

**SC 102b. Field Research II:
Issues in Political, Policy, and Organizational Ethnography and Participant Observation**

**12th ECPR Summer School in Methods and Techniques, 7-11 August 2017
Central European University, Budapest, Hungary**

prof. dr. Dvora Yanow
Guest Professor
Sub-department Communication, Philosophy, & Technology
Wageningen University, NL
Dvora.Yanow@wur.nl

As a young man, [Tzvetan] Todorov left his native Bulgaria for France. He found himself in a new land—one sense of *dépaysé*—but also disoriented, even homeless—yet another meaning. This sense of homelessness is often a curse, but for Todorov it was a great opportunity. Thanks to his incurable state of *dépayement*, he remarked, he could not help but bring a ‘new, different, surprised regard to a new culture. I experience this condition as a source of wealth, not impoverishment.’

--Robert Zaretsky. 2017. A philosopher of otherness dies when he’s needed most.
Chronicle of Higher Education (February 10).¹

Participant-observer ethnographic field research—central among the many methods that fall under the umbrella of interpretive and qualitative research methods—has, in one widely cited view, been ‘borrowed’ from sociology and anthropology into many subfields of political science, including comparative governmental studies, international relations, area studies, public policy (domestic, including local, state, regional; international; EU, etc.), public administration/local government studies, public law/legal studies, and organizational studies. It is not new, however, either to organizational studies or to political studies generally, having been employed in the US at least since the 1950s, and some would say even earlier, pointing to Frederick Winslow Taylor’s early 20th century observations of workers, the 1930s studies of the Hawthorne, Illinois, Western Electric plant, and Richard Fenno’s studies of US federal legislators first published in 1966.² Indeed, one might argue, as Saleminck (2003³) does, that ethnography originated as a colonial practice, which positions its anthropological version as a subset of a broader range of administrative practices (perhaps even growing out of earlier state practices of statistical descriptions of populations⁴). Whatever its origins, ethnography—Malinowski added the participant-observer dimension to academic ethnography in 1922—is useful in a wide range of settings for research questions that seek to explore the meanings of particular practices, concepts or processes to situational actors, often in order to illuminate a wider-ranging, at times more theoretical issue of concern. The latter might include studying the meaning of ‘security’ (Cai Wilkinson) or ‘democracy’ (Frederic Schaffer) in non-Western states; how policy-makers or legislators think about the decisions they make and how they go about them (Fenno); how workers shape their work practices and their relationships to managers (Julian Orr); the

¹ www.chronicle.com/article/A-Philosopher-of-Otherness-/239178?cid=at&utm_source=at&utm_medium=en&elqTrackId=022ccb0957af4bf5a4c3091091ae2bee&elq=2b1e927da9c4410fa6a95634ac8ae066&elqaid=12552&elqat=1&elqCampaignId=5113 (accessed 2 July 2017).

² Fenno, Richard F., Jr. 1966, *The Power of the Purse: Appropriations Politics in Congress*; 1973, *Congressmen in Committees*; 1978, *Home Style: House Members in Their Districts*. All: Boston: Little, Brown & Co.

³ Saleminck, Oscar. 2003. Ethnography, anthropology and colonial discourse. In *The ethnography of Vietnam's Central Highlanders: A historical contextualization, 1850-1990*, 1-39. London: RoutledgeCurzon.

⁴ See, e.g., Hacking, Ian. 1990. *The taming of chance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

meaning of authority relations in a state (Samer Shehata); how violence gets routinized (Timothy Pachirat); how street-level bureaucrats implement national policies (Yanow); and so on.

This course is intended for those who are in the midst of conducting field research or who have already completed the fieldwork component of their research project and are thinking about, starting to or already working on writing up their field notes and drafts of chapters or papers/articles. (Those who are planning on conducting such a study but have not yet gone into the field should first take the ECPR Summer School's 'Field Research I: Introduction to Ethnography and Field Research' or an equivalent course.) The project might be a traditional ethnographic or participant-observer study (based in a community or an organization, for instance); it may have involved 'shadowing' a political leader or policy-maker; and/or it might have included formal (expert, elite or other) ethnographic interviews (i.e., in conversational style—engaging people in talk⁵). Researchers may also have combined ethnographic methods (observing, with whatever degree of participation, which typically includes talking to situational members) with the close reading of topic-relevant documents and/or visual materials in some form (e.g., in archives, newspaper morgues, and the like, or webpages) in order to generate data which they are intending to analyze using other methods (e.g., some form of discourse analysis; metaphor, category or other language-focused analysis; space analysis or other visual method; narrative analysis; and so on).

The course will focus on several of the concepts and issues central to current debates about political, policy, and organizational participant-observer ethnography. These include:

- the relational turn in understanding ethnographic research, including power and politics issues that arise in the conduct of field research;
- reflexivity and positionality, especially as these bear on the generation of data and the trustworthiness of one's knowledge claims;
- research ethics, in light of growing formal attention to this topic on the part of university (and other) ethics review committees and ensuing requirements presented by journal publishers;
- writing as method – looking at knowledge claims and their evidentiary base, and the ways in which these are presented in research writings.

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. Additional class exercises may be added.

Prerequisite knowledge

The course is designed as an 'advanced' course in interpretive-qualitative research methods. It is intended for students who have already conducted field research. That prerequisite can be waived for students who have taken and successfully passed "Field Research I: Introduction to Ethnography and Field Research" or its equivalent. In addition, students should have already taken at least one course introducing them to the methodological underpinnings of interpretive and qualitative research, ideally including some readings in the philosophy of social science. (Examples of such courses in the ECPR Methods School include 'Introduction to Interpretive Research Designs' [Summer] and 'Philosophy and Methodology of the Social Sciences' [Summer refresher, Winter course].) Those who wish to brush up on the methodological background will find suggested readings following the daily schedule.

Required readings

[Please note that 'required' refers to the reading of things, not necessarily to their purchasing.]

⁵ Spradley, James P. 1979. *The ethnographic interview*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth; Fujii, Lee Ann. 2017. *Interviewing in social science research: A relational approach*. New York: Routledge (due 9 August).

1. Schwartz-Shea, Peregrine and Yanow, Dvora. 2012. *Interpretive research design: Concepts and processes*. New York: Routledge. [selected chapters; see syllabus]
2. Depending on your research field:
 - a. Schatz, Edward, ed., 2009. *Political ethnography: What immersion contributes to the study of power*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. [selected chapters]
 - b. Ybema, Sierk et al., eds. 2009. *Organizational ethnography*. London: Sage. [selected chapters]
3. Lee-Treweek, Geraldine and Linkogle, Stephanie, eds. 2000. *Danger in the field: Risk and ethics in social research*. London: Routledge. [selected chapters]
4. Goffman, Alice. 2014. *On the Run: Fugitive Life in an American City*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. [Entire book; we will use this as the 'case study' illustrating the issues discussed in session #3.]
5. Journal articles, conference papers, and book chapters, as noted on the syllabus.

In general, you are responsible for locating the readings on your own. Hard-to-obtain readings [marked *] will be provided; details on this will be sent to those registered for the course. If there are other readings that you are having difficulty getting ahold of via your own university library, please let me know; I will help to the extent that I can. Please keep in mind that I cannot post readings on the course Moodle page for reasons of copyright. The CEU library will do its best to make readings available, too, but most of these should be read before the course starts, and the library cannot promise when things will be available or guarantee that they will be.

Pre-course assignment

You will be invited to briefly introduce yourself via email to all course participants. In particular, please 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 your introduction to the group no later than 27 July. If received by then, your specific questions are more likely to be built into course discussions, and many people will begin (or may, indeed, already be) traveling around that time.

In-class procedures

1. If we are a large-ish group, you will be asked to divide yourselves into working groups of 2-3 members each. If we are a small group, we may proceed with 'groups' of one.
2. Each group will be responsible for bringing questions from the readings and/or participants' experiences to one of the day's meetings. If you wish, you may ask others not in your group for their contributions to the set of questions.

Credits

This course carries 2 ECTS. The subject matter does not allow for an examination, and none will be offered. It is not possible to do 'additional work' for additional credit.

A note on the course slides

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 three reasons. One, some of the material I use is under copyright, and I do not have permission to circulate it. Second, the slides constitute my

processing of 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). Three, recent research shows that we learn more, and better, when we make our own notes on lectures. If you are interested in a particular slide or in specific sources that I might list there, please do ask me; I will be happy to share those.

Instructor's bio

I am a policy/political/organizational ethnographer and interpretive methodologist interested in the generation and communication of knowing and meaning in organizational and policy settings. My current research includes a book project on state-created categories for immigrant and '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 authored book is *Interpretive Research Design: Concepts and Processes* (Routledge 2012), with Peregrine Schwartz-Shea; our co-edited book *Interpretation and Method* is out in a second edition (M E Sharpe 2014). I received the 2012 and 2014 Cora Maas teaching awards for previous versions of this course.

<http://wu.academia.edu/DvoraYanow>

Daily Schedule of Session Topics and Readings

Reader's Guide:

- a. This is the updated, final syllabus for the 2017 course; but the schedule may be modified during the course week (e.g., changing the sequence of course topics), depending on registered students' backgrounds and how our discussions evolve.
- b. This course covers a lot of ground, in a short amount of time. I have designated Friday's sessions for the discussion of topics that will have arisen during the week but which we've not adequately discussed, and to take up questions about your individual projects that we have not gotten to yet. You are, of course, always welcome to raise questions as these are sparked by in-class discussions during the week.
- c. 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, for two reasons. Ph.D. students and others planning on an academic career should note that becoming familiar with and mastering the literature of a field is part of the not-so-hidden agenda of coursework. The syllabus is designed, therefore, to introduce you to a variety of readings in this field. In addition, I try to select readings that I find engaging, but what is engaging for me may not be for you, so there is some redundancy built in such that if one reading doesn't 'speak' to you, another in the grouping might. Please do at least a few of the readings for each session before the course; others may prove interesting to you later on.
- d. 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? What other questions do *you* have?

	Topic(s)	Details, Readings
MONDAY		
9-10.30	1. Introductions to persons and topic	<p><u>Think</u>: What do we mean by field research, fieldwork, participant observation, ethnography, and interviewing? The opening session will introduce the course topic, as well as course participants, in a way oriented to provide us with a shared language for the course. This background, and especially the 2nd session today, may also help you in presenting, explaining, and perhaps even justifying your work to members of your department, colleagues at conference panels, etc.</p>
10.30-11.00	B R E A K	
11.00-12.30	2. Logics of inquiry in interpretive research: Abduction and surprises; flexibility and exposure; from observing to theorizing.	<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? How can one design and plan for a research project when the 'setting' is a movable target. What are the implications of abductive inquiry for theorizing from field data?</p> <p><u>In class</u> 2 short videos >> on moving from observation to theory.</p> <p><u>Read</u> Schwartz-Shea, Peregrine and Yanow, Dvora. 2012. <i>Interpretive research design: Concepts and processes</i>. New York: Routledge, chs. 2, 3, 5. 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. Wilson, William Julius and Chaddha, Anmol. 2010. The role of theory in ethnographic research. <i>Ethnography</i> 10/4: 549-64. 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. Timmermans, Stefan and Tavory, Iddo. 2012. Theory construction in qualitative research: From grounded theory to abductive analysis. <i>Sociological Theory</i> 30: 167.</p>

		<p><u>For further reading</u></p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Fine, Gary Alan and Hallett, Tim. 2014. Stranger and stranger: Creating theory through ethnographic distance and authority. <i>Journal of Organizational Ethnography</i> 3/2: 188-203.</p>
13.00-?		LUNCH
		It is a custom in the ECPR Methods Schools for instructors to plan one 'social outing' for the course. In years past we have found that gathering for lunch on the 1 st day works well. Unless that proves problematic for people, let's plan on that.
TUESDAY		
9-10.30	3. Power issues in the field: Researcher identities	<p><u>Think</u>: 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? How does one manage one's own identity, in all its aspects, in the field? Should we involve situational members? How? Issues in 'member-checking.' What about collaborative authorship? And what about advice-giving: What do you do when people in your research setting ask you to tell them what you're finding—two weeks into your research? ?</p> <p><u>Read</u></p> <p>*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.</p> <p>*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.</p> <p>Down, Simon and Hughes, Michael. 2009. When the 'subject' and the 'researcher' speak together. In Sierk Ybema et al., <i>Organizational ethnography</i>. London: Sage, ch. 4. [and see below @ **]</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>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.</p> <p>Koning, Juliette and Ooi, Can-Seng. 2013. Awkward encounters and ethnography. <i>Qualitative Research in</i></p>

		<p><i>Organizations and Management</i> 8/1: 16-32.</p> <p>Adams, Laura L. 1999. The mascot researcher: Identity, power, and knowledge in fieldwork. <i>Journal of Contemporary Ethnography</i> 28/4: 331-63.</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>**Consider (scan in re. collaborative authorship; what’s going on here?)</p> <p>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> <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>11-12.30</p>	<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? That is, can ‘outsiders’ become ‘insiders’? How native is a ‘native’ ethnographer?</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 Sierk Ybema et al., <i>Organizational ethnography</i>. London: Sage, ch. 8.</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>Till, Karen E. 2001. Returning home and to the field. <i>Geographical Review</i> 91 (1/2): 46-56.</p> <p><u>For further reading</u></p> <p>Ganiel, Gladys and Mitchell, Claire. 2006. Turning the categories inside-out: Complex identifications and</p>

		multiple interactions in religious ethnography. <i>Sociology of Religion</i> 67/1: 3-21.
WEDNESDAY		
<p>9-10.30</p>	<p>5. Evidence and ‘proof’ in field research—the case of Alice Goffman</p>	<p><u>Think</u>: Sociologist Alice Goffman’s book has been the focus of critics’ allegations that ethnography as a method is not trustworthy in terms of the character of its “findings.” The topic lends itself to several themes, including ideas raised by DA-RT discussions* in (US) political science:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) that ethnographic—and by extension, other interpretive and qualitative—research is insufficiently transparent; 2) that such research is not replicable, thereby casting doubt not only on its claims, but also on its character as science; 3) that it is advocacy masquerading as science. <p>With respect to Goffman’s work, critics have questioned the character of the evidence and also challenged the author’s own research ethics. We will use her book as the foil for this session’s discussion. Read it and some of the criticisms; a few of these are listed here, and others will be provided (see email). How do you assess the critiques? What about researcher power and the <i>political</i> character of research?</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">* On DA-RT, see readings listed at the end of the syllabus.</p> <p><u>Read</u> Goffman, Alice. 2014. <i>On the run: Fugitive life in an American city</i>. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.</p> <p><u>Some of the critiques</u>:</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>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>Parry, Marc. 2015. Conflict over sociologist's narrative puts spotlight on ethnography. <i>Chronicle of Higher Education</i> (June 12). http://m.chronicle.com/article/Conflict-Over-Sociologists/230883/</p>

		<p>Lewis-Kraus, Gideon. 2016. The trials of Alice Goffman. <i>New York Times</i> (January 12). www.nytimes.com/2016/01/17/magazine/the-trials-of-alice-goffman.html</p> <p>Van Maanen, John and de Rond, Mark. 2017. The making of a classic ethnography: Notes on Alice Goffman's <i>On the Run</i>. <i>Academy of Management Review</i> 42/2: 396-406.</p> <p>Portilla, Ana. 2016. <i>On the Run</i> : l'ethnographie en cavale? De la controverse éthique au débat sociologique. <i>Genèses</i> 2016/1 (n° 102): 123-39.</p> <p>Stay tuned: Pachirat, Timothy. Forthcoming. <i>Ethnographers among wolves</i>. NY: Routledge, ch.6: The trial [of Alice Goffman].</p>
10.30-11	B R E A K	
11-12.30	<p>6. Evidence and 'proof' in writing field research: Evaluative 'standards' for interpretive research – 'rigor' and objectivity, 'reliability' and 'validity'?</p>	<p><u>Think</u>: One way to understand the controversy over Goffman's book is through attending to the character of the writing, in the context of the broader argument that writing is method. 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?</p> <p><u>Read</u></p> <p>Gusfield, Joseph R. 1976. The literary rhetoric of science: Comedy and pathos in drinking driver research. <i>American Sociological Review</i> 41: 16-34.</p> <p>Overington, Michael A. 1977. A critical celebration of Gusfields' "The literary rhetoric of science." <i>American Sociological Review</i> 42/1: 170-73.</p> <p>Gusfield, Joseph R. 1977. Reply to Overington. <i>American Sociological Review</i> 42/1: 173-74.</p> <p>Golden-Biddle, Karen and Locke, Karen. 1993. Appealing work: An investigation in how ethnographic texts convince. <i>Organization Science</i> 4: 595–616.</p> <p>Richardson, Laurel. 1994. Writing: A method of inquiry. In Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln, eds., <i>Handbook of qualitative research</i>, 516–29. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.</p> <p>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>, 2nd ed., 120-46. Armonk, NY: M E Sharpe.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Lichterman, Paul. 2016. Interpretive reflexivity in ethnography. <i>Ethnography</i> 18/1: 35–45.</p> <p>Lynch, Cecelia. 2008. Reflexivity in research on civil society: Constructivist perspectives. <i>International Studies Review</i> 10: 708–21.</p>

		<p>Czarniawska, Barbara. 2016. Reflexivity versus rigor. <i>Management Learning</i> 47/5: 615–19.</p> <p><u>More, if you have time:</u></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>Yanow, Dvora. 2009. Dear author, dear reader. In Edward Schatz, ed., <i>Political ethnography: What immersion contributes to the study of power</i>. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, ch. 13.</p> <p>Yanow, Dvora and Schwartz-Shea, Peregrine. 2009. Reading and writing as method. In Sierk Ybema et al., <i>Organizational ethnography</i>. London: Sage, ch. 3.</p> <p>Polkinghorne, Donald E. 2007. Validity issues in narrative research. <i>Qualitative Inquiry</i> 13/4: 471-86.</p> <p>Duneier, Mitchell. 2011. How not to lie with ethnography. <i>Sociological Methodology</i> 41/1: 11-11.</p> <p><u>Additional readings</u></p> <p>Tilly, Charles. 2006. Afterword: Political ethnography as art and science. <i>Qualitative Sociology</i> 29: 409-12.</p> <p>Fierke, K. M. 2002. Links across the abyss: Language and logic in international relations. <i>International Studies Quarterly</i> 46: 331-54.</p> <p>McCloskey, Donald N. 1994. How to do a rhetorical analysis of economics, and why. In Roger Backhouse, ed., <i>Economic methodology</i>, 319-42. London: Routledge.</p> <p>Schwartz-Shea, Peregrine, and Yanow, Dvora. 2002. 'Reading' 'methods' 'texts': How research methods texts construct political science. <i>Political Research Quarterly</i> 55 (2): 457-86.</p> <p>Humphreys, Michael and Watson, Tony. 2009. Ethnographic practices: From 'writing up'...to writing. In Sierk Ybema et al., <i>Organizational ethnography</i>. London: Sage, ch. 2.</p>
THURSDAY		
9-10.30	7. Ethnography and research ethics I: Researcher <> researched relationality— protecting research participants beyond ethics review committee policies	<p><u>Think:</u> What is the history, internationally and in your home country or institutional base, of concerns with research ethics and the protection of human subjects/participants in research? What ethical issues do you face, or have you encountered, in your research? Do these involve protecting participants? informed consent? something else? What about deception or covert research—should it be prohibited? Why/why not? Should ethnographers be obliged to 'give back'? Should we stop doing ethnography and do (participatory) action research instead, on ethical grounds? If there are ethics review committees on your campus, what is your relationship to them? Are there ethical issues which that review process does not address?</p>

		<p><u>Read</u></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>Desmond, Matthew. 2014. Relational ethnography. <i>Theory & Society</i> 43:547–79.</p> <p>Rupp, Leila J. and Taylor, Verta. 2011. Going back and giving back: The ethics of staying in the field. <i>Qualitative Sociology</i> 34: 483–96.</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>For further readings</u></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>.</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> <p>Piccio, Daniela R. 2009. “United in diversity”: Research ethics in European political science. <i>PS: Political Science & Politics</i> 49/4: 839-44.</p>
--	--	--

		<p><u>Also potentially relevant</u> Greenwood, Davydd J. and Levin, Morten. 2007. <i>Introduction to action research</i>, 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Schein, Edgar H. 1998. <i>Process consultation revisited: Building the helping relationship</i>. Addison-Wesley Longman.</p>
11-12.30	8. Ethnography and research ethics II: Protecting the researcher	<p><u>Think</u>: How might research pose danger for a researcher? Has or does your research place you in danger? What sort? And if so, how have or do you handle(d) that? What would you advise a new field researcher?</p> <p><u>Read</u> 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. Howland, Corinna and Woolner, Christina. 2016. Universities must protect PhDs doing risky fieldwork. Here's how. <i>The Guardian</i> (July 19). www.theguardian.com/higher-education-network/2016/jul/19/universities-must-do-more-to-protect-phds-doing-risky-fieldwork-heres-how?CMP=share_btn_link.</p> <p><u>Supplemental readings</u> Lecocq, Baz. 2002. Fieldwork ain't always fun: Public and hidden discourses on fieldwork. <i>History in Africa</i> 29: 273-82. de Rond, Mark. 2012. Soldier, surgeon, photographer, fly: Fieldwork beyond the comfort zone. <i>Strategic Organization</i> 10/3: 256–62. Wood, Elisabeth Jean. 2006. The ethical challenges of field research in conflict zones. <i>Qualitative Sociology</i> 29: 373-86. Goodhand, Jonathan. Research in conflict zones: Ethics and accountability. <i>Forced Migration Review</i> 8: 12-15. Belousov, Konstantin et al. 2007. Any port in a storm: Fieldwork difficulties in dangerous and crisis-ridden settings. <i>Qualitative Research</i> 7: 155-75. Blee, Kathleen M. 1998. White-knuckle research: Emotional dynamics in fieldwork with racist activists. <i>Qualitative Sociology</i> 21/4: 381-99. 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. See also Fujii, in press, on interviewing. Hillhorst, Dorothea et al. 2016. <i>Security guidelines for field research in complex, remote, and hazardous</i></p>

		<p><i>places</i>. Rotterdam: Institute of Social Studies.</p> <p><u>Essays</u></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). www.insidehighered.com/news/2014/08/13/researchers-react-study-about-sexual-harassment-scientists-field</p> <p>Coming Out (of a Different Type of Closet). <i>Women In Astronomy</i> [blog]. http://womeninastronomy.blogspot.com/2011/02/coming-out-of-different-type-of-closet.html</p> <p>Balter, Michael. 2016. The sexual misconduct case that has rocked anthropology. <i>Science</i> (February 9). www.sciencemag.org/news/2016/02/sexual-misconduct-case-has-rocked-anthropology.</p> <p>Ackermann, Rebecca Rogers. 2016. It is time: My personal journey from harassee to guardian. <i>Tenure, She Wrote</i> [blog; February 9]. https://tenureshewrote.wordpress.com/2016/02/09/it-is-time-my-personal-journey-from-harassee-to-guardian/#more-2567.</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, Julienne N., and Hinde, Katie. 2014. Survey of academic field experiences (SAFE): Trainees report harassment and assault. <i>PLOS ONE</i> 9/7 e102172. http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0102172</p> <p>Pollard, Amy. 2009. Field of screams: difficulty and ethnographic fieldwork. <i>Anthropology Matters Journal</i> 11/2. www.anthropologymatters.com.</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? What other issues are on your mind that we've not yet discussed, or not fully? Prepare this for tomorrow.
FRIDAY		
9-10.30	9. Your turn: Participants' Issues	What's on your mind? What haven't we discussed yet?
10.30-11	B R E A K	
11.00-12.00	10. Other topics in p/p/o	Think: What is special about 'ethnography'? How is it different from 'just' interviewing? Is it thinkable to

	ethnography and participant observation	do 'textual ethnography' in political science, and if so, what does or might that mean? Further open session to address participants' concerns.
12.00-12.30		Course evaluation [time set aside at the request of Methods School organizers].

Background readings

General

- Agar, Michael. 2013. *The lively science: Remodeling human social research*. Minneapolis, MN: Mill City Press. [see his webpage www.ethnoworks.com; the book page is www.thelivelyscience.com/]
- Jackson, Patrick Thaddeus. 2010. *The conduct of inquiry in international relations: Philosophy of science and its implications for the study of world politics*. NY: Routledge.
- Sigdel, Anil. 2015. Interview – Charles King. *E-International Relations* (Oct 18). <http://www.e-ir.info/2015/10/18/interview-charles-king/>.
An interview, rather than an academic article, but one in which a rationale for interpretive-qualitative research is articulated quite clearly
- Yanow, Dvora and Schwartz-Shea, Peregrine, eds. 2014. *Interpretation and method: Empirical research methods and the interpretive turn*, 2nd edition. Armonk, NY: M E Sharpe.

On fieldnotes

- Emerson, Robert M., Rachel I. Fretz, and Linda L. Shaw. 2011. *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*, 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sanjek, Roger. 1990. *Fieldnotes*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Wolfinger, Nicholas H. 2002. On writing fieldnotes: Collection strategies and background expectancies. *Qualitative Research* 1/2: 85-95.

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.
- Ginzburg, Carlo. 1989. Clues: Roots of an evidential paradigm. *Clues, myths, and the historical method*, 96-125. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Ginzburg, Carlo and Davin, Anna. 1980. Morelli, Freud and Sherlock Holmes: Clues and scientific method. *History Workshop Journal* 9 (Spring): 5-36.
- 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.
- 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.
- Katz Rothman, Barbara. 1986. Reflections: On hard work. *Qualitative Sociology* 9/1: 48-53.
- Ortner, Sherry B. 2016. Dark anthropology and its others: Theory since the eighties. *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 6 /1: 47–73.
- Pachirat, Timothy. Forthcoming. *Ethnography among Wolves*. NY: Routledge.
- Philips, Dennis C. 1983. After the wake: Postpositivistic educational thought. *Educational Researcher* (May): 4-9.
- 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.
- Albro, Robert. 2010. Writing Culture Doctrine: Public Anthropology, Military Policy, and World Making. *Perspectives on Politics* 8/4: 1087-93.
- Bengtsson, Stina. 2014. Faraway, so close! Proximity and distance in ethnography online. *Media, Culture & Society* 36/6: 862-77.
- Calhoun, Craig. 2010. Social science research and military agendas: Safe distance or bridging a troubling divide? *Perspectives on Politics* 8/4: 1101-6.
- Cramer, Christopher, Johnston, Deborah, Oya, Carlos, and Sender, John. 2015. Mistakes, crises, and research independence: The perils of fieldwork as a form of evidence. *African Affairs* 115/458: 145-60.
- Cramer, Renee Ann. 2009. Sharing in community while interviewing "outlaws": Methodological opportunities and challenges. *International Review of Qualitative Research* 4: 453-79.
- 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.
- Fenno, Richard F., Jr. 1986. Observation, context, and sequence in the study of politics. *American Political Science Review* 80/1: 3-15. [the source of 'soak and poke']
- Fujii, Lee Ann. 2015. Five stories of accidental ethnography: Turning unplanned moments in the field into data. *Qualitative Research* 15/4: 525-39.
- Gehlbach, Scott. 2015. The fallacy of multiple methods. *Comparative Politics Newsletter* (Fall): 11-12. <http://comparativenewsletter.com/>.
- James, Allison. 2013. Seeking the analytic imagination: Reflections on the process of interpreting qualitative data. *Qualitative Research* 13/5: 562-77.
- Islam, Gazi. 2015. Practitioners as theorists: Para-ethnography and the collaborative study of contemporary organizations. *Organizational Research Methods* 18/2:231-51.
- Raulet-Croset, Nathalie and Borzeix, Anni. 2014. Researching spatial practices through commented walks: "On the move" and "walking with." *Journal of Organizational Ethnography* 3/1: 27-42.
- Rouleau, Linda, de Rond, Mark, and Musca, Geneviève. 2014. From the ethnographic turn to new forms of organizational ethnography. *Journal of Organizational Ethnography* 3/1: 2-9.

- Schwartz-Shea, Peregrine and Majic, Samantha, eds. 2017. Ethnography and participant observation: Political science research in this “late methodological moment.” Symposium introduction. *PS: Political Science & Politics* 50/1: 97-102. Includes these essays and comments:
- Majic, Samantha. 2017. Participating, Observing, Publishing: Lessons from the Field. *PS: Political Science & Politics* 50/1: 103-08.
- Forrest, M. David. 2017. Engaging and Disrupting Power: The Public Value of Political Ethnography. *PS: Political Science & Politics* 50/1: 109-13.
- Curry, James M. 2017. In-Depth Qualitative Research and the Study of American Political Institutions. *PS: Political Science & Politics* 50/1: 114-20.
- Kang, Susan. 2017. What the Documents Can’t Tell You: Participant Observation in International Relations. *PS: Political Science & Politics* 50/1: 121-25.
- Simmons, Erica S. and Smith, Nicholas Rush. 2017. Comparison with an Ethnographic Sensibility. *PS: Political Science & Politics* 50/1: 126-30.
- Brodkin, Evelyn Z. 2017. The Ethnographic Turn in Political Science: Reflections on the State of the Art. *PS: Political Science & Politics* 50/1: 131-34.
- Schatz, Edward. 2017. Disciplines that Forget: Political Science and Ethnography. *PS: Political Science & Politics* 50/1: 135-38.
- Watson, Tony J. 2011. Ethnography, reality, and truth: The vital need for studies of ‘how things work’ in organizations and management. *Journal of Management Studies* 48/1: 202-17.
- Zilber, Tammar B. 2014. Beyond a single organization: Challenges and opportunities in doing field level ethnography. *Journal of Organizational Ethnography* 3/1: 96-113.

On interviewing

- Fujii, Lee Ann. In press. *Interviewing in social science research: A relational approach*. NY: Routledge.
- Spradley, James P. 1979. *The ethnographic interview*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Rubin, Herbert J. and Rubin, Irene S. 2011. *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data*. Sage.

On silences

- Bengtsson, Tea Torbenfeldt and Fynbo, Lars. 2017. Analysing the significance of silence in qualitative interviewing: Questioning and shifting power relations. *Qualitative Research* DOI: 10.1177/1468794117694220.
- Wilkinson, Cai. 2015. The unsaid and unseen: On hearing silences and seeing invisibilities in strategic narratives. *Critical Studies on Security* 3/3: 338-40.

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*. Economica, 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.

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

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

Down, Simon. 2012. A historiographical account of workplace and organizational ethnography. *Journal of Organizational Ethnography* 1/1: 72-82.

G. Literary anthropology

Czarniawska, Barbara. 2012. Accounting and detective stories: an excursion to the USA in the 1940s. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal* 25/4: 659-72.

H. For those who may be unaware of the DA-RT issues and debates that have been roiling APSA over the last couple of years, some sources are:

Lupia, Arthur and Colin Elman. 2014. Openness in Political Science: Data Access and Research Transparency, Introduction. *PS: Political Science & Politics* 47/1 (2014): 19-42.

Isaac, Jeffrey C. 2015. For a more *public* political science. *Perspectives on Politics* 13/2: 269–83.

Also by Isaac:

2015. Further thoughts on DA-RT. *The Plot: Politics Decoded* (blog), November 16. www.the-plot.org/2015/11/02/further-thoughts-on-da-rt/ (accessed May 9, 2016).

2015. A broader conception of political science publicity, Or why I refuse DA-RT and yet did not sign the 'Delay DA-RT' petition. *The Plot: Politics Decoded* (blog), December 3. www.the-plot.org/2015/12/03/a-broader-conception-of-political-science-publicity-or-why-i-refuse-da-rt-and-yet-did-not-sign-the-delay-da-rt-petition/ (accessed May 9, 2016).

2016. Is more deliberation about DA-RT really so good? *The Plot: Politics Decoded* (blog), January 23. www.the-plot.org/2016/01/23/is-more-deliberation-about-da-rt-really-so-good/ (accessed May 9, 2016).

Special issues from various APSA sections devoted to the topic:

Qualitative Methods (2015), especially essays by Cramer, Pachirat, and Wood and Parkinson: www.maxwell.syr.edu/uploadedFiles/moynihan/cqrm/Newsletter%2013_1.pdf

Comparative Politics Newsletter 26/1: 1–64 (2016)

International History and Politics Newsletter 1/2: 2-29 (2016)

Schwartz-Shea, Peregrine and Yanow, Dvora. 2016. Legitimizing Political Science or Splitting the Discipline? Reflections on DA-RT and the Policy-making Role of a Professional Association. *Gender & Politics* 12/3 [online: doi:10.1017/S1743923X16000428].

<https://dialogueondart.org/about/>

from QMMR: www.qualtd.net/page/about AND www.dartstatement.org