think again, and perhaps ask someone who is more experienced. This learning process is rather exciting, like an adventure. However, the thirteenth time I made a bar for the duckboards I hadn't to think very hard. It felt like it made itself. And now it wasn't exciting anymore.

When something becomes a routine the autopilot is often switched on and you can let the mind wander. But not always; for example, when I'm felling trees with the power saw I don't consciously think about anything else, even if I have done that job many times before. The danger makes you being very attentive. Besides, for most DIY'ers there is not much space for routines; as beginners we most often have to be one-hundred-per-cent focused on our tasks.

Intimacy. Absorbed by the work you get physically close to the materials. In this intimacy you use your senses and also feel the strains of heavy labour. Wounds, scars and swellings on your body are signs of the painful moments of DIY. Especially when you get tired it's easy to be clumsy and make errors, which are the most usual product of the beginner's efforts. They force you to concentrate still harder and sometimes even, as I have mentioned, to pull down what you have built and redo it. The manual work is therefore often emotionally charged. Like George, I feel happy and proud when I succeed. When I fail and the result is all but perfect I get angry at myself, frustrated and disappointed.

Intelligence. The importance of thinking when doing carpentry and other manual tasks should be obvious. However, the intellectual skills that physical labour requires are generally

underestimated. Observing teachers and students in vocational training, Mike Rose (2004) noted the mental processes of carpentry and plumbing, for example the mathematics involved in cabinet assembly. He portrays the choreography of hand, eye, ear and brain, and writes about finished products as “materialized thoughts”. The ever presence of abstraction, planning, and problem solving in everyday work is described as a complex cybernetic system, information flowing back and forth in action (Rose 2004: 79).

In spite of the “silent knowledge” the reality of manual work, for both professionals and DIY’ers, is linguistically and intellectually organized, something that Douglas Harper and Mike Rose eloquently has shown in their books. You have to learn a vocabulary and a symbol system for carpentry, plumbing and electrical work. The skills of craftsmen like Willie are exhaustively verbalized by themselves, but also, for example, in lots of hand-books and instruction films.

Sensuality. When doing work on the wall, the pipes or the roof, you are immersed in bodily activities that are as well about your senses as about words.⁸ Although feelings and sensual experiences seldom are mentioned in DIY-manuals, every amateur carpenter knows how important they are. I’m looking, listening, touching and smelling to know what to do. I’m balancing on the ladder, crawling on the floor, kneeling and lying on my back, using parts of the body as tentacles. I’m measuring by eye and stroking surfaces with my hands. I’m adjusting my stance and motion via the tactile feedback I get from tools and materials. This haptic dimension of manual work means that you “see” with your hands and feet. By touching things you learn what to do next. The fingers become an “extended gaze” (Ehnmark 2002: 27).

Returning to Jonas Frykman’s thoughts about “what people do, but seldom say”, I now have to do an about turn. In spite of the intellectual capacity it takes to do manual work, it might perhaps sometimes be better to show what and how you are doing, than to tell about it. Many of the skills I need and use in DIY are in fact not very suitable to talk or write about. They are certainly possible to describe, but it would be as futile as teaching someone only with words how to bike, swim, dance, sail or to drive a car. Instead you just have to learn by doing. Then you do it “by feel”, as Willie said.

So, while the circular saw is roaring, there is silence (---) around how to master it. Both doing practical things and communicating that in written words are about conscious or unconscious selection. It’s about choosing words and materials, testing sentences and solutions, drilling, filing and planing, cutting out and redoing. This means that in the three stories about the duckboards I have omitted several pieces of information that I certainly need to know as

an amateur carpenter, but that the reader doesn't have to know to follow my line of argument, for example the exact movements of screwing, sawing, sandpapering, and oiling. These are movements that the hand "knows" how to do.

Smooth transitions

Thinking further about the switching between writing and manual work, I now see both differences and similarities. Unlike building duckboards, where I pretty much knew before I started what the product would look like, picturing it in my mind, I didn't know at all in advance what this paper should contain – rather, it is now a completely different text compared to the first draft. And unlike DIY, writing a paper (for me) means writing several versions, deleting sentences and whole paragraphs, changing words, arguments and even ideas. Making duckboards I knew very well what the point was: I saw it clearly, there it was, ready to be used, as it was intended. When writing I have to discover the point, since it rarely is evident. There is more room for surprises when the reader takes over, than when one places oneself on the duckboards.

As a carpenter you develop a sense of anticipation. You think ahead and visualize where you will end up, what you will do next, and next after that. When I write, I first put together words to see what I'm thinking, and then I continue writing. If I have any anticipation at all of where I will end up, it mostly proves to be wrong. The new version beats the old.

I almost always write something else than I planned – and that is a blessing. It is the longing for discoveries that keeps me writing. Certainly I "build" and "repair" my text, but without understanding much about the process. I feel have very little command of my thinking, compared to my recently acquired DIY-expertise. It's the composition of words into sentences I master, if anything, pressing the right keys with my index fingers.

The building of a house may of course also implicate a lot of changes and modifications, but it's a more linear process – notwithstanding all small and big errors, nasty surprises and all that goes awry. However, in spite of what I just have said, Elizabeth Shove et al. (2007: 61) believe there can be few DIY'ers who have completed a major project in exactly the way they anticipated, having gone through only the processes envisaged and used only the tools and materials they thought they would need. In that way it once more resembles writing.

But even if DIY is almost inherently explorative, you don't suddenly decide to use bricks instead of wood for the walls. You may choose between screws and nails, but preferably you don't hit the nail with a screwdriver. You don't start intending to make

duckboards and end up with a firewood bin. And, again, it's easier to visualize the planned project. In DIY there are ready-made answers, but not in writing. Writing can take you almost anywhere, where it is even quite possible to hit metaphorical nails with a metaphorical screwdriver, especially when doing licentious ethnography.

In spite of the differences between DIY and writing, there have lately been rather smooth transitions for me between intellectual and manual work, between thought and accomplishment, between hunch and undertaking. You just rise from the sofa and the laptop, walk a few steps, change clothes, grab hold of your tools and start making things. Then you try to think of what you are doing while doing it, writing down ideas in a notebook as they are emerging and later on transforming them to readable text in the computer.

This kind of DIY autoethnography, besides being enjoyable, at least to myself, also has the advantage of being doubly productive; you manufacture lasting things with your hands as well as producing ideas (also with the help of your hands) about your own and other home-fixers' activities. Thinking, writing and performing manual tasks become deeds that correspond with each others. If the paper wouldn't become good enough, you still have made duckboards that are nice to stand on while taking a shower.

Conclusion

Writing about DIY has influenced both my home fixing and my research. As an amateur carpenter I've become more reflexive and as an ethnographer more near-sighted, producing research material by interacting with tools and materials, rather than with other people. Hitting the nail with the hammer I now listen to the echoing sound, consciously sensing the movement and the blow in my hand and arm, but also looking curiously at myself from a distance or recording the interior monologue.

Once in a while I catch me mumbling phrases from this paper. I climb on to the roof to mend the rain gutter, thinking loudly: "Climbing the ladder for reaching higher is a multisensory experience." Yes, indeed it is and now it's time for George to return. He perceives the cold steel and hears the ringing sound of it swinging and scraping against the wall. Carefully he is feeling his way on the steps with hands and feet, balancing in a fear of falling. At the same time he is excited by being high up in the air. As usual the radio is on, creating a special soundscape.

Using George as an alter ego has helped me to become a more licentious ethnographer. Being an acting subject as well as an observed person, body and mind intertwined, I have tried to capture complex bodily micro-events in words, using different styles of writing. What

remains is to reflect on what one might learn from this piece of joint intellectual and practical work.

It has certainly been fun to tell stories about how to make duckboards, but the purpose of this paper is of course not only that. Neither do I want to take the opportunity to promote autoethnography as a superior research method or style of writing. Like Martyn Hammersley and Paul Atkinson (2007: 204) I would rather keep a proper balance “between a totally impersonal authorial style that elides the agency of the observer-author and an exaggeratedly literary form in which the author seems more important than the rest of the social world”. And I also want to avoid, or at least be conscious of, the pitfalls of autoethnography that Heewon Chang (2008: 54 ff.) warns about: self-indulgent introspection, over-relying on personal memory, and elaborate narratives with underdeveloped cultural analysis.

Instead, the aim is to figure out how this way of doing research may contribute to a development of ethnographic practice in general. How can you use autoethnographic and self-narrative experiments to improve fieldwork and writing? Thinking about this task six main ideas come to my mind.

Irregularity. The first is that all ethnography may be seen as a kind of DIY-project. You are using yourself, your body, mind and personality, not only scientific methods, to produce knowledge. In this process you are learning by doing through trials and errors, as when you learn how to fix things at home. All the time you have to ask if your way of producing materials and ideas is working. Are the field notes good enough for your purposes? Is the analysis well thought-out? Are the interpretations interesting?

You can never be sure of how to accomplish these undertakings in the right way since there are very few solid rules to guide research. Therefore you must do a lot of experimenting along the way. In fact, you could say that standard ethnography is characterized by irregularity. Everybody that has done fieldwork and written about it knows that. Still it has to be repeated, because it is easy to forget all the mess before the book or article is finished. There may also be a wish to conceal it in order to present a more systematic picture of the research process. Then, even the professional ethnographer feel as a DIY'er when in field, trying to understand what is going on.

Oscillation. Second, the practice of ethnography may be described as a continuous oscillation between observation, listening, thinking, interpreting, writing, reading, sensing, discovering, and new observations. In this heavy intellectual and sensory traffic the researcher confronts a mix of frustration, joy and new energy. This means you have to prepare yourself for such emotional turns to have the courage to finish the fieldwork, continue to write and

finally present a text for critical readers. My experience is that autoethnography is a good way to practice the crisscrossing between feelings and reflections and make you a more sensitive fieldworker.

Oblivion. Third, I think ethnography partly is research in disguise, however open and honest you want to be for ethical reasons. This applies even to autoethnography, oddly enough. When making duckboards I was not all the time conscious of being observed, in spite of being this observer myself. In fact, many times I forgot that I was a research object, being immersed in my role as a carpenter. It was not until afterwards I became intellectually aware of what had been going on. Therefore we can be rather sure of that other people yet more easily overlook that they are targets for ethnographic research. Sometimes even the fieldworker does the same and instead sees them as a more or less nice company.

Oblivion is then one of the conditions of fieldwork – as well, of course, as the momentary full attention of the ethnographic observer and listener. The question is what to do with this absent-mindedness. Is it possible to get something out of these instants that you didn't define as research material? As an autoethnographer you can try to remember later on what you did and experienced when you were totally concentrated on a special task, for example on managing the power saw. It may be exciting to discover what happened at the same time as the tree was falling. What did you perceive half consciously? By being more attentive to your own mind wanderings you could develop a split vision competence.

Bias. Fourth, studying my own manual labour, I have rather bad control of the bias in the observations and interpretations resulting from my positions as an elderly, heterosexual, white, privileged, academic male. These are only a few of all potential social and cultural elements that influence the experience and representations of my carpentry. Nowadays it's common to hear that all social and cultural research, for better or worse, is predisposed in some way or other. Without bias, here broadly defined as interest and commitment, you perhaps cannot ask meaningful questions or look enquiringly at the world. Are there really any notions at all concerning human relations that are not preconceived?

Subjectivity should therefore not necessarily be seen as a threat to ethnographic detachment. Instead you should transform it to an analytic resource, by treating it in the same way as other people's subjective experiences. This means that the ethnographer will reflect on her or his fieldwork as a co-production together with those being studied, being a special part of the ongoing interaction.

Exercises. Fifth, I think that autoethnography is a good way of exercising observation and interpretation, without disturbing other people. It's a helpful technique to learn more

about the complexity of doing fieldwork. You will also get to know more about how the research material is produced in situ.

In these exercises you will moreover have the time and opportunity to experiment with different ways of looking, listening and writing. For example, what happens if I write about my actions without mentioning anything about thoughts and feelings? What if you look at the present from a historic point of view? What would a sensory ethnography of DIY look like, also taking account of smells, tastes and touches? These are only a few of all possible autoethnographic try-outs.

In academic education autoethnographic exercises prove to be an effective way to teach students how to do cultural research, using their senses. When they return from their first fieldworks, for example observing social life in a department store or a railway station, or describing their own family's celebration of Christmas, they are often excited by their new ability to see or hear or smell something else than before at places and in situations they thought they were familiar with. Performing observations and writing field notes makes them more attentive to how strange ordinary everyday life may appear, depending on how you look at it. It is one thing to read about this discovery, quite another to experience it yourself.

Imagination. Finally, still you cannot simply transfer this method into conventional research of social behaviour. Introspection or watching yourself is something else than observing other people. As an autoethnographer, studying your own experiences, you have for sure a privileged access to the thoughts and feelings of the observed person. In theory, you ought to be a good informant about yourself. Regarding other people you mostly have to imagine what they are up to.

However, my efforts to be an object of autoethnographic observation only partly succeeded, as I hinted above. It turned out that I was not always a reliable witness of my own actions. A haze of unconsciousness, blurred feelings and silent knowledge made me sometimes a secret to myself. Even now I had to guess. When studying other people, your basic assumption should therefore be that you *never* know what they really are thinking and feeling, whatever they tell you. You can only get some biased knowledge about what they say and do through observing and listening to them carefully, always in doubt about what they mean. In this endeavour imagination and empathy are indispensable research assets.

Doing good ethnography simply means to use all conceivable kinds of materials and to analyse them, for example, from a cultural point of view. Doing autoethnography – of DIY or anything – is a means for those purposes. It may be, as in writing this paper, a way to study how you learn to manage tools for practical purposes, how you carry out ideas in manual

work or what it means to switch between intellectual and bodily activities. After that, of course, you have to broaden your perspective and put your personal experiences in a larger social context.

But right now I close the laptop and leave the sofa, eagerly aiming at my carpenter's shed and all the waiting tools. It's time to make new staircase banisters.

Notes

¹ DIY, as home fixing, is a mass movement in the Western world, involving a majority of men and supported by a lot of handbooks, magazines, TV-programs, and by the Internet. See Goldstein (1998) for a historic perspective.

² The gendering of DIY is of course an important issue. Places like the garage, the workshop and the carpenter's shed have been described as men's special hide-outs, where they are protected against other, less satisfying, demands, and yet respond to the expectation that men should play a more active role in the home (Twitchell 2006). See also the discussions in Gelber (1997) and Schweder (2003). Moreover, in media the home fixer mostly is presented as a masculine person. If I had devoted myself to classic female dominated DIY-activities as knitting, sewing, weaving or lace-making, I think I would have experienced myself – and been regarded by other people – in a different way.

³ See Ingold et al. (2008) that have studied the art of walking by walking in different places and ways.

⁴ For a discussion of magical-mythical thinking about material objects, see Verrips (1994).

⁵ In a similar way Heewon Chang (2008: 143ff) mentions four different styles of writing "self-narratives": descriptive-realistic, confessional-emotive, analytical-interpretive, and imaginative-creative.

⁶ In recent years the theoretical discussion about materiality has become intensified. A lot of cultural researchers have been inspired by Bruno Latour's and others' ideas about things as "actants" in networks of human and material interaction (see, for example, Frykman 2006, Damsholt et al. 2009, Miller 2009).

⁷ There are a lot of other autoethnographies using subjective/literary forms of writing, see for example Bochner & Ellis (2002).

⁸ For an introduction to "sensory ethnography", see Pink (2009).

References

- Anderson, Leon, 2006. Analytic Autoethnography. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, Vol. 35, No. 4: 373-395.
- Bachelard, Gaston 1948/2002: *Earth and the Reveries of Will*. Dallas: Dallas Institute of Publications.

-
- Bochner, Arthur P. & Carolyn Ellis (eds.) 2002: *Ethnographically Speaking. Autoethnography, Literature, and Aesthetics*. Walnut Creek, Calif.: Altamira Press
- Chang, Heewon 2008: *Autoethnography as Method*. Walnut Creek, Calif.: Left Coast Press.
- Damsholt, Tine, Dorthe Gert Simonsen & Camilla Mordhorst 2009: *Materialiseringer. Nye perspektiver på materialitet och kulturanalyse*. (Materializations. New perspectives on materiality and cultural analysis.) Aarhus: Aarhus Universitetsforlag.
- Davies, Charlotte Aull 1999: *Reflexive Ethnography. A Guide to Researching Self and Others*. London: Routledge.
- Denzin, Norman K. 1997: *Interpretive Ethnography. Ethnographic Practices for the 21st Century*. London: SAGE.
- Ehn, Billy & Orvar Löfgren 2010: *The Secret World of Doing Nothing*. Berkeley, Cal.: University of California Press.
- Ehnmark, Anders 2002: Morfars yxa. (Grandpa's axe.) In: Aaase, Maja et al. *Medan handen arbetar vidgas blicken*. (While the hand works, the gaze is extended.) Stockholm: Bromberg.
- Etherington, Kim 2004: *Becoming a Reflexive Researcher. Using Our Selves in Research*. London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Frykman, Jonas 1990: What People Do, But Seldom Say. *Ethnologia Scandinavica*, Vol. 20: 50-62.
- Frykman, Jonas 2006: Ting som redskap. (Things as tools.) *RIG*, nr 2: 65-77.
- Frykman, Jonas & Nils Gilje (eds.) 2003: *Being There. New Perspectives on Phenomenology and the Analysis of Culture*. Lund: Nordic Academic Press.
- Gelber, Steven M. 1997: Do-It-Yourself: Constructing, Repairing and Maintaining Domestic Masculinity. *American Quarterly*, 49 (I): 66-112.
- Goldstein, Carolyn M. 1998: *Do It Yourself. Home Improvement in 20th-Century America*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press.
- Hammersley, Martyn & Paul Atkinson 2007: *Ethnography. Principles in Practice*. London: Routledge.
- Harper, Douglas 1987: *Working Knowledge. Skill and Community in a Small Shop*. Chicago: The University of Chicago.
- Ingold, Tim & Jo Lee Vergunst (eds.) 2008: *Ways of Walking. Ethnography and Practice on Foot*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Meneley, Anna & Donna Jean Young 2005: *Auto-Ethnographies. The Anthropology of*

-
- Academic Practices*. Peterborough, Ont.; Broadview Press
- Miller, Daniel 2008: *The Comfort of Things*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Muncey, Tessa 2010: *Creating Autoethnographies*. London: SAGE.
- Pink, Sarah 2009: *Doing Sensory Ethnography*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Queneau, Raymond 1979 (1947): *Exercises in Style*. London: John Calder.
- Reed-Danahay, Deborah E. (ed.) 1997: *Auto/Ethnography. Rewriting the Self and the Social*. Oxford: Berg.
- Rose, Mike 2004: *The Mind at Work. Valuing the Intelligence of the American Worker*. London: Penguin Books.
- Schweder, Richard A. 2003: *Why Do Men Barbecue? Recipes for Cultural Psychology*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Shove, Elizabeth, Matthew Watson, Martin Hand & Jack Ingram 2007: *The Design of Everyday Life*. New York: Berg.
- Twitchell, James B. & Ken Ross 2006: *Where Men Hide*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Verrips, Jojada 1994: The Thing Didn't 'Do' What I Wanted. Some Notes on Modern Forms of Animism in Western Societies. In: Verrips, Jojada (ed.), *Transactions. Essays in Honour of Jeremy F. Boissevain*. Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis.
- Wolf, Margery 1992: *A Thrice-Told Tale. Feminism, Postmodernism, and Ethnographic Responsibility*. Stanford, Cal.: Stanford University Press.

Billy Ehn is professor of ethnology at Umeå University. Among his recent publications are *The Secret World of Doing Nothing* (2010, with Orvar Löfgren) and *Etnografiska observationer* (2009, with Gösta Arvastson). He has practiced various kinds of autoethnography, more or less consciously, in several fieldworks since the 1970's, for example as a worker in a factory and as a child minder at different day care centres. He has also written a self-biography, which is slightly influenced by his ethnographic interests.