Pegem Journal of Education and Instruction, Vol. 16, No. 1, 2026 (pp. 3046-3061)
RESEARCH ARTICLE WWW.PEGEGOG.NET

Digital Ethnography as a Foundational Paradigm: A Sociological Reading of Cultural Practices and Technological Agency in Cyberspace

Lilia Bouranda

Department of Media and Communication Studies , University of Ouargla, Algeria
Email: Bouranda.lilia@univ-ouargla.dz
Received : 21/09/2025 ; Accepted : 23/03/2026 ; Published : 15/05/2026

Abstract

This article examines the epistemological potential of the ethnographic method as an indispensable analytical paradigm for audience and user studies in the digital age. Its central aim is to move beyond the cognitive limitations and reductive positivism inherent in purely quantitative methodologies. Grounded in a theoretically rigorous synthesis of Practice Theory and Actor-Network Theory (ANT), the study advances the argument that sustained field immersion within the naturalistic contexts of digital action represents the most effective mechanism for decoding tacit cultural practices and uncovering the latent needs that govern the human–technology relationship.

The article maps a range of contemporary methodological adaptations—most notably Rapid Ethnography and Digital Ethnography—foregrounding their distinctive capacity to reconcile the anthropological depth of "thick description" with the accelerating demands of modern industrial and digital environments. Drawing on an applied analytical model that traces how media audiences negotiate algorithmic systems and construct digital media consumption cultures, the study argues that ethnography transcends its conventional function as a tool for technical design optimisation, emerging instead as a strategic and critical framework capable of addressing complex ethical dilemmas. These include the detection of algorithmic bias, the exposure of filter bubbles and echo chambers, and the delineation of privacy boundaries within cyberspace. In so doing, the research positions ethnography as a cornerstone of a foundational methodology equipped to comprehend the multifaceted complexities of the contemporary digital landscape and to reconceptualise the very notion of technological agency.

Keywords: Digital Ethnography; Algorithmic Culture; Technological Agency; Filter Bubbles; Echo Chambers; Netnography; Digital Media Ethics

1. Introduction

The rapid and far-reaching transformations reshaping contemporary cyberspaces pose an acute epistemological and methodological challenge to researchers across the humanities and social sciences. Neither conventional observational instruments nor the raw torrent of quantitative big data are, in themselves, sufficient to capture and decode the full complexity of digital human behaviour and its cultural expressions. Within this broader methodological uncertainty, Digital Ethnography has emerged as a foundational paradigm—one that aspires to move beyond reductive statistical readings toward a thick understanding of deep cultural practices. This imperative is articulated by Hine (2015), who argues that anthropological tools must be adapted and recalibrated to the technological medium if researchers are to understand how virtual identities are formed and how digital interactions unfold.

The transition from classical ethnography to what Kozinets (2010) terms online ethnography—or netnography—does not simply represent a change of research setting, a swapping of the physical field for a virtual one. Rather, it involves a wholesale reconstitution of the interactive relationship between researcher and field. Kozinets contends that deep anthropological immersion in digital communities enables researchers to surface the symbols, rituals, and symbolic interactions that define users' subcultural formations—dimensions that remain largely invisible to quantitative measurement instruments.

Drawing on the perspective advanced by Pink et al. (2016) regarding the integration of multi-sensory data and qualitative evidence in probing contemporary digital environments, this study sets out to illuminate the epistemological capacities of the ethnographic method in eliciting the latent meanings behind screens and tracing the behavioural and social trajectories that conventional methodologies consistently overlook. In this context, ethnography operates not merely as a descriptive instrument but as a critical methodology that interrogates the longstanding binary opposition between the "real" and the "virtual," reconceiving cyberspace as an authentic social context within which cultures and practices are constituted in parallel with, and in constant interaction with, the material world.

These considerations frame the central problematic this study addresses: the inadequacy of surface-level methodological approaches in apprehending the complexities of human agency within algorithmically governed environments. The overarching research question may be stated as follows:

How does the ethnographic method, conceived as a foundational paradigm, contribute to the revelation of tacit cultural practices and to the reconceptualisation of agency within the complex interplay between human actors and algorithmic-technical systems?

Digital Ethnography rests on robust epistemological foundations that extend well beyond descriptive observation, anchoring itself in the phenomenological tradition, which targets an understanding of lived meaning from the perspective of social actors themselves. Philosophically, this approach proceeds from a deconstruction of the artificial binary opposition between "the real" and "the virtual," conceiving cyberspace as an authentic social context and lived experience within which cultures and practices are constituted in parallel and in dynamic entanglement with the material world.

Methodologically, Digital Ethnography draws on the intellectual legacy of Geertz (1973) and the concept of thick description: the researcher's role is not confined to the mechanical recording of digital acts but extends to the excavation of complex layers of meaning and the cultural codes that surround each act. This methodological grounding demands a form of field radicalism that compels the researcher to achieve total immersion in the research environment—transforming from a detached external observer into an active participant who interrogates the mechanisms of technological agency and the nuanced ways in which users negotiate algorithmic systems. Ethnography, in this manner, becomes a strategic critical instrument uniquely capable of surfacing the unspoken and decoding the intricate entanglements of digital interaction.

2. Epistemological and Methodological Foundations of the Ethnographic Approach

Ethnography transcends its identity as a datacollection technique, resting on philosophical foundations that shape how social reality is apprehended. Three interrelated principles are particularly significant.

2.1 The Emic–Etic Distinction

The emic perspective—the insider view—constitutes the very core of ethnographic depth. The researcher immerses herself or himself in elucidating the meanings, value systems, and behavioural norms as they are construed and internalised by the community under study (Pike, 1967). This demands a form of epistemological bracketing: the deliberate suspension of prior assumptions and pretheoretical judgements. The etic perspective— the outsider, analytical view—

situates subjective experience within a broader theoretical framework, but it acquires scientific legitimacy only as the product of genuine immersion in the community's interior experience. The two perspectives work in productive tension throughout the research process.

2.2 Participant Observation and Field Immersion

Participant observation is the central technique of ethnographic inquiry, requiring the researcher to become an active constituent of the activity under study. It is not merely surveillance; it is a mode of social learning and continuous role negotiation. The enduring methodological challenge lies in managing what is often described as "analytic distance"—the delicate calibration between the position of objective observer and that of immersed participant. This dialectic was foundational to the conception of fieldwork pioneered by Malinowski (1922) under the rubric of field acculturation, and it remains as generative in digital contexts as in physical ones.

2.3 Thick Description as the Criterion of Methodological Rigour

To achieve scholarly rigour, the ethnographer draws on Geertz's (1973) practice of thick description. Rather than confining analysis to a mechanical account of what happened, the researcher advances to the deconstruction of socio-cultural contexts and underlying intentionalities—the question of why and how. A user's interaction with a digital interface, for instance, is not reducible to a keystroke or a screen tap; it is an act governed by complex professional contexts, institutional pressures, and the accumulated weight of collective practices—all of which confer on it its genuine cultural signification.

3. Typological Classifications and the Adaptation of Ethnography to Contemporary Contexts

The methodological versatility of the ethnographic approach is demonstrated by its capacity to branch into a range of sub-types, each configured to the particular nature of the environment under investigation.

3.1 Classical and Institutional Ethnography

- **Conventional Ethnography:** The traditional paradigm, requiring sustained physical presence within geographically defined communities, aims at building a holistic comprehension of culture (Malinowski, 1922). Its characteristic methodological depth and the imperatives of technological – acceleration (Hughes et al., 1994).
- **Digital Ethnography:** Investigates how individuals integrate technologies into the fabric of everyday life and how that

knowledge—remains a standard against • **Netnography:** A specialised approach which other ns are often measured. for the analysis of cultures constituted through the digital medium— ne

- **Institutional Ethnography:** Turning its gaming communities, discussion forums, analytical lens toward the unwritten social media platforms. Published systems and rules operating within content and interactive dialogues are organisations—hospitals, corporations, treated as authentic cultural acts, subject regulatory bodies—this form maps to the same rigorous interpretive analysis prevailing organisational culture and the applied to any field data (Kozinets, informal governance structures that 2022).

  shape practice from within.
- **AI Ethnography:** An emergent research

The Digital and Networked Paradigm trajectory examining the dialectical relationship between users and opaque

- **Rapid Ethnography:** Developed in automated systems. Drawing on Dourish direct response to the exigencies of and Bell (2007), it focuses on three business and industry, this approach principal analytical axes:

  contribution—deep contextual employs intensive, time-compressed periods of immersion—spanning days to – weeks—to address specific design or procedural problems. It attempts the difficult balance between

  integration, in turn, shapes social structures and cultural formations (Pink, – 2012).

  Agency Distribution: analysing how decision-making authority is distributed—and

contested— between human actors and algorithmic processes.

Trust Dynamics: tracing the construction and collapse of trust in automated outputs within highstakes environments such as medicine, navigation, and financial services.

Compensatory Practices: mapping the informal, improvisational strategies that users develop to circumvent the limitations and errors of intelligent systems—practices that often reveal more about system design than any formal evaluation.

3.3 Ethical Protocols and Criteria of Methodological Quality

Scientific integrity in ethnographic research demands adherence to stringent protocols across two interrelated dimensions.

Enhancing Validity and Trustworthiness

- Methodological Triangulation: the crossreferencing of data through multiple sources—observation, interview, and documentary analysis—to ensure the consistency and corroboration of findings (Denzin, 1989).
- Member Checking: actively involving research participants in reviewing and validating final analyses, thereby confirming the fidelity with which their lived experiences have been represented (Guba & Lincoln, 1985).

Ethical Dilemmas in Digital Spaces

Digital Ethnography presents distinctive ethical challenges, particularly with regard to informed consent. The researcher must negotiate carefully between the ostensibly public character of available data and the ethical imperative to protect the identity and privacy of individuals within virtual spaces (Kozinets, 2022). This requires the adoption of ethically reflexive practices attuned to the specific affordances and vulnerabilities of digital contexts—a matter discussed in depth in Section 8 below.

4. Applied Ethnography: Practice Theory and Actor-Network Theory

Situating ethnography within contemporary social theory substantially enhances its scholarly purchase. The methodological evolution from classical to applied ethnography reflects a shift in orientation: rather than pursuing holistic cultural documentation, applied ethnography concentrates on addressing specific problems and generating actionable insights across domains such as design and marketing (Sunderland & Denny, 2007).

Much of ethnography's analytical force derives from its alignment with Practice Theory,

which posits that behaviour is not the outcome of individual rational deliberation but is embedded within deep-rooted social and cultural patterns (Schatzki et al., 2001). Ethnographic immersion enables the researcher to access and document these cultural practices—the ensemble of procedures, routines, and tacit rules through which technology is woven into everyday life. Actor-Network Theory (ANT) supplies a further analytical framework, conceiving interaction as constituted by a network of both human and non-human actants: devices, software platforms, institutional protocols, and environmental settings (Latour, 2005). Through ethnography, the researcher can document how this network organises and mediates everyday interactions, yielding a comprehensive account of technology-in-use rather than technology-as-designed.

5. Methodological Review: Adapting Ethnographic Tools to Digital Research Environments

Digital environments require a systematic adaptation of conventional ethnographic instruments to ensure rigour and validity. Hybrid methodologies have become indispensable, and contemporary ethnographic research in user studies now encompasses a range of complementary approaches:

- **Rapid Ethnography:** employing intensive, short-duration immersion to generate timely insights within research contexts subject to tight deadlines (Hughes et al., 1994).
- **Digital Ethnography:** focusing on communities, interactions, and behaviours within virtual environments and digital platforms, and analysing user-generated content to disclose collective cultures and shared meaningmaking practices (Kozinets, 2022).
- **Cultural Probes:** participants are provided with a toolkit of creative instruments and self-documentation tasks, thereby reducing the direct influence of the researcher on the data and capturing experience from the inside out (Gaver et al., 2004).

To ensure scholarly quality, researchers must employ data triangulation across diverse sources—including observation, interview data, and quantitative behavioural analytics—alongside member checking to verify that analyses align with participants' own accounts of their experience (Guba & Lincoln, 1985; Denzin, 1989). These procedures are not merely procedural safeguards; they are constitutive of the validity claims that qualitative inquiry depends on.

6. AI Ethnography: Studying the Human–Algorithm Interface

The proliferation of artificial intelligence systems presents a singular methodological challenge: these systems are characterised by opacity and a fundamental lack of transparency in their decision-making logic. Quantitative metrics alone are insufficient to account for how users negotiate with, adapt to, or resist the outputs of AI systems. Ethnography represents the methodological approach best suited to studying human–AI interaction, capable of revealing several dimensions that remain otherwise inaccessible:

- **Situational Trust and Algorithmic Dependence:** how users determine, in the course of real-world professional practice, when to trust or distrust an AI system's decision—whether in medical diagnosis, financial decision-making, or navigational contexts. Such judgements are shaped as much by cultural and organisational context as by assessed system performance.

- **Compensatory Practices:** how users develop informal workarounds to overcome the limitations or errors of AI systems, thereby exposing genuine weaknesses in system design that formal evaluation processes rarely surface (Dourish & Bell, 2007).

- **Socio-Cultural Impact:** examining how AI systems reshape social relations and power structures within institutions and communities. What ethnography studies, in this context, is not the system itself but the social practice that mediates its use—a distinction with significant implications for both research and design.

The distinctive revelatory value of ethnography in this domain lies in its capacity to expose the gap between espoused behaviour and enacted behaviour: what users report in surveys and what they actually do in everyday life. Overcoming this inherent limitation of selfreport bias (Nisbett & Wilson, 1977) is of critical importance for the design of interfaces and services intended to integrate seamlessly into human practices.

Yet substantial methodological and ethical challenges persist. Researchers studying digital behaviours must adhere to a rigorous standard of informed consent and guarantee the anonymisation of participant data—even where that data exists within technically public spaces—in order to avoid violating contextual privacy norms (Kozinets, 2022). The challenge of time and resource constraints can be addressed through the adoption of directed ethnography, in

which big data analytics are deployed to identify focal areas warranting deeper qualitative immersion (Hammersley, 2007).

7. Case Study: Audience Engagement with Algorithmic Content on Social Media Platforms

In the contemporary digital media landscape, audiences are no longer passive recipients of content; they have become active participants in a complex ecosystem governed by algorithmic logics. The emergence of filter bubbles and echo chambers—wherein algorithmic curation confines users to selfreinforcing informational environments—has rendered ethnographic inquiry indispensable for understanding these dynamics in ways that transcend the surface-level metrics typically generated by media organisations.

7.1 Research Objectives

The ethnographic aim in this context is to explore the lived experience of the algorithm: how users interpret and respond to algorithmically recommended content, what adaptive and resistant strategies they develop in relation to it, and how such recommendations shape their identities, social relationships, and media consumption patterns over time (Kozinets, 2022).

7.2 Central Research Question

How do users negotiate their identities and social formations within social media environments governed by algorithmic logics? Do they develop a culture of resistance, strategic accommodation, or passive conformity in relation to these systems—and what are the cultural conditions that determine which orientation prevails?

7.3 Methodology

Addressing this question requires the integration of Digital Ethnography with traditional fieldbased observation to produce a comprehensive and contextually grounded account of user practices.

Hybrid Participant Observation

- **Digital Observation:** The researcher participates in groups and forums on the target platform to monitor public dialogues and the ways in which news or promotional content circulates and is interpreted (Kozinets, 2022). Published content is recorded and analysed to identify the shared symbols and language through which audience cultures are constituted (Pike, 1967).

- **Field Observation:** The researcher visits users in their domestic or social environments to observe, in real time, how they interact with smartphones or

computers during naturally occurring media consumption moments. This reveals contextual factors that no loginanalytics dataset can capture:

- Do users consume content alone or in company?
- Do they interrupt media consumption with other tasks, and how do they sequence these activities?
- Do they share screens with family members, and how does that sharing alter interpretation?

In-Depth Interviews and Collaborative Review

Rather than simply asking users how they use a platform, ethnographic techniques allow the researcher to interpret behaviour in context:

- **Collaborative Screen Review:** The researcher sits with the user and asks them to scroll through their feed or viewing history, posing real-time questions about why they paused at a particular piece of content or ignored another. This elicits the moment-bymoment logic of selection and allows users to articulate the meaning they assign to the algorithm's suggestions (Geertz, 1973).

- **Surfacing Unstated Needs:** Observation frequently reveals practices that users have not verbalised and may not consciously recognise as practices at all—for instance, reading news on one application but sharing it on an entirely different, ostensibly unrelated platform. Such findings expose complex crossplatform content distribution behaviours that exceed the boundaries of any single service and challenge assumptions built into platform design (Schatzki et al., 2001).

7.4 Ethnographic Findings and the Value of Interpretive Insight

What this form of inquiry produces goes well beyond surface-level metrics:

- **Revealing Algorithmic Culture:** Ethnography demonstrates that users develop a tacit, working understanding of how algorithmic recommendation operates—an implicit knowledge that functions as a form of shared digital media literacy. Statements such as "if I click on this, it will send me more of that" represent not simply individual observations but elements of a collective cultural repertoire that shapes how people post, interact, and curate their digital presence.

- **The Social Life of Content:** The study illuminates how the meaning of media content shifts as it circulates across social relationships—how technology becomes embodied in those relationships rather than existing apart from them (Dourish, 2006). Users may strategically adopt and share content—whether humorous, provocative, or politically charged—not primarily because of the content itself but to signal membership in a particular social group, regardless of the message's original intent.

- **Strategies of Avoidance and Resistance:** Ethnographic observation documents users' attempts to game or circumvent the algorithm—through alternative accounts, manual filters, or deliberate misrepresentation of preferences—pointing to an active culture of resistance to automated control (Pink, 2012). These practices constitute a form of everyday agency that aggregate data is structurally incapable of detecting.

This applied ethnographic model demonstrates its value for media and communication research precisely because it connects technical decisions—algorithm design, content ranking, recommendation logic—to their deep social and cultural consequences, including the formation of public opinion and the structuring of media consumption patterns.

8. Ethical Challenges in Digital Ethnography

The blurring of public and private boundaries in online spaces creates a set of ethical dilemmas for the ethnographic researcher that exceed those typically encountered in traditional field research. Three challenges deserve particular attention.

8.1 The Public–Private Boundary and Informed Consent

The first challenge concerns the status of publicly available online content. Users often regard closed social media groups or posts addressed to a defined circle of friends as private spaces—even when those posts are technically accessible to thousands of group members. Directly quoting or referencing such material can constitute a violation of contextual privacy norms, regardless of whether formal anonymisation has been applied (Kozinets, 2022). The operative principle here is contextual integrity: information shared in one normative context carries expectations about how it will flow that researchers are obliged to respect. Methodologically, this requires adopting a

precautionary approach: obtaining explicit informed consent from participants for any direct interaction—including in-depth interviews or screen reviews—and, when analysing publicly available content, paraphrasing rather than directly quoting in ways that might permit identification through search engines. The analytical focus should remain on cultural meaning and context rather than individual attribution.

8.2 Manipulation of the Algorithmic Environment

Some ethnographic studies require the researcher to create test accounts or join subcommunities in order to observe responses to specific environmental conditions. The introduction of an unidentified researcher—or a fictitious account—into a community risks distorting the very interactions it seeks to study, compromising both methodological validity and the principle of transparency that ethical research demands (Hammersley, 2007).

The appropriate response is to commit to methodological transparency: disclosing the researcher's role clearly within interactive or closed communities unless there is a documented and ethically justified methodological rationale for not doing so. Where intervention is unavoidable, it should be minimised to the greatest extent possible, and its ethical justification should be explicitly addressed in the methodology section.

8.3 Responsibility When Encountering Harmful or Illegal Activity

Because ethnography aspires to depth immersion in participants' everyday lives, researchers may encounter activities that are harmful or unlawful—misinformation campaigns, hate speech, online harassment. This creates an acute tension between the obligation to protect participant confidentiality and the ethical duty of care toward those who might be harmed by the behaviour in question.

This tension should be resolved prospectively rather than reactively, through the development of clear ethical protocols prior to fieldwork and the securing of institutional ethics board approval. These protocols should specify, in advance, the categories of activity—such as credible threats of harm to self or others—that will require the researcher to break confidentiality and report, and participants should be informed of these limits explicitly at the outset (Denzin, 1989). Maintaining an analytical rather than adjudicative orientation—documenting and interpreting behaviours rather than passing judgement on them—helps preserve the integrity of the research relationship, while recommendations concerning how platforms might address the issues identified can be reserved for the conclusions.

9. Key Findings

The foregoing analysis allows us to draw together several substantive conclusions regarding the ethnographic method as a foundational paradigm in digital media research.

- **The Limits of Quantitative Methods in Isolation:** Big data remains, in a meaningful sense, mute until it is • **Beyond the Real–Virtual Binary:** interrogated through ethnographic Cyberspace is a genuine social context, methods. Statistical analysis can not a simulated or secondary one. Users' document what is happening; digital practices are extensions of their ethnography discloses why and how material identities, needs, and social meanings are formed. The two are relationships—not separate activities complementary rather than competing, conducted in a quarantined virtual realm. but the qualitative dimension is • **Ethnography as an Instrument of**

  irreplaceable.

- **The Formation of Algorithmic** method possesses a distinctive capacity **Culture:** Users of digital platforms are to detect algorithmic bias, map filter not passive consumers; they are agents bubbles and echo chambers, and who develop tacit knowledge of delineate the boundaries of digital algorithmic systems and mobilise that privacy. This positions it not merely as a knowledge in their practices of posting, research tool but as a resource for the engagement, and evasion. This ethical design and governance of constitutes a genuinely cultural algorithmic systems.
  formation—a shared repertoire of understanding and practice that shapes • **Methodological Adaptability:** Hybrid media consumption in ways invisible to ethnographic models—Rapid any aggregate metric. Ethnography for time-sensitive applied

- **Thick Description and the Decoding of** problems, Digital Ethnography for the **Technological Agency:** Understanding study of virtual communities—preserve the relationship between human beings the method's analytical depth while and technology requires the kind of total adapting its procedures to the pace and immersion that decodes compensatory complexity of the digital environment. practices—the informal behavioural This adaptability is itself a scientific innovations through which users bridge virtue, and one that the research the gaps left by technical systems or community should continue to develop.
  resist the limitations of AI-generated outputs.

Ethical Governance: The ethnographic

The trajectory traced in this article makes one thing clear: ethnography has travelled a considerable distance from its origins as an anthropological instrument for the study of remote or bounded communities. It has become—and this article has argued it must become—a foundational paradigm for understanding the human condition in an era defined by algorithmic governance. What recommends it is not only its traditional toolkit of participant observation and field immersion but its flexible capacity to evolve: to produce the rapid, targeted insights that applied research demands while retaining the depth that makes it irreplaceable.

That capacity carries with it both an epistemological and an ethical imperative. Epistemologically, ethnography provides the field-based framework through which theories such as Actor-Network Theory and Practice Theory can be applied to lived digital reality, bridging the gap between sociological abstraction and the texture of everyday technologically mediated experience. Ethically, it emerges as a form of advocacy for human privacy and agency against the opacity of algorithmic systems, particularly in high-stakes domains such as healthcare and public communication.

10. Conclusion

The practical recommendation this study advances follows directly: research and design processes must integrate hybrid methodologies that combine the scale of big data with the interpretive depth of what has been termed thick data. Only by holding these two registers together can innovation remain culturally grounded and ethically responsible. The future of social science in cyberspace depends, in no small part, on our willingness to read what lies behind the screens—and to make that knowledge count.

References

Denzin, N. K. (1989). The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods. McGraw-Hill.

Dix, A., Finlay, J., Abowd, G. D., & Beale, R. (2004). Human-computer interaction (3rd ed.). Pearson Education.

Dourish, P. (2006). Implications for design. In Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (pp. 541–550). Association for Computing Machinery.

Dourish, P., & Bell, G. (2007). The infrastructure of experience and the experience of

infrastructure: Meaning and structure in everyday encounters with space. Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design, 34(3), 414–430.

Gaver, W. W., Boucher, A., Pennington, S., & Walker, B. (2004). Cultural probes and the value of uncertainty. Interactions, 11(5), 53–56.

Geertz, C. (1973). The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays. Basic Books.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. SAGE Publications.

Hammersley, M. (2007). The issue of quality in qualitative research. In P. Atkinson & S. Delamont (Eds.), The SAGE handbook of social research methods (pp. 543– 553). SAGE Publications.

Hine, C. (2015). Ethnography for the internet: Embedded, embodied and everyday. Bloomsbury Academic.

Hughes, J., King, V., Rodden, T., & Andersen, H. (1994). Moving out from the control room: Ethnography in system design. Proceedings of the 1994 ACM Conference on Computer-Supported Cooperative Work (pp. 429–439). ACM.

Kozinets, R. V. (2010). Netnography: Doing ethnographic research online. SAGE Publications.

Kozinets, R. V. (2022). Netnography: The essential guide to qualitative social media research (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Latour, B. (2005). Reassembling the social: An introduction to actor-network theory. Oxford University Press.

Malinowski, B. (1922). Argonauts of the Western Pacific. Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Nisbett, R. E., & Wilson, T. D. (1977). Telling more than we can know: Verbal reports on mental processes. Psychological Review, 84(3), 231–259.

Pike, K. L. (1967). Language in relation to a unified theory of the structure of human behavior. Mouton.

Pink, S. (2012). Situating everyday life: Practices and places. SAGE Publications.

Pink, S., Horst, H., Postill, J., Hjorth, L., Lewis, T., & Tacchi, J. (2016). Digital ethnography: Principles and practice. SAGE Publications.

Schatzki, T. R., Knorr Cetina, K., & von Savigny, E. (Eds.). (2001). The practice turn in contemporary theory. Routledge.

Suchman, L. A. (1987). Plans and situated actions: The problem of human-machine communication. Cambridge University Press.

Sunderland, P. L., & Denny, R. M. (2007). Doing anthropology in consumer research. Left Coast Press.