

10th ECPR Summer School in Methods and Techniques
27 July - 31 July 2015
University of Ljubljana, Slovenia

Issues in Political, Policy, and Organizational Ethnography

prof. dr. Dvora Yanow
Guest Professor
Sub-department Communication, Philosophy, & Technology
Wageningen University
and
Professor of Organizational Studies, Keele University, Staffordshire, UK
Dvora.Yanow@wur.nl

Ms. Marie Kouassi
Course Assistant
Université de Louvain
msa.kouassi@gmail.com

Participant-observer ethnographic methods – central among the many methods that fall under the umbrella of interpretive and qualitative research methods – have, in one view, been ‘borrowed’ from sociology and anthropology into many fields in political science, including comparative governmental studies, area studies, public policy (domestic/state, regional, local; international, EU, etc.), public administration/local government/organizational studies, and public law/legal studies. They are not new, however, either to organizational studies or to political studies generally, having been employed since the 1940s and perhaps even earlier (e.g., the Hawthorne studies of the 1920s). Moreover, one might argue that ethnography originated in colonial administrative practices, which renders its anthropological version a subset of a broader range of practices (Salemink 2003). Whatever its origins, ethnography is useful in a wide range of settings for research questions that seek to explore the meanings of particular political concepts, practices or processes to situational actors, often in order to illuminate a wider-ranging, at times more theoretical issue of concern. Examples might include studying how street-level bureaucrats interpret public policies in implementing them (e.g., Lipsky 1980); how policy-makers or legislators think about the decisions they make and how they go about making them (Fenno 1986); how workers shape their work practices and their relationships to managers (Orr 1996); how routinized violence in a slaughterhouse can account for the regularization of violence in the state in which it is located (see Pachirat 2011); how authority structures in factories can illuminate authority relations in the broader society (see Shehata 2009); and so on.

In these and other research settings, participant-observer ethnography has been adapted to serve the research questions and theoretical engagements particular to the disciplines in which that research is housed (including anthropology). Political/policy/organizational and other ‘marked’ ethnographies draw on traditional ethnographic methods (observing, with whatever degree of participation; talking to situational members) and may incorporate formal (expert, elite or other) interviews (i.e., in conversational style, engaging people in talk) and/or some form of documentary research (a close reading of topic-relevant documents, e.g., in archives, newspaper morgues, and the like). These methods generate data which may also be analyzed using other methods (e.g., discourse analysis; metaphor, category or other language-focused analysis; space analysis; narrative analysis; and so on). Ethnographic research is not solely an interview-based study; although (usually small) surveys may be done as part of a research project that includes participant-observation, a survey is not an ethnography; nor is ethnography entirely reduceable to a set of methods, being more of a ‘sensibility’ than a tool-kit.

This course is designed for those who are considering undertaking a field research project, are about

to embark on one (i.e., whose research proposals have been accepted by their thesis/dissertation committee or supervisor), are in the midst of conducting one, or have just come out of the field and are thinking about, starting to or in the midst of writing up their field notes and drafts of chapters or papers/articles. The project might be a traditional ethnographic or participant-observer study (of a community or an organization, for example); one based on 'shadowing' a political leader or policy-maker; and/or some other adaptation. Course topics lean towards constructivist-interpretive ethnographic research, but it makes space for realist-objectivist research as well; and we will try to address the needs and interests of both researchers with field experience and those who have yet to begin.

The course will take up several of the concepts and issues central to current discussions in political, policy, and organizational ethnography. These include:

- the relational turn in understanding ethnographic research, including power and politics in the conduct of field research;
- questions of reflexivity and positionality, especially as these bear on knowledge claims and the judgments as to the trustworthiness of those claims;
- writing as method, but also reading as method – looking at truth claims and their evidentiary base, and the ways in which these are presented, from the perspective of a prospective reader, whether situational member or colleague.

This year, we will also engage issues of research ethics more directly, including not only questions of harms to participants but also harms to researchers.

Classes will combine lecture with discussion. Students will be expected to come to class with their own questions in hand, prepared to discuss the readings and to draw links between them and their own research designs and field experiences. Afternoon 'field exercises' ["labs"] will complement the morning sessions; they are likely to entail group-work as well as individual work.

References

Fenno, Lipsky, Pachirat, Shehata – see syllabus.

Salemink, Oscar. 2003. Ethnography, anthropology and colonial discourse. In *The ethnography of Vietnam's Central Highlanders: A historical contextualization, 1850-1990*, 1-39. London: RoutledgeCurzon.

Prior knowledge

To get the most out of this course, students should have taken at least one course in interpretive or qualitative research methods, preferable in the philosophy of social science looking at the methodological underpinnings of qualitative and interpretive approaches (e.g., Patrick Jackson's or Robert Adcock's courses in the ECPR Winter Methods School). Prior exposure to observational research, with whatever degree of participation, is desirable, as is 'laboratory' experience conducting conversational interviews. Students who wish to brush up on the methodological background might read one or both of these books, which inform the approach to this course:

- Michael Agar, 2013. *The lively science: Remodeling human social research*. Minneapolis, MN: Mill City Press. [www.thelivelyscience.com/ or Agar's webpage www.ethnoworks.com]
- Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, eds., *Interpretation and method: Empirical research methods and the interpretive turn*, 2nd edition (Armonk, NY: M E Sharpe, 2014), especially the book and section introductions and chs. 1, 2, 24, and 25.

Course readings

1. Allaine Cerwonka and Liisa H. Malkki, 2007, *Improvising theory: Process and temporality in ethnographic fieldwork* (University of Chicago Press).

This book presents email correspondence between a political science Ph.D. student [Cerwonka] starting her field research and the anthropologist on her committee [Malkki], with reflective commentary from each. What is also remarkable about it for our purposes is that Cerwonka was taking her degree at Stanford University, and many of the reflections are about the department faculty's doubts concerning her ethnographic methods (!).

2. Depending on your research field:

a. Edward Schatz, ed., *Political ethnography: What immersion contributes to the study of power*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009.

b. Sierk Ybema et al., eds., *Organizational ethnography*. London: Sage, 2009.

3. Peregrine Schwartz-Shea and Dvora Yanow, *Interpretive research design: Concepts and processes*. New York: Routledge, 2012. [SSY in syllabus]

4. Geraldine Lee-Treweek and Stephanie Linkogle, eds. 2000. *Danger in the field: Risk and ethics in social research*. London: Routledge.

5. Other journal articles, conference papers, and book chapters, as noted in the syllabus.

Hard-to-obtain readings [marked *] will be provided; details on this forthcoming. If there are other readings that you are having difficulty obtaining in your own university library, please let us know; we will help to the extent that we can. Please keep in mind that we cannot post readings on the course Moodle page for reasons of copyright.

Pre-course assignment

We will ask you via email to briefly introduce yourself to all course participants. In particular, we would ask you to answer the following questions:

- Where do you stand with respect to your fieldwork: finished? just starting? etc.
- What specific questions or concerns, if any, are you bringing with you to the course?

Please email these to the group **no later than 18 July**. If received by then, they are more likely to be built into course discussions.

Credits

This course carries 2 ECTS. The subject matter does not allow for an examination, and none will be offered.

A note on the course Powerpoint slides

Dvora Yanow says: I am often asked to send my slides, either after a class session or at the end of a course. In case this alters your expectations for the sessions and how you might engage the materials there, let me say now that I do not make my slides available, for two reasons. One, some of the material I use is under copyright, and I do not have permission to circulate it. Second, and for me more important, the slides constitute my notes on the readings assigned for class. You, too, can do the same readings and note for yourself what you find important (as you would during class sessions). Recent research shows that we learn more, and better, when we make our own notes. (The same principle obtains, for instance, with respect to notes on field research observations,

conversations, documents, etc.) If you are interested in a particular slide or in additional sources that I might list there, please do ask me; I will be happy to share those.

Instructor's and Course Assistant's bios

Dvora Yanow: I identify as a policy/political/organizational ethnographer and interpretive methodologist. My research and teaching have long been shaped by an interest in the generation and communication of knowing and meaning in organizational and policy settings. Present research investigates state-created categories for 'race-ethnic' identities, immigrant integration policies and citizen-making, research regulation and ethics policies, practice theory, and science museums and the idea of science. My most recent book is *Interpretive research design: Concepts and processes* (Routledge 2012), with Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, the first volume in the Routledge Series in Interpretive Methods, which we co-edit; our co-edited *Interpretation and Methods* is now out in a second edition. I also teach courses on writing qualitative research and on politics and language for the ECPR Winter Methods School and received the 2012 Cora Maas teaching award for this ethnography course. <http://wu.academia.edu/DvoraYanow>

Marie Kouassi: I am a PhD candidate in International Relations at the University of Louvain in Belgium. My primary areas of interest are in peacebuilding interventions, critical approaches to peace and conflict studies, poststructuralism in International Relations, social psychological research on intergroup relations, and interpretive policy analysis. Focusing on efforts to promote social cohesion in Ivory Coast, I look at the language used to designate those at the receiving end. I received my M.A. in Political Science with a specialization in IR from the University of Lyon and a B.A. in Law from the same university.

Note:

- a. This is the updated, final syllabus for the 2015 course.
- b. I reserve the right to modify the schedule during the course week, including revising the daily homework assignments (in the form of ‘laboratory’ exercises in Ljubljana), depending on registered students’ backgrounds and how our discussions evolve.
- c. I would hope to accommodate student questions about their own work during class time. If the class is large, however, we will need to see how we manage this. Students are always invited to ask questions specific to their own research projects as these are sparked by in-class discussions. These aspects of course design will be determined once the final size of the class is known.
- d. Be advised: More is listed in the syllabus than what you are likely to be able to read in advance of the course. My philosophy of syllabus design is to provide you with a range of readings, selecting those that I find engaging. But what is engaging for me may not be for you, so there is some redundancy built in. Ph.D. students, lecturers, and those planning on an academic career should note that mastering the literature in a field is part of that work; the syllabus is designed accordingly. What is listed here constitutes part of the key literature in this field.
- e. The daily ‘thought’ questions are what I have in mind when I think about each session’s focus. Use them to guide your readings. How do *you* answer them?

	Topic(s)	Details, Readings
Monday 9-10.30	1. Seeing like an ethnographer: Introductions and course overview	<p>Overview of course structure, readings, and an ethnographic sensibility.</p> <p><u>Read</u> Schatz, introduction. Ybema et al., introduction. Pader, Ellen. 2014. Seeing with an ethnographic sensibility. In Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, eds., <i>Interpretation and method: Empirical research methods and the interpretive turn</i>, 2nd ed., 194-208. Armonk, NY: M E Sharpe. [good basic treatment] Yi’En, Cheng. 2014. Telling stories of the city: Walking ethnography, affective materialities, and mobile encounters. <i>Space and Culture</i> 17/3: 211–23. Kunda, Gideon. 2013. Reflections on becoming an ethnographer. <i>Journal of Organizational Ethnography</i> 2/1: 4-22. [marvelously reflective essay] McGovern, Mike. 2011. Popular development economics—An anthropologist among the mandarins. Review essay. <i>Perspectives on Politics</i> 9/2: 345-55. [on what is at stake] Nader, Laura. 1974/1969. Up the anthropologist: Perspectives gained from studying up. In Dell Hymes, ed., <i>Reinventing Anthropology</i>, 284-311. New York: Vintage Books.</p>

		<p><u>Ethnography in different disciplines/fields</u> [examples; read selectively]</p> <p>Fenno, Richard F., Jr. 1986. Observation, context, and sequence in the study of politics. <i>American Political Science Review</i> 80/1: 3-15. [a classic]</p> <p>Wedeen, Lisa. 2010. Reflections on ethnographic work in political science. <i>Annual Review of Political Science</i> 13:255–72.</p> <p>[ALSO OF INTEREST: Wedeen, Lisa. 2009. Ethnography as interpretive enterprise. In Schatz, ch. 3.]</p> <p>Stepputat, Finn. 2012. Knowledge production in the security–development nexus: An ethnographic reflection. <i>Security Dialogue</i> 43/5: 439–55.</p> <p>van Hulst, Merlijn J. 2008. Quite an experience: Using ethnography to study local governance. <i>Critical Policy Studies</i> 2/2: 143-59.</p> <p>Baiocchi, Gianpaolo and Connor, Brian T. 2008. The <i>ethnos</i> in the <i>polis</i>: Political ethnography as a mode of inquiry. <i>Sociology Compass</i> 2/1: 139–55. [from the perspective of sociologists]</p> <p>Auyero, Javier. 2006. Introductory Note to <i>Politics under the Microscope: Special Issue on Political Ethnography</i>. <i>Qualitative Sociology</i> 29:257–59.</p> <p>Culyba, Rebecca J., Heimer, Carol A., and Petty, Julieigh Coleman. 2004. The ethnographic turn: Fact, fashion, or fiction? <i>Qualitative Sociology</i> 27/4: 365-89.</p> <p>Morrill, Calvin and Fine, Gary Alan. 1997. Ethnographic contributions to organizational sociology. <i>Sociological Methods & Research</i> 25/4: 424-51.</p> <p><i>Organizational Research Methods</i> 13/2 (2010): 224-319: essays by Cunliffe, Van Maanen, Goodall, Shotter, Agar [see class #5], and Zickar and Carter.</p> <p>Jarzabkowski, Paula, Bednarek, Rebecca, and Cabantous, Laure. 2015. Conducting global team-based ethnography: Methodological challenges and practical methods. <i>human relations</i> 68/1: 3–33.</p> <p>Jordan, Brigitte and Dalal, Brinda. 2006. Persuasive encounters: Ethnography in the corporation. <i>Field Methods</i> 18: 359-81.</p> <p>Suchman, Lucy. 1995. Making work visible. <i>Communications of the ACM</i> 38/9: 56-64.</p> <p>Megoran, Nick. 2006. For ethnography in political geography: Experiencing and re-imagining Ferghana Valley boundary closures. <i>Political Geography</i> 25/6: 622-40.</p> <p><u>Re-read</u> Cerwonka and Malkki, <i>Improvising theory</i>, pp. 1-40.</p> <p><u>IR folk</u></p> <p><i>IF</i> you read Wanda Vradi, 2008, The strange case of ethnography and international relations, <i>Millennium: Journal of International Studies</i> 37/2: 279–301;</p>
--	--	--

		<p><i>THEN</i> also read 2 critiques: Jason P. Rancatore, 2010, <i>It is strange: A reply to Vvasti, Millennium: Journal of International Studies</i> 39/1: 65–77; AND Montsion, Jean-Michel. 2010. Research (im)possibilities: Reflections from everyday international relations. <i>Altérités</i> 7/2: 79-94. AND Lie, Jon Harald Sande. 2013. Challenging anthropology: Anthropological reflections on the ethnographic turn in international relations. <i>Millennium: Journal of International Studies</i> 41/2: 201–20.</p> <p><u>Optional</u> Atkinson, Paul and Hammersley, Martyn. 1994. Ethnography and participant observation. In Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln, eds. <i>Handbook of qualitative research</i>, 248-61. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Becker, Howard S. and Geer, Blanche. 1957. Participant observation and interviewing: A comparison. <i>Human Organization</i> 16/3: 28-32. Trow, Martin. 1957. Comment on “participant observation and interviewing: A comparison”. <i>Human Organization</i> 16/3: 33-35. Gready, Paul. 2014. PRACTICE NOTES: First encounters: Early career researchers and fieldwork. <i>Journal of Human Rights Practice</i> 6/2: 195–200. [3 articles here, of possible interest to early career researchers]</p>
11-12.30	2. Design I: Issues in selecting (and accessing) settings, actors, times, ...	<p><u>Think</u>: Where is ‘the field’? What is involved in ‘accessing’ the research field? How long should you stay? Is ‘saturation’ a good measure?</p> <p><u>Read</u> SSY, chs. 1, 4. Kubik, Jan. 2009. Ethnography of politics. In Schatz, ch. 1. van der Waal, Kees. 2009. Getting going. In Ybema et al., ch. 1. Birgitte Jordan, 2010. Ethnography and ‘The one-year rule.’ www.lifescapes.org/Papers/Ethnography%20and%20the%20one%20year%20rule.doc [acc. 11.06.15] Bondy, Christopher. 2013. How did I get here? The social process of accessing field sites. <i>Qualitative Research</i> 13/5: 578–90.</p> <p><u>Recommended</u> Marcus, George E. 1995. Ethnography in/of the world system: The emergence of multi-sited</p>

		ethnography. <i>Annual Review of Anthropology</i> 24: 95-117. <u>Optional</u> Marcus, George E. and Okely, Judith. 2007. <i>Debate Section. Social Anthropology/Anthropologie Sociale</i> 15/3: 353–67. [Marcus, ‘How short can fieldwork be?’; Okely, Response to George E. Marcus; Marcus, Response to Judith Okely; Okely, Reply to George E. Marcus] [Marcus: research as design]
Afternoon/ evening		‘Lab’ assignment: Observation exercise; city center or other location TBD. Details will be handed out in class.
<u>Tuesday</u> 9-10.30	3. ‘But I thought we were friends?!’ and other emotional realities: Researcher identities in field research Access is more than a noun – problematics of dual identities in the field and other issues in the researcher-participant relationship.	<u>Think</u> : How does one manage one’s own identity, in all its aspects, in the field? What is entailed in being a researcher at the same time that one is an observer (with whatever degree of participation) – i.e., having and managing dual identities in the field? Should we involve situational members? How? Issues in ‘member-checking.’ What about collaborative authorship? And what about advice-giving? <u>Read</u> *Gans, Herbert. 1976. Personal journal: B. On the methods used in this study. In M. Patricia Golden, ed., <i>The research experience</i> , 49–59. Itasca, IL: F.E. Peacock. *Gans, Herbert J. 1968. The participant observer as a human being: Observations on the personal aspects of fieldwork. In Howard S. Becker, Blanche Geer, Robert S. Weiss, and David Riesman, eds., <i>Institutions and the person: Festschrift in honor of Everett C. Hughes</i> . Chicago: Aldine. Beech, Nic et al. 2009. ‘But I thought we were friends?!’ In Ybema et al., ch. 10. Adams, Laura L. 1999. The mascot researcher: Identity, power, and knowledge in fieldwork. <i>Journal Of Contemporary Ethnography</i> 28/4: 331-63. Koning, Juliette and Ooi, Can-Seng. 2013. Awkward encounters and ethnography. <i>Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management</i> 8/1: 16-32. Vähäsantanen, Katja and Saarinen, Jaana. 2013. The power dance in the research interview: Manifesting power and powerlessness. <i>Qualitative Research</i> 13/5: 493-510. <u>Consider</u> (in re. collaborative authorship; what’s going on here?) Greenwood, Davydd J. and José Luis González, with Julio Cantón Alonso, Ino Galparsoro Markaide, Alex Goiricelaya Arruza, Isabel Legarreta Nuin, and Kepa Salaberría Amesti. 1990. <i>Culturas de Fagor: Estudio antropológico de las cooperativas de Mondragón</i> . San Sebastian: Editorial Txertoa.

		<p>Greenwood, Davydd J. and José Luis González Santos, with Julio Cantón Alonso, Ino Galparsoro Markaide, Alex Goiricelaya Arruza, Isabel Legarreta Nuin, and Kepa Salaberría Amesti. 1992. <i>Industrial democracy as process: Participatory action research in the Fagor Cooperative Group of Mondragón</i>. Assen-Maastricht: Van Gorcum.</p> <p>François Guindon (in collaboration with the Neeposh family). 2015. Technology, material culture and the well-being of Aboriginal peoples of Canada. <i>Journal of Material Culture</i> 20/1: 77–97.</p> <p><u>Supplemental readings</u></p> <p>Cooper, Matthew. 2008. Sharing data and results with study participants: Report on a survey of cultural anthropologists. <i>Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics</i> 3/4: 19–34.</p> <p>Zuiderent, Teun. 2002. Blurring the center: On the politics of ethnography. <i>Scandinavian Journal of Information Systems</i> 14/2: 59-78. [on researcher identity constructed by others]</p> <p>Schein, Edgar H. 1998. <i>Process consultation revisited: Building the helping relationship</i>. Addison-Wesley Longman.</p>
11-12.30	<p>4. ‘Native,’ ‘at-home’ ethnography: Insider-outsider standing and knowledge claims</p>	<p><u>Think</u>: Can one bridge the epistemological differences between researcher and researched? Can ‘outsiders’ become ‘insiders’? How native is a ‘native’ ethnographer? Does (participatory) action research help resolve the issues?</p> <p><u>Read</u></p> <p>Agar, Michael. 2007. Emic/etic. In George Ritzer, ed., <i>The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology</i>, 1371-74. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.</p> <p>Narayan, Kirin. 1993. How native is a ‘native’ anthropologist? <i>American Anthropologist</i> 95: 671-86.</p> <p>Alvesson, Mats. 2009. At home ethnography. In Ybema et al., ch. 8.</p> <p>Down, Simon and Hughes, Michael. 2009. When the ‘subject’ and the ‘researcher’ speak together. In Ybema et al., ch. 4.</p> <p>Henderson, Frances B. 2009. “We thought you would be white”: Race and gender in fieldwork. <i>PS: Political Science & Politics</i> 42/2: 291-4.</p> <p>Wamai, Njoki. 2014. First contact with the field: Experiences of an early career researcher in the context of national and international politics in Kenya. <i>Journal of Human Rights Practice</i> 6/2: 213–22.</p> <p>*Nencel, Lorraine and Yanow, Dvora. 2015. On methodological relics: Reconsidering etic outsiders, emic insiders, and fieldwork relationships. Presented at the European Association of Social Anthropologists (Ljubljana, 26-30 August 2008); under revision.</p>

		<p><u>Supplemental reading</u> Greenwood, Davydd J. and Levin, Morten. 2007. <i>Introduction to action research</i>, 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.</p>
<p>Afternoon/ evening</p>		<p>'Lab' assignment: Conversational interviewing exercise, same location as yesterday; details as yesterday.</p> <p><u>Think</u>: If you want to learn what it was like for an older person when she was growing up, you might find it helpful to ask specific questions to mentally move her back in time to the house where she grew up, the shop floor where he worked, etc. What did it look like? Smell like? Sound like? If it is someone younger, you could ask about specific experiences, perhaps their first crush, a favorite teacher, bullying at school, relationships with other family members, etc.</p> <p>Studs Terkel was famous for his ability to get people to open up; it reportedly came from a genuine empathy and non-judgmental curiosity. You are trying to get at the lived experience. What specific sorts of questions might you ask in your own research to achieve this? Practice and discuss this with other course members.</p>
<p><u>Wednesday</u></p> <p>9-10.30</p>	<p>5. Design II: Logics of inquiry in interpretive research— Abduction and surprises; Flexibility and exposure</p>	<p><u>Think</u>: Compare abduction with induction as a logic of inquiry for ethnographic processes. What are the 'knowledge (truth) conditions' of ethnographic research? Designing and planning for a research project when the setting is a movable target.</p> <p><u>Read</u> SSY, chs. 2, 3, 5. Allina-Pisano, Jessica. 2009. How to tell an axe murderer. In Schatz, ch. 2. Fujii, Lee Ann. 2010. Shades of truth and lies: Interpreting testimonies of war and violence. <i>Journal of Peace Research</i> 47/2: 231-41. Agar, Michael. 2010. On the ethnographic part of the mix: A multi-genre tale of the field. <i>Organizational Research Methods</i> 13 (2): 286–303. Locke, Karen, Golden-Biddle, Karen, and Feldman, Martha S. 2008. Making doubt generative: Rethinking the role of doubt in the research process. <i>Organization Science</i> 19/6: 907-18. Van Maanen, John, Sørensen, Jesper B., and Mitchell, Terence R. 2007. The interplay between theory and method. <i>Academy of Management Review</i> 32/4: 1145–54.</p> <p><u>Re-read</u> Cerwonka and Malkki, <i>Improvising Theory</i>, pp. 162-87.</p>

		<p><u>Supplemental reading</u> Friedrichs, Jorg and Kratochwil, Friedrich. 2009. On acting and knowing: How pragmatism can advance international relations research and methodology. <i>International Organization</i> 63: 701-31. Strübing, Jörg. 2007. Research as pragmatic problem-solving: The pragmatist roots of empirically-grounded theorizing. In Antony Bryant and Kathy Charmaz, eds., <i>The Sage handbook of grounded theory</i>, 581-601. London: Sage. Wilson, William Julius and Anmol Chaddha. 2010. The role of theory in ethnographic research. <i>Ethnography</i> 10/4: 549-64.</p>
11-12.30	<p>6. Positionality and power: Reflexivity in the field and on the page</p>	<p><u>Think:</u> How does one achieve ‘objectivity’ when one is immersed, physically and emotionally, in a field setting and context? If that is not possible, how does/might a researcher give an account of her interactive effect on people, places, events, ...? Are there drawbacks to ‘snowball’ exposure? Can we ask, ‘With whom would you advise me <i>not</i> to speak?’ How is positional reflexivity different from autoethnography? Is reflexivity really taboo, as Anteby would have it?</p> <p><u>Read</u> SSY, ch. 6. Cohn, Carol. 2006. Motives and methods: Using multi-sited ethnography to study US national security discourses. In Brooke Ackerly, Maria Stern, and Jacquie True, eds., <i>Feminist methodologies for international relations</i>, 91-107. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.</p> <p>and/or</p> <p>Cohn, Carol. 1987. Sex and death in the rational world of defense intellectuals. <i>Signs</i> 12/ 4, 687-718. Review Adams (1999). Pachirat, Timothy. 2009. The <i>political</i> in political ethnography: Reflections from an industrialized slaughterhouse on perspective, power, and sight. In Schatz, ch. 6. Shehata, Samer. 2014. Ethnography, identity, and the production of knowledge. In Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, eds., <i>Interpretation and method: Empirical research methods and the interpretive turn</i>, 2nd ed., 209-27. Armonk, NY: M E Sharpe. *Wilkinson, Claire. 2008. Positioning ‘security’ and securing one’s position: The researcher’s role in investigating ‘security’ in Kyrgyzstan. In Caleb Wall and Peter Mollinga, eds., <i>Field work in difficult environments: Discussing the divergence between theory and practice</i>, 43-63. Berlin: Lit Verlag. Zirakzadeh, Cyrus Ernesto. 2009. When nationalists are not separatists: Discarding and recovering academic theories while doing fieldwork in the Basque region of Spain. In Schatz, ch. 4. Anteby, Michel. 2013. Relaxing the taboo on telling our own stories: Upholding professional distance and</p>

		<p>personal involvement. <i>Organization Science</i> 24/4: 1277–90.</p> <p>Watson, Tony J. 1995. Shaping the story: Rhetoric, persuasion and creative writing in organisational ethnography. <i>Studies in Cultures, Organizations and Societies</i> 1/2: 301-11.</p> <p><u>Examples of methods sections</u> [see also list of ethnographies at end]</p> <p>Duneier, Mitchell. 1999. <i>Sidewalk</i>. NY: Farrar, Straus & Giroux. Introduction and Appendix: A statement on method (4-14, 333-57).</p> <p>Michel, Alexandra. 2011. Transcending socialization: A nine-year ethnography of the body's role in organizational control and knowledge workers' transformation. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i> 56/3: 325–68, esp. 332-35.</p> <p>Petryna, Adriana. 2003. <i>Life exposed: Biological citizens after Chernobyl</i>. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. Ch. 1, http://press.princeton.edu/chapters/s9863.pdf.</p> <p><u>See also:</u></p> <p>Symposium. 2006. 'Field research methods in the Middle East.' <i>PS: Political Science & Politics</i> 39/3: 417-41, esp. Tessler and Jamal.</p> <p>Pachirat, Timothy. 2009. Shouts and murmurs: The ethnographer's potion. <i>Qualitative & Multi-Method Research</i> 7/2: 41-44. www.maxwell.syr.edu/uploadedFiles/moynihan/cqrm/Newsletter7.2.pdf</p> <p>Bayard de Volo, Lorraine. 2009. Participant observation, politics, and power relations. In Schatz, ch. 5.</p> <p>Ortbals, Candice D. and Rincker, Meg E. 2009. Fieldwork, identities, and intersectionality: Negotiating gender, race, class, religion, nationality, and age in the research field abroad. <i>PS: Political Science & Politics</i> 42/2: 287-328.</p> <p><u>Supplemental readings</u></p> <p>Bell, Diane, Caplan, Pat, and Kahan Karim, Wazir, eds. 1993. <i>Gendered fields: Women, men and ethnography</i>. NY: Routledge.</p> <p>Cesara, Manda. 1982. <i>Reflections of a woman anthropologist: No hiding place</i>. New York: Academic Press.</p> <p>Golde, Peggy, ed. 1986. <i>Women in the field</i>, 2nd ed. Berkeley: University of California Press.</p> <p>Lewin, Ellen and Leap, William L., eds. 1996. <i>Out in the field: Reflections of lesbian and gay anthropologists</i>. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.</p> <p>Rosaldo, Michele and Lamphere, Louise. 1974. <i>Woman, culture, and society</i>. Stanford: Stanford University Press.</p>
--	--	---

		Warren, Carol A. B. 1988. <i>Gender issues in field research</i> . Thousand Oaks: Sage.
Afternoon/ evening		'Lab' assignment: Participating observation exercise, same location as first 2 days; more details in class.
Thursday 9-10.30	7. Ethnography and research ethics I: Protecting research participants	<p><u>Think</u>: What ethical issues do you face, or have you encountered, in your research? Do these involve protecting participants? informed consent? something else? Should deception or covert research be outlawed? Should ethnographers be obliged to 'give back'? Should we stop doing ethnography and do (participatory) action research instead, on ethical grounds? What do you do when people ask you to tell them what you're finding—2 weeks into your research? What is your relationship to ethics review committees on your campus? Are there ethical issues which that review process does not cover?</p> <p><u>Read</u></p> <p>Parry, Marc. 2013. Conflict over sociologist's narrative puts spotlight on ethnography. <i>Chronicle of Higher Education</i> (June 13). http://m.chronicle.com/article/Conflict-Over-Sociologists/230883/</p> <p>Fujii, Lee Ann. 2012. Research ethics 101: Dilemmas and responsibilities. <i>PS: Political Science & Politics</i> 45/4: 717-23.</p> <p>Wall, Caleb and Overton, John. 2006. Unethical ethics? Applying research ethics in Uzbekistan. <i>Development in Practice</i> 16/1: 62-67.</p> <p><u>On deception in field research</u></p> <p>Leo, Richard A. 1995. Trial and tribulations: Courts, ethnography, and the need for an evidentiary privilege for academic researchers. <i>American Sociologist</i> 26/1: 113–34.</p> <p>Erikson, Kai. 1995. Commentary. <i>American Sociologist</i> 26/2:4-11.</p> <p>Leo, Richard A. 1996. The ethics of deceptive research roles reconsidered: A reply to Kai Erikson. <i>American Sociologist</i> 27/1: 122–28.</p> <p>Erikson, Kai. 1996. A response to Richard Leo. <i>American Sociologist</i> 27/1: 129–30.</p> <p>Denzin, Norman K. 1968. On the ethics of disguised observation. <i>Social Problems</i> 15/4: 502-4.</p> <p>Becker, Howard S. 1967. Whose side are we on? <i>Social Problems</i> 14/3: 239-48.</p> <p><u>Background to Erikson/Leo exchange</u></p> <p>Erikson, Kai T. 1967. Comment on disguised observation in sociology. <i>Social Problems</i> 14/4: 366-73.</p> <p>Scarce, Rik. 1994. (No) trials (but) tribulations. <i>Journal of Contemporary Ethnography</i> 23/2:123-49.</p>

		<p><u>Supplemental readings</u></p> <p>Greenwood, Davydd J. and Levin, Morten. 2007. <i>Introduction to action research</i>, 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.</p> <p>Schein, Edgar H. 1998. <i>Process consultation revisited: Building the helping relationship</i>. Addison-Wesley Longman.</p> <p>Eckl, Julian. 2008. Responsible scholarship after leaving the veranda: Normative issues faced by field researchers—and armchair scientists. <i>International Political Sociology</i> 2/3: 185–203.</p> <p>Read in context with reviews of Alice Goffman, <i>On the run</i> (U Chicago Press, 2014), esp.:</p> <p>Lubet, Steven. 2015. Ethics on the Run. <i>The New Rambler</i> http://newramblerreview.com/book-reviews/law/ethics-on-the-run [accessed 17 June 2015].</p> <p>Goffman, Alice. 2015. A reply to Professor Lubet’s critique. <i>New Republic</i> www.ssc.wisc.edu/soc/faculty/docs/goffman/A%20Reply%20to%20Professor%20Lubet.pdf.</p> <p>Lubet, Steven. 2015. Alice Goffman’s denial of murder conspiracy raises even more questions. <i>New Republic</i> (June 3). www.newrepublic.com/article/121958/sociologist-alice-goffman-denies-murder-conspiracy-run [accessed 17 June 2015].</p> <p>But see also: Stoller, Paul. 2015. Alice Goffman and the future of ethnography. <i>Huffington Post</i> (June 15). www.huffingtonpost.com/paul-stoller/alice-goffman-and-the-future-of-ethnography-b_7585614.html [accessed 17 June 2015].</p> <p>Lahman, Maria K. E., Rodriguez, Katrina L., Moses, Lindsey, Griffin, Krista M., Mendoza, Bernadette M., and Yacoub, Wafa. 2015. A rose by any other name is still a rose? Problematizing pseudonyms in research. <i>Qualitative Inquiry</i> 21/5: 445–53.</p>
11-12.30	8. Ethnography and research ethics II: Protecting researchers	<p><u>Think:</u> How might research pose danger for a researcher? Has, does or will your research place you in danger? What sort? And if so, how have you handled that or how do you plan to?</p> <p><u>Read</u></p> <p>Lee-Treweek, Geraldine and Linkogle, Stephanie, eds. 2000. <i>Danger in the field: Risk and ethics in social research</i>. London: Routledge, Overview and chs. 1, 3, 6, 8, 9; skim 4, 5, 7.</p> <p><u>Supplemental readings</u></p> <p>Wood, Elisabeth Jean. 2006. The ethical challenges of field research in conflict zones. <i>Qualitative Sociology</i> 29: 373-86.</p> <p>Goodhand, Jonathan. Research in conflict zones: Ethics and accountability. <i>Forced Migration Review</i> 8: 12-15.</p>

		<p>Belousov, Konstantin <i>et al.</i> 2007. Any port in a storm: Fieldwork difficulties in dangerous and crisis-ridden settings. <i>Qualitative Research</i> 7: 155-75.</p> <p>Blee, Kathleen M. 1998. White-knuckle research: Emotional dynamics in fieldwork with racist activists. <i>Qualitative Sociology</i> 21/4: 381-99.</p> <p>Lecocq, Baz. 2002. Fieldwork ain't always fun: Public and hidden discourses on fieldwork. <i>History in Africa</i> 29: 273-82.</p> <p>de Rond, Mark. 2012. Soldier, surgeon, photographer, fly: Fieldwork beyond the comfort zone. <i>Strategic Organization</i> 10/3: 256–62.</p> <p>Fujii, Lee Ann. 2013. Working with interpreters. In Layna Mosley, ed., <i>Interview research in political science</i>, 144-58. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, esp. 150-51.</p> <p>Gifford, Lindsay and Hall-Clifford, Rachel. 2008. From catcalls to kidnapping: Towards an open dialogue on the fieldwork experience of graduate women. <i>Anthropology News</i> 26-27 (September).</p> <p>Flaherty, Colleen. 2014. What happens in the field. <i>Inside Higher Ed</i> (August 13). https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2014/08/13/researchers-react-study-about-sexual-harassment-scientists-field</p> <p>Blog: Women In Astronomy: Post: Coming Out (of a Different Type of Closet) http://womeninastronomy.blogspot.com/2011/02/coming-out-of-different-type-of-closet.html</p> <p>Woolston, Chris. 2015. Risky encounters. <i>Nature</i> 518 (19 February): 445-46.</p> <p>Jahren, A. Hope. 2014. Science has a sexual assault problem. <i>New York Times</i> (September 18). www.nytimes.com/2014/09/20/opinion/science-has-a-sexual-assault-problem.html?emc=eta1&r=0 [accessed 17 June 2015].</p> <p>Clancy, Kathryn B. H., Nelson, Robin G., Rutherford, Julianne N., and Hinde, Katie. 2014. Survey of academic field experiences (SAFE): Trainees report harassment and assault. <i>PLOS ONE</i> 9/7 e102172.</p>
Afternoon/ evening		'Lab' assignment: Integrating all of this into your own work...: What specific research ethics issues or personal risks are you facing, or have you faced, in your research? How will/did you handle them?
Friday 9-10.30	9. Issues in evaluation and writing	<p>Evaluative 'standards' for interpretive research – The questions of 'rigor' and objectivity, 'reliability' and 'validity.'</p> <p><u>Think</u>: Are there special characteristics of ethnographic writing that distinguish it from other genres of research writing? Do these have any bearing on the trustworthiness of the researcher's claims? What makes ethnographic (and other forms of interpretive) research trustworthy? How does researcher power</p>

		<p>shape the <i>political</i> character of the research?</p> <p><u>Read</u> Duneier, Mitchell. 2011. How not to lie with ethnography. <i>Sociological Methodology</i> 41/1: 11-11. Schwartz-Shea, Peregrine. 2014. Judging quality: Evaluative criteria and epistemic communities. In Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, eds., <i>Interpretation and method: Empirical research methods and the interpretive turn</i>, 120-46. Armonk, NY: M E Sharpe. Locke, Karen and Velamuri, S. Ramakrishna. 2009. The design of member review: Showing what to organization members and why. <i>Organizational Research Methods</i> 12/3: 488-509. Richardson, Laurel. 1994. Writing: A method of inquiry. In <i>Handbook of qualitative research</i>, ed. Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln, 516–29. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Watson, Tony J. 1995. Shaping the story: Rhetoric, persuasion and creative writing in organisational ethnography. <i>Studies in Cultures, Organizations and Societies</i> 1:2, 301-311. Yanow, Dvora. 2009. Dear author, dear reader. In Schatz, ch. 13. Humphreys, Michael and Watson, Tony. 2009. Ethnographic practices: From ‘writing up’...to writing. In Ybema et al., ch. 2. Yanow, Dvora and Schwartz-Shea, Peregrine. 2009. Reading and writing as method. In Ybema et al., ch. 3.</p> <p><u>Additional</u> Golden-Biddle, Karen and Locke, Karen. 1993. Appealing work: An investigation in how ethnographic texts convince. <i>Organization Science</i> 4: 595–616. Tilly, Charles. 2006. Afterword: Political ethnography as art and science. <i>Qualitative Sociology</i> 29: 409-12.</p>
11.00-12.30	10. Organizational-policy-political ethnography: Unresolved issues?	<p><u>Think</u>: What is special about ‘ethnography’? How is it different from ‘just’ interviewing? What is <i>political</i> or <i>policy</i>, or <i>organizational</i>, ethnography, and how is it different from ‘anthropological ethnography’? Is it thinkable to do ‘textual ethnography’ in political science, and if so, what does or might that mean? And what do we do about ‘theory’???</p> <p><u>Read</u> Mannay, Dawn and Morgan, Melanie. 2015. Doing ethnography or applying a qualitative technique? Reflections from the ‘waiting field’. <i>Qualitative Research</i> 15/2: 166–82. St. Pierre, Elizabeth A. and Jackson, Alecia Y. 2014. Qualitative data analysis after coding. <i>Qualitative</i></p>

		<p><i>Inquiry</i> 20/6: 715–19.</p> <p>Forsey, Martin Gerard. 2010. Ethnography as participant listening. <i>Ethnography</i> 11/4: 558-72.</p> <p>Nader, Laura. 2011. Ethnography as theory. <i>HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory</i> 1/1: 211-19.</p> <p>Wilkinson, Cai. 2014. On not just finding what you (thought you) were looking for: Reflections on fieldwork data and theory. In Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, eds., <i>Interpretation and method: Empirical research methods and the interpretive turn</i>, 2nd ed., 387-405. Armonk, NY: M E Sharpe.</p> <p>Schatz, Edward. 2009. What kind(s) of ethnography does political science need? In Schatz, Conclusion. Schatz, Edward, ed. 2009. Symposium: Ethnographic methods in political science. <i>QMMR Newsletter</i> 7/2 (Fall): 32-50. www.maxwell.syr.edu/uploadedFiles/moynihan/cqrm/Newsletter7.2.pdf</p> <p>*Yanow, Dvora. 2009. Organizational ethnography and methodological angst: Myths and challenges in the field. <i>Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management</i> 4/2: 186-99.</p> <p>Yanow, Dvora, ed. 2013. 'Reclaiming the Past': Symposium on Nancy Morey and Fred Luthans, 'Anthropology: The forgotten behavioral science in management history' (Academy of Management Proceedings, 1987). <i>Journal of Organizational Ethnography</i> 2/1: [82]-116.</p> <p>Yanow, Dvora and Geuijen, Karen. 2009. Defining 'organizational ethnography.' In Ybema et al., Appendix.</p> <p><u>Check out</u></p> <p>Manning, Peter. 1993. Review of Gideon Kunda, <i>Engineering Culture</i> [Temple University Press, 1992]. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i> 38/1: 134-37. http://web.mit.edu/sloan/osg-seminar/pre_02_docs/Kunda2.html [accessed 11 June 2015].</p> <p>Yanow, Dvora. 1993. Controlling cultural engineering? [Review of Gideon Kunda, <i>Engineering culture</i>, Temple University Press, 1992.] <i>Journal of Management Inquiry</i> 2/2: 206-13.</p> <p>(Optional: Yanow, Dvora. 1996. Review of Gideon Kunda, <i>Engineering Culture</i> [Temple University Press, 1992]. <i>Public Administration Review</i> 56/2: 211-12. http://web.mit.edu/sloan/osg-seminar/pre_02_docs/Kunda3.html [accessed 11 June 2015].)</p>
--	--	---

Additional literature

A. Methodological and historical works

- Edelman, Murray. 1964. *The Symbolic Uses of Politics*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Edelman, Murray. 1977. *Political Language*. New York: Academic Press.
- Fernando, Mayanthi L. 2014. Ethnography and the politics of silence. *Cultural Dynamics* 26/2: 235–44.
- Geertz, Clifford. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. NY: Basic Books. Esp. ch. 1.
- Jackson, Patrick Thaddeus. 2008. Foregrounding ontology: Dualism, monism, and IR theory. *Review of International Studies* 34/1: 129-53.
- Jackson, Patrick Thaddeus. 2008. Can ethnographic techniques tell us distinctive things about world politics? *International Political Sociology* 2/1: 91-93.
- Jackson, Patrick Thaddeus. 2011. *The conduct of inquiry in international relations: Philosophy of science and its implications for the study of world politics*. NY: Routledge.
- Hawkesworth, M. E. 1988. *Theoretical Issues in Policy Analysis*. Albany: SUNY Press, chs. 1-4.
- Hiley, David R., Bohman, James F., and Shusterman, Richard, eds. 1991. *The Interpretive Turn*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Polkinghorne, Donald E. 1983. *Methodology for the Human Sciences*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Polkinghorne, Donald E. 1988. *Narrative Knowing and the Human Sciences*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Rabinow, Paul and Sullivan, William M., eds. 1979/1985. *The Interpretive Turn*, 1st/2nd eds. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Reiter, Bernd. 2006. The hermeneutic foundations of qualitative research. *Qualitative Methods* 4/2: 18-24. [answer to the question, When should I stop interviewing?]
- Smith, Dorothy E. 2001. Text and the ontology of organizations and institutions. *Studies in Cultures, Organizations and Societies* 7: 159-98.
- Smith, Dorothy E. 2005. *Institutional ethnography: A sociology for people*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Smith, Dorothy E., ed. 2006. *Institutional ethnography as practice*. Rowman and Littlefield.
- Suddaby, Roy. 2006. What grounded theory is not. *Academy of Management Journal* 49/4: 633-42. [Its title notwithstanding, an excellent overview of interpretive methodological starting points.]
- Taylor, Charles. 1971. Interpretation and the sciences of man. *Review of Metaphysics* 25: 3–51. Reprinted in Fred R. Dallmayr and Thomas A. McCarthy, eds., *Understanding and Social Inquiry*, 101–31. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press; and Paul Rabinow and William M. Sullivan, eds., *Interpretive Social Science: A Reader*, 25–71. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Wax, Murray L. 2000. Old Chicago and new France. *American Sociologist* 31/4: 65-82.

B. On representation and knowledge claims

- Clifford, James and Marcus, George E., eds. 1986. *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Golden-Biddle, Karen and Locke, Karen. 1993. Appealing work: An investigation in how ethnographic texts convince. *Organization Science* 4: 595–616.
- Golden-Biddle, Karen and Locke, Karen. 1997. *Composing Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Van Maanen, John. 1986. *Tales of the Field*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

C. More readings on method

- Agar, Michael. 1986. *Speaking of ethnography*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Bengtsson, Stina. 2014. Faraway, so close! Proximity and distance in ethnography online. *Media, Culture & Society* 36/6: 862–77.
- Downey, Greg, Dalidowicz, Monica, and Mason, Paul H. 2015. Apprenticeship as method: Embodied learning in ethnographic practice. *Qualitative Research* 15/2: 183–200.
- Feldman, Martha S., Bell, Jeannine, and Berger, Michele Tracy, eds. 2003. *Gaining access*. Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira.

- Fujii, Lee Ann. 2014. Five stories of accidental ethnography: Turning unplanned moments in the field into data. *Qualitative Research* [online].
- James, Allison. 2013. Seeking the analytic imagination: Reflections on the process of interpreting qualitative data. *Qualitative Research* 13/5: 562-77.

On interviewing

- Fujii, Lee Ann. Forthcoming. *Relational interviewing for social science research: An interpretive approach*. NY: Routledge.
- Rubin, Herbert J. and Rubin, Irene S. 2011. *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data*. Sage.
- Spradley, James P. 1979. *The ethnographic interview*. New York: Holt, Rinhart and Winston.

On shadowing

- Wolcott, Harry F. 2003/1973. *The man in the principal's office*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Mintzberg, Henry. 1970. Structured observation as a method to study managerial work. *Journal of Management Studies* 7/1: 87-104.
- McDonald, Seonaidh. 2005. Studying actions in context: A qualitative shadowing method for organizational research. *Qualitative Research* 5/4: 455-73.
- McDonald, Seonaidh, and Simpson, Barbara. 2014. Shadowing research in organizations: The methodological debates. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management* 9/1: 3 – 20. [Introduction to a special issue]
- Gilliat-Ray, Sophie. 2011. 'Being there': The experience of shadowing a British Muslim Hospital chaplain. *Qualitative Research* 11/5: 469–86.

Visual methods

- Bell, Emma, Warren, Warren, and Schroeder, Jonathan, eds. 2014. *The Routledge Companion to Visual Organization*. NY: Routledge.
- Hagaman, Dianne. 1996. *How I learned not to be a photojournalist*. University Press of Kentucky. <http://www.diannehagaman.com/books/pj2/pj2-title.html>

D. Teaching

- McGranahan, Carole. 2014. What is ethnography? Teaching ethnographic sensibilities without fieldwork. *Teaching Anthropology* 4: 23-36.

E. Political or policy ethnographies (not necessarily traditional or self-described ethnographies)

- Blau, Peter. 1963 [1953]. *The Dynamics of Bureaucracy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Crozier, Michel. 1964. *The Bureaucratic Phenomenon*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dubois, Vincent. 2010. *The Bureaucrat and the Poor: Encounters in French Welfare Offices*. Aldershot: Ashgate. orig. *La Vie au Guichet: Relation Administrative et Traitement de la Misère*. Économica, coll. Études politiques, 3rd ed., 2010 [1999].
- Goodsell, Charles T. 1988. *The Social Meaning of Civic Space*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.
- Gusfield, Joseph R. 1981. *The Culture of Public Problems: Drinking-Driving and the Symbolic Order*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kondo, Dorinne K. 1990. *Crafting Selves: Power, Gender, and Discourses of Identity in a Japanese Workplace*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lin, Ann Chih. 2000. *Reform in the Making*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Linder, Steven. 1995. Contending discourses in the electric and magnetic fields controversy. *Policy Sciences* 28: 209–30.
- Lipsky, Michael. 1980. *Street-Level Bureaucracy*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Luker, Kristin. 1984. *Abortion and the Politics of Motherhood*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Mitchell, Timothy. 1991. *Colonising Egypt*. Berkeley: University of California Press. ('textual ethnography')
- Mitchell, Timothy. 2002. *Rule of Experts*. Berkeley: University of California Press. ('textual ethnography')

- Orr, Julian. 1996. *Talking About Machines: An Ethnography of a Modern Job*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Pachirat, Timothy. 2011. *Every Twelve Seconds*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Pader, Ellen J. 1993. Spatiality and social change: Domestic space use in Mexico and the United States. *American Ethnologist* 20: 114–37.
- Paley, Julia. 2001. Making democracy count. *Cultural Anthropology* 16: 135–64.
- Schmidt, Ronald, Sr. 2000. *Language Policy and Identity Politics in the United States*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Shehata, Samer S. 2009. *Shop Floor Culture and Politics in Egypt*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Singerman, Diane. 1995. *Avenues of Participation*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Stein, Sandra J. 2004. *The Culture of Education Policy*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Swaffield, Simon. 1998. Contextual meanings in policy discourse: A case study of language use concerning resource policy in the New Zealand high country. *Policy Sciences* 31: 199–224.
- Van Maanen, John. 1978. Observations on the making of a policeman. *Human Organization* 32: 407–18.
- Walsh, Katherine Cramer. 2004. *Talking About Politics: Informal Groups and Social Identity in American Life*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Yanow, Dvora. 1996. *How Does a Policy Mean? Interpreting Policy and Organizational Actions*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

For organizational ethnographies, see Annotated Bibliography in Ybema et al., 2009.

- Kuronen, Tuomas and Virtaharju, Jouni. 2015. The fishing president: Ritual in constructing leadership mythology. *Leadership* 11/2: 186–212.