Afterword
Chapter 16
A Policy Ethnographer's Reading of Policy Anthropology

Dvora Yanow

Much as anthropologists talk about coming to understand their own cultures better for having lived in other countries, sometimes travelling to a foreign discipline helps one see one's own more clearly. Reading in cognate fields can generate oblique visions that enable eureka moments for present-day thinkers, much as displacing bathtub water did for ancient Greeks. So it might be for those reading this book from the tub of political science, policy studies, public administration/organisational studies and international relations – the 'we' of this chapter. For I come to these chapters as someone with a primary disciplinary home in 'politics' and subfield specialisations in public policy and organisational studies, but also as a long-time reader of anthropological literature, especially concerning ceremonies and rituals, myths, language (including metaphors and categories) and other aspects of the symbolic, the social and the cultural. As a methodologist, one of the central questions I brought to this book was: what, if anything, distinguishes policy anthropology from policy ethnography? By the latter I mean studies of public policies and policy processes from a political science background (including public policy, public administration, comparative government and international relations), without formal training in anthropology but informed by ethnographic methods and interpretive methodologies. I use these two terms throughout this chapter in drawing that distinction.

Taken as a whole, these chapters have the potential to enable 'us' political/policy ethnographers to see what has been directly under our noses for some time, but which has been obscured by recent political science's insistence, hegemonically, on turning human action – words, deeds, settings and interactions mediated by physical artefacts – into numbers. Yet, just as that discipline –

from the perspective of understanding human action on and in its own terms – is blinkered by its theoretical heritage, so too can anthropology be hampered – from the perspective of theorising public policies – by its methodological heritage. Strictures and boundaries developed within or imposed by epistemic communities and disciplinary devices can forestall successful communication, learning and even collaboration between the two groups.

These chapters show a way out, for both. They provide a necessary corrective for both fields: an anthropology that increasingly looks to root its studies in domestic governmental, organisational and other urban and trans-local settings, in strong contrast to its traditional 'foreign', bounded, village settings; and a public policy studies, perhaps even a political science, that is increasingly seeking to overcome a behaviouralist hegemony of the last thirty-five years that holds up quantitative methods as the scientific yardstick and expects qualitative methods to aspire to that 'standard' (Brady and Collier 2004).

For anthropological readers who may be unfamiliar with events and trends in political and policy sciences, let me note that the discipline is only now taking its own 'interpretive turn' (e.g., Klotz and Lynch 2007; Yanow and Schwartz-Shea 2006). *Policy Worlds* comes at a time of ferment when ethnography is becoming a serious contender, once again, for attention in North American political science; witness the recent publication of Schatz's *Political Ethnography* (2009) by a major press, the American Political Science Association's (APSA) Qualitative Methods Section's award of its 2007 Best Paper prize to Pachirat's (2009) ethnography, and Routledge's taking over of the rechristened *Critical Policy Studies* journal associated with the Europe-based Interpretive Policy Analysis conference. Yet these efforts still struggle against a strongly entrenched realist-objectivist hegemony, especially within the APSA, the Association for Public Policy and Management (APPAM) and North American public policy and political science curricula and journals.

For those of us in policy and political studies who have been contending with that hegemonic impulse, *Policy Worlds* is a welcome contribution. It should promote dialogue between anthropologists and interpretive policy analysis and political science scholars. To the extent that 'policy anthropology' is marginalised within its disciplinary home as 'applied anthropology' and 'policy/political ethnography' is marginalised within its base for not doing survey or 'mixed methods' (qualitative plus quantitative) research, the two groups might not only find common intellectual ground but also assist each other in their respective science wars. Several themes in the book's chapters, shared by both disciplinary communities, might facilitate that potential conversation.

Shared Meanings

First among these is a shared focus on meaning and its production and contestation. Policy anthropologists and political/policy ethnographers are equally as likely to look for meaning-making not only in the acts and

interpretations of decision makers, policy experts and other elites, but also among those on the 'receiving end' of governmental activities with local knowledge of their neighbourhood or agency. Both kinds of researchers ask how governments' ideas about and expectations of individuals and collective entities (neighbourhoods and communities, schools and hospitals, corporations and factories) – whose bodies, identities and behaviours they seek to shape, change and control – are embedded in and expressed through public policies (see, for example, Nyqvist, Chapter 11, this volume). Research conducted by both seeks to elucidate the processes through which this occurs.

In their introduction, as do the chapter authors elsewhere in the book, Cris Shore and Susan Wright bring into the policy arena theoretical developments taking place outside of traditional policy studies (especially its U.S.A. versions). These include the contributions of the French *Sciences Po* school and other post-behaviourist, post-structuralist theories, such as Latour's actor-network theory, Foucault's knowledge/power interrelationships and Bourdieu's habitus. Such theorising has the potential to catapult policy scholarship far beyond its current boundaries, as I note below with respect to the definition of 'policy' itself. This is where these chapters make a major contribution for those coming from the relatively atheoretical background of traditional policy studies. At the same time, some of the analyses presented here would have benefited from a greater awareness of the work done in that discipline. For example, that policies have unintended consequences 'that go beyond the original intentions' (Shore and Wright, Introduction, this volume) was learned by policy studies researchers in the early 1970s, becoming the starting point for many policy implementation analyses. A bit of disciplinary history helps clarify how this came about.

The instrumental-rational model of the policy process (a set of stages that strongly echoes the steps of the 'scientific method'), which Shore and Wright call 'authoritative instrumentalism' (Introduction, this volume), is a received wisdom that is still the starting point of many textbooks today. To the extent that this is a 'practitioner perspective', as they claim, that status derives from the way in which policy analysis developed into a field of professional practice. 'Policy studies' developed in the U.S.A. in the 1960s and 1970s, when the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, supported by primarily federal legislatures and courts, used policies actively as social change instruments (consider, for example, civil rights policies attacking entrenched housing, educational and employment practices). The model, and the conceptualisations associated with it, were exported to the world of practice in a newly created professional degree, the Master of Public Policy (MPP), established at a number of U.S. universities. Chief among these was Harvard's Kennedy School of Government, an analysis-oriented heir of the university's more theoretical Graduate School of Public Administration. Through its training for mid-career policy makers, public administrators and other decision makers, many of whom held positions in Washington, the model was exported to the world of practice, as well as to practice-focused

conferences and journals – although many practitioners themselves admitted that their worlds did not operate in such rational-instrumental ways.

It was the practice-informed critique of that model (Pressman and Wildavsky 1984; Lipsky 1978, 1980), including its separation of 'political' policy making from 'apolitical' administration, that launched the field of policy implementation studies, out of which interpretive policy analysis grew (Fischer 2003; Fischer and Forester 1993; Hajer and Wagenaar 2003; Yanow 1993, 1995). These scholars (including critical theorists and political discourse analysts) have common cause with policy anthropologists in showing, as noted in the Introduction to this volume, how policy analysis is in fact 'not a quasi-scientific activity'.

But I am not convinced that it is their anthropological background per se that gives policy anthropologists an edge over policy ethnographers and other interpretive policy analysts in focusing on policy meanings and the (inter)subjective meaning-making of policy-relevant actors, so as to 'challenge received wisdom and think outside of the conventional policy box' (from the Introduction). That is precisely what interpretive policy analysts began doing in the 1970s and 1980s (and what Edelman did even earlier; see, e.g., Ascher 1987; Brunner 1982; DeHaven-Smith 1988; Dryzek 1982; Edelman 1964, 1977; Fay 1975; Goodsell 1988; Hawkesworth 1988; Healy 1986; Jennings 1983, 1987; Rein and Schön 1977; Torgerson 1986; Yanow 1987). Moreover, influenced by Habermasian and other theorising, much interpretive policy analysis took a discursive conceptual turn in the 1990s. In a methodological departure from behaviouralist political science, this led them to go and talk to people – the so-called 'targets' of public policies (Schneider and Ingram 1993). That unfortunate term suggests that the only persons with agency in a policy situation are 'policy actors' – legislators, their staff, lobbyists, implementers and the like. In contrast, those on the receiving end of decisions are sitting ducks just waiting for policy solutions to hit them, like the missiles of Robert McNamara's U.S. Department of Defense (DoD), where so much technical policy analysis (e.g., cost-benefit analysis) was initially developed. Brought by him from the Ford Foundation, from DoD it entered the Kennedy School and other academic curricula.

Administrations of the 1960s and 1970s inherited, and maintained, a highly paternalistic period of governmental policy making (the Ford Foundation's Grey Areas Programs, forerunners of the Great Society programmes, including the Peace Corps and its domestic counterpart, VISTA), which intended to do good, as defined by elites, but which denied recipients' expertise in their own local knowledge and their own agency (a pattern continued by some of the more recent social constructionist treatments of policy analysis). Even the 'participatory planning' movement of this era was critiqued for its cosmetic aspects (e.g., Arnstein 1969). The more recent discursive, dialogical turn counters this denial of agency to those on the 'receiving ends' of policies. It has sparked several authors (Dryzek 1990; Schneider and Ingram 1997) to argue that interpretive policy analysis is much more democratic than the

traditional, top-down policy analysis that has become standard in academic curricula for training professionals.

Perhaps, then, *pace* the Introduction to this volume, it is not 'anthropology's more open and democratic approach' *per se* that leads to emphasising situated meaning, policy process' messiness and the complexities, ambiguities and contestations of policy meanings – in short, to the problematising of policy itself. Policy anthropology is not alone in doing this. Rather, it is the ontological and epistemological underpinnings shared by policy anthropologists, policy ethnographers and other interpretive policy analysts, rooted in a phenomenological hermeneutics and manifested in ethnographic sensibilities and/or practices adopted and cultivated by both disciplines, that carry within them the impetus to such analytic starting points.

Policy scholars are, however, still often restricted by the theoretical heritage of their disciplinary base. Here is where the chapters of this book can be enlightening, beginning with the very definition of what 'policy' means.

Defining 'Policy'

Although those coming from political and policy studies backgrounds tend to take for granted much that is highlighted in these chapters, it is very useful to have one's 'common sense' spelt out explicitly and held up as an object of reflection. For example:

> If part of the 'work of policy' is to classify and organise people and ideas in new ways, then it becomes easy to understand why policies can be such powerful vehicles for social change. (Shore and Wright, Introduction, this volume)

That policies are social change mechanisms is, I think, a baseline assumption among policy analysts – that is part of the air we breathe. To have it held up for investigation, however, is a useful reminder that things might be otherwise – and a challenge to return to our assumptions and interrogate them.

Policy and political scientists' present-day conceptualisations of policy processes are constrained or framed by the intellectual history that has shaped that understanding. The institutional approach with which North American studies of governmental action began conceptualises three branches of government, each balancing the others, with the legislative branch passing laws/making policies. Such a formulation restricted policy 'making' to legislative actions and the decision-making acts of legislators; even their staff were an analytic non-entity until the appearance of Redman's participant-observer case study (1973). Even when 'policy making' was expanded on the front end to include 'agenda-setting' and on the back end to cover 'implementation', it was still framed as a linear, assembly-line process. This linear model vests politics and power exclusively in the hands of decision-making elites, reflecting the conceptualisation of authority embedded in Weberian bureaucracy theory (which also undergirds the politics-administration dichotomy). Breaking out

of the straitjacket of that disciplinary history to imagine policy in a new way has not been easy.

Anthropologists suffer no such history. Their conceptualisation of policy could catapult us out of our received framing: policy is 'a continuous process of contestation across a political space' (Wright and Reinhold, Chapter 5, this volume). No linearity here! The same sense of multiplicities of actors and settings, of locales of power and influence, of cyclicality of policy proposal and revision as described in the public policy literature comes into focus in this discussion. Moreover, in drawing on other theoretical sources, new potentialities emerge: 'Hegemony and contestation are central to this idea of policy: political conflicts to defend or unsettle established discourses and advance particular ways of conceptualising the role of the individual, social institutions and even of government itself' (Wright and Reinhold, Chapter 5, this volume). Such formulations, looking not to the regularity and control of manufacturing but more to power and conflict, potentially reframe the ways in which we think about 'policy'. So, whereas the critique of a linear, top-down model of the policy process has already been articulated in the policy studies literature, these chapters offer new ways of conceiving of policy itself.

But even more is required. This treatment still encounters the definitional problems found in the policy studies literature. Is 'policy' the formal document that is the outcome of a legislative act? Is it a set of inclinations, as in 'The British Government's policy is ...'? Is it a specific programme? Implicit in some chapters is a sense that the key question is not what is a policy, or even what's happening here, but instead, what work is a policy doing? That kind of question, the sort of focus found in science studies, shifts analytic attention to the meanings of concepts – such as 'policy', in a broader, 'governance' discourse – or of specific terms in particular policy issues – such as 'gay' (Wright and Reinhold, Chapter 5, this volume) or 'housing decay' (Schön 1979).

Other conceptual arenas in which this book's ideas interact generatively with those in (interpretive) policy analysis include the research setting; the up/down direction of study; power and agency; and public perceptions of the power of 'science'. I will take these up in order.

Multi-sited Research, in Space and Time

Anthropologists are also constrained by disciplinary history, although theirs seems more methodological than theoretical. Their battle is against the traditional model of a 'single site', a geographically bounded setting, with its inhabitants, language, tools and practices. Following the policy – the legislative document, for example, or the legislator – moves traditional anthropology to a necessarily 'multi-sited' study, the marked term suggesting the challenge. For policy ethnography, this is a nonissue: we look for the

sites of decision-making power and of silent and/or silenced voices without pressure to constrain our study to the borders of a specific physical setting. The policy itself is the site, not some geographically bounded entity.

A policy issue's borders are more diffuse than those of a village or city: no civil administrator or planner has drawn a red line around it on a map. We exchange the boundedness of place (and of time) for the relatively more open domain of a policy issue and the processes through which it comes onto the public agenda (or does not), is legislated (or not), implemented successfully (or not) and resurfaces later (potentially) reframed in a different guise. This typically involves a wide range of policy-relevant actors – those whose behaviour is to be changed, activists both pro and con, gatekeepers, stakeholders, legislators and their staffs, lobbyists, agency directors and their staffs, street-level bureaucrats, other implementers and evaluators. Greg Feldman's 'nonlocal ethnography' (Chapter 2, this volume), then, may be nonlocal in the traditional anthropological sense of setting, but it is very local – very situated – with respect to specific policies and their entailments and policy-relevant documents and actors. It might be considered local with respect to settings as well, but in a rather different sense; consider housing policy, for instance, which is situated not with respect to one specific house, but rather to a category of housing type, and is no less spatial for that.

Space is not only geographic; in policy spheres, it also refers to levels of analysis. 'Public policy studies' in U.S. academia has long meant domestic legislative processes and policies only – welfare, housing, transportation, environment, etc.; foreign policy has more commonly been left to international relations (IR). The creation of the European Union (EU) has made the limitations of this boundary making abundantly clear: environmental problems, after all, cross state lines, and policies must do likewise. Both policy and IR scholars stand to benefit from policy anthropologists' inclination not to recognise boundaries between domestic and 'supranational entities', as Janine Wedel (Chapter 8, this volume) puts it. Cris Shore's exploration (Chapter 9, this volume) of the build-up to the war in Iraq is a wonderful example of analysis that crosses such 'spatial' boundaries.

In shifting to a focus on discourses, which are 'present in multiple locations but are not of any particular location', Feldman (Chapter 2, this volume) gets at precisely this point, to which Shore (Chapter 9, this volume) also turns. To the extent that much interpretive policy analysis engages in discourse analysis of some sort, the two epistemic communities are on the same page. What the privileging of language at the hands of discourse analysis threatens to lose, however, is the ways in which acts and physical artefacts are also significant in policy meanings. This is manifest in methods of policy discourse analysis, which tend to rest on documents and/or interviews, often presenting the latter – wrongly, in my view – as ethnographic research. A policy anthropology that encompasses 'discursive spaces' without abandoning participant-observer ethnography can help interpretive policy analysis gain methodological clarity.

And time? Interpretive policy analysts seem much more cognisant than their traditional policy/political science counterparts of historical antecedents to contemporary policies and the contingencies of present social and political realities. This is the sort of 'writing the history of the present' that Wright and Reinhold (Chapter 5, this volume) discuss. Their 'studying through', following an actor or how a policy issue might be framed at one moment and reframed at another, can apply not only to physical un-boundedness but to time un-boundedness as well (Rein and Schön 1977; Schön and Rein 1994).

Top Down/Bottom Up Meets Studying Down/Studying Up

Traditional policy analysis, as with nearly all political science, engages its subject matter at the top. That is where power, the *leitmotif* of the discipline's work, presumably resides. Anthropologists, by contrast, have traditionally studied down. I cannot, for instance, imagine an anthropologist producing a work that instructs students in 'elite interviewing' alone, although that is a central focus in recent U.S. political science (Leech 2002; contrast Bogner, Littig and Menz 2009). When seeking to overcome disciplinary strictures, the two disciplines use similar language, but look in opposite directions: policy and political scientists study 'bottom-up' processes, such as implementation; anthropologists 'study up'. But that invocation notwithstanding, anthropologists, claim Wright and Reinhold (Chapter 5, this volume), tend to focus on the dominated even when they are interested in domination. If the same holds true for policy/political studies scholars – that we attend to those in power even when thinking to study workers, community residents, etc. – this might explain part of the current scepticism regarding ethnographic work!

What a marvellous opportunity for the two groups to join intellectual forces, drawing on their respective topographical orientations and the strengths of their methods. In fact, interpretive policy analysts and others have studied those in lower positions of bureaucratic hierarchies, including street-level bureaucrats (Lipsky 1980; Prottas 1979; Weatherley 1979) and agency clients' meaning-making of policy implementation (Stein 1984; Yanow 1996), using ethnographically informed research methods. Much methodological potential resides in this possible collaboration.

But we might also take a cue from Shore's (Chapter 9, this volume) idea that policies require not so much studying up – in fact, policy implementation scholars might argue that it requires studying down – as studying across and every which way (perhaps Wright and Reinhold's 'studying through') in a network sort of fashion, something that Wedel also points to. This is what following a policy and policy-relevant actors, objects, acts and language achieves 'teasing out connections and observing how policies bring together individuals, discourses and institutions ... and the new kinds of networks, relations and subjects this process creates' (Shore, Chapter 9, this volume). 'Up' and 'down' are intertwined, conceptually, with methodological issues

of place and single-sitedness; dating from anthropology's academic origins, they are, ultimately, increasingly outdated formulations. The study of policy might indeed provide a pathway towards methodological reframing for the discipline as a whole.

Power and Agency: Researchers, Policy-Relevant Actors and Knowledge Claims

Clearly, we need to uproot the language of policy 'targets', as well as the thinking that underlies it. But is there a structural dimension to our conceptualisation of research relationships and the generation of knowledge that promotes such thinking? 'Up' and 'down', both stances reflect the researcher's (felt) cognitive and power position relative to situational members. Does this facilitate a view of some as targets lacking in agency – the idea, as Davide Però puts it (introduction to Section III), that policy's 'subjects are passively constructed by the policies that act upon them'? Gritt Nielsen's discussion (Chapter 4, this volume) of Danish educational policy and Chinese students suggests another direction, her incorporation of a multi-perspectival analysis embodying the networked 'through-ness' noted above. Unhampered by a political scientist's disciplinary restrictions, she draws on actor network/science studies theories of Callon, Latour, Law and others to advance a reconceptualisation of the policy process in terms of students' subjectivities, emerging assemblages and translations. It would be interesting to see this approach brought into dialogue with the classic multi-perspectival works of Graham Allison (1971), offering three interpretations of U.S. decision making in the 'Cuban missile crisis', or Lipsky (1980), looking at street-level bureaucrats' 'policy making' activities as distinct from formal legislative processes. According legitimacy to multiple perspectives – and not just those of policy makers or researchers – is one way of moving beyond 'targets', a perceived lack of knowledge and a lack of agency. Can it also open the door to reconsiderations of the knowledge/power link?

David Mosse uses his experiences with former colleagues and funders who sought to scuttle his book publication to raise a number of related issues with which other literatures also engage and that could make for interesting cross-fertilisation. Organisational studies, for example, addresses the matter of employee loyalty and reactions when that loyalty is breached, a situation not uncommon in the experience of community organisers working for (quasi) governmental agencies. Such discussions recall Hirschman's (1970) classic discussion of exit or voice as strategies when loyalty to the organisation has been betrayed. Argyris and Schön's (1974) analysis shows managers dealing with cognitive dissonance by enacting defences, with disastrous results for their effectiveness. Consultants' experiences of making clients' tacit knowledge explicit (Schein 1992) – when the latter thought it well hidden – parallel what Mosse presents. It is not so much a problem of tension between

ethnographers and experts that is at play as it is the complex relationships between knowledge and power, whoever their bearers are.

Anthropologists have long been in the lead in engaging their positionality explicitly in producing knowledge and the need for researcher reflexivity in considering personal as well as physical situatedness in the generation of 'truth claims'. Although *de rigueur* in anthropology, these are still very much contested methodological spaces in policy/political studies. There, researchers are much more likely to consider the 'positionalities', without using that term, of those researched than to explicitly engage their own, something that Tara Schwegler (Chapter 7, this volume) touches upon. Policy anthropologists can be an example to policy ethnographers, linking reflexivity more directly to issues of power – the bread and butter of political scientific inquiry – and not 'just' to the subjectivities of knowledge generation. In so doing, they might enable us to overcome political science's resistance to such considerations. The related methodological issues are well worth elaborating. What are the power/knowledge issues in the common advice that researchers use 'member checking' in qualitative research (Erlandson et al. 1993)? And what characterises research relationships that might provoke a 'native' to exclaim to an ethnographer: 'But I thought we were friends?' (Beech et al. 2009)?

Science and 'the State'

Another dimension of power in the policy process is the societal standing accorded to conceptualisations of science, in particular in policy usages of scientific-sounding terms, which garner them a certain legitimacy. Several chapters touch directly on the relationship between perceptions of science and the state. Drawing on the widespread understanding of science as objective and value-neutral, they succeed, as Shore puts it (Chapter 9, this volume), in making policy discourses 'appear so "natural" that [the policy's] ideological content comes to be regarded as common sense and therefore beyond question'. In one example, Dorothy Louise Zinn (Chapter 12, this volume) remarks on the ways in which in Lucania, Italy, government officials' use of 'technical-scientific "facts"' positioned these beyond political debate. Birgit Müller (Chapter 15, this volume) continues this theme, noting how the United Nations' Food and Agriculture Organization, in rendering policy issues technical, moved them outside the realm of democratic politics. In this process, perceptions of science join with the ideas of technical-rational policy processes, including their instrumentally rational bureaucracies, in promoting values that set them apart from power and politics. Rendering the political technical has profound implications for democratic political ideals. This is something that policy scientists, other than those working within science and technology studies or perhaps environmental policy studies, have rarely engaged. It is a topic that I would hope to see developed in further work in both disciplines.

Prognosis

Stepping outside one's disciplinary training and reframing the way one asks questions or defines concepts is not easy. That is why looking obliquely, through another discipline's eyes and framing devices, can be useful. What public policy scholars stand to gain by looking through the lenses of these chapters is new insights into ways to conceptualise and theorise 'policy'. For political scientists who often conflate ethnographic research with interviewing (by which they typically mean the single, 'one-off' interview rather than the 'intensive interviewing' Wright refers to in the Introduction to Section I of this volume), this book will be a useful antidote. It demonstrates what an 'ethnographic sensibility' and that ineffable quality of 'being there' bring to a research project that interviewing alone does not and cannot. What anthropologists would gain from conversation with their interpretive policy analysis counterparts is greater insight into the methodological implications of studying things that are not bounded by traditional ethnographic space and time. Several chapters note the necessity, in studying public policy making, of drawing on more kinds of data than would be included in a traditional anthropological ethnography. Among them are Wedel, who observes that the 'complexity of governing also calls for the employment of multiple methods', by which she apparently means various sorts of documentary evidence along with interview and ethnographic material, and Shore, who includes 'informant narratives' and official texts, and the triangulation of the latter against the former. Examples of such studies abound within policy studies, especially pre-implementation analyses of public bureaucracies (Blau 1963; Crozier 1964; Kaufman 1960; Selznick 1949). To this list of methods innovations we should add Weldes' (2006) 'low data', such as Shore's nine- or ninety-day-old newspaper, the kinds of sources often dismissed in political science as popular culture or in anthropology, according to Shore, as 'journalism'.

Pace Shore (Chapter 9, this volume), far from posing a challenge to claiming an insider's perspective or 'native's point of view' on the issue, ethnographies of policies, which are perforce non-local in a traditional anthropological sense, are very much 'policy-local' in the ways illustrated in these chapters and thereby potentially provide that insider's point of view. The question has to be who is 'the native' in policy studies – and which 'natives' are we studying? What ethnography can and must do, whether practised by anthropologists or by policy/political studies scholars, is to identify those multiple policy-relevant communities of meaning that are 'native' to the issue under study and seek insiders' understandings of these multiple points of view. For it is in these multiplicities of interpretations and clashes of meaning-making that the complexities of policy making and implementation develop and reside; and it is the explication of these conflicting understandings that both policy anthropologists and policy ethnographers should be after.

There is something distinctive about 'ethnographying' public policies, and joining forces – or at least reading across the boundaries thrown up by

our respective epistemic communities – promises to help all of us articulate what that is, something that will at least help us be better teachers of newer generations of scholars.

References

Allison, Graham T. 1971. *Essence of Decision*. Boston: Little, Brown.

Argyris, Chris and Donald A. Schön. 1974. *Theory in Practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Arnstein, Sherry R. 1969. 'A Ladder of Citizen Participation', *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 35(4): 216–24.

Ascher, William. 1987. 'Editorial', *Policy Sciences* 20: 3–9.

Beech, Nic, Paul Hibbert, Robert MacIntosh and Peter McInnes. 2009. '"But I Thought We Were Friends?" Life Cycles and Research Relationships', in Sierk Ybema, Dvora Yanow, Harry Wels and Frans Kamsteeg (eds), *Organizational Ethnography: Studying the Complexities of Everyday Organizational Life*. London: Sage, pp. 196–214.

Blau, Peter. 1963 [1953]. *The Dynamics of Bureaucracy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bogner, Alexander, Beate Littig and Wolfgang Menz. 2009. *Interviewing Experts: Methodology and Practice.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Brady, Henry E. and David Collier (eds). 2004. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Brunner, Ronald D. 1982. 'The Policy Sciences as Science', *Policy Sciences* 15(2): 115–35.

Crozier, Michel. 1964. *The Bureaucratic Phenomenon*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

DeHaven-Smith, Lance. 1988. *Philosophical Critiques of Policy Analysis*. Gainesville: University of Florida Press.

Dryzek, John S. 1982. 'Policy Analysis as a Hermeneutic Activity', *Policy Sciences* 14(4): 309–29.

——. 1990. *Discursive Democracy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Edelman, Murray. 1964. *The Symbolic Uses of Politics*. Urbana: University of Illinois.

——. 1977. *Political Language*. New York: Academic Press.

Erlandson, David A., Edward L. Harris, Barbara L. Skipper and Steve D. Allen. 1993. *Doing Naturalistic Inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Fay, Brian. 1975. *Social Theory and Political Practice*. Boston: George Allen & Unwin.

Fischer, Frank. 2003. *Reframing Public Policy: Discursive Politics and Deliberative Practices*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Fischer, Frank and John Forester (eds). 1993. *The Argumentative Turn in Policy Analysis and Planning*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Goodsell, Charles T. 1988. *The Social Meaning of Civic Space*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.

Hajer, Maarten A. and Hendrik Wagenaar (eds). 2003. *Deliberative Policy Analysis*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hawkesworth, M.E. 1988. *Theoretical Issues in Policy Analysis*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Healy, Paul. 1986. 'Interpretive Policy Inquiry. A Response to the Limitations of the Received View', *Policy Sciences* 19(4): 381–96.

Hirschman, Albert O. 1970. *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations and States*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Jennings, Bruce. 1983. 'Interpretive Social Science and Policy Analysis', in Daniel Callahan and Bruce Jennings (eds), *Ethics, the Social Sciences, and Policy Analysis*. New York: Plenum, pp. 3-35.

——. 1987. 'Interpretation and the Practice of Policy Analysis', in Frank Fischer and John Forester (eds), *Confronting Values in Policy Analysis.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage, pp. 128–52.

Kaufman, Herbert. 1960. *The Forest Ranger*. Baltimore, MD: Published for Resources for the Future by Johns Hopkins University Press.

Klotz, Audie and Cecelia Lynch. 2007. *Strategies for Research in Constructivist International Relations*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Leech, Beth L. (ed.). 2002. 'Interview Methods in Political Science', *PS: Political Science & Politics* 35(4): 663–88.

Lipsky, Michael. 1978. 'Standing the Study of Public Policy Implementation on its Head', in Walter Dean Burnham and Martha Weinberg (eds), *American Politics and Public Policy.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 391–402.

——. 1980. *Street-level Bureaucracy*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Pachirat, Timothy. 2009. 'The Political in Political Ethnography: Dispatches from the Kill Floor', in Edward Schatz (ed.), *Political Ethnography: What Immersion Contributes to the Study of Power*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 143–61.

Pressman, Jeffrey L. and Aaron Wildavsky. 1984 [1973]. *Implementation: How Great Expectations in Washington are Dashed in Oakland; Or, Why it's Amazing that Federal Programs Work at All…*, 3rd ed., expanded. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Prottas, Jeffrey M. 1979. *People-processing*. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.

Redman, Eric. 1973. *The Dance of Legislation*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Rein, Martin and Donald A. Schön. 1977. 'Problem Setting in Policy Research', in Carol Weiss (ed.), *Using Social Research in Policy Making*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, pp. 235-51.

Schatz, Edward. (ed.). 2009. *Political Ethnography: What Immersion Contributes to the Study of Power*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Schein, Edgar H. 1992. *Organizational Culture and Leadership.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schneider, Anne and Helen Ingram. 1993. 'Social Construction of Target Populations. Implications for Politics and Policy', *American Political Science Review* 87(2): 334–47.

——. 1997. *Policy Design for Democracy*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.

Schön, Donald A. 1979. 'Generative Metaphor', in Andrew Ortony (ed.), *Metaphor and Thought.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 137–63.

Schön, Donald A. and Martin Rein. 1994. *Frame Reflection: Toward the Resolution of Intractable Policy Controversies.* New York: Basic Books.

Selznick, Philip. 1949. *TVA and the Grass Roots*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Soss, Joe B. 2002. *Unwanted Claims: The Politics of Participation in the U.S. Welfare System*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Stein, Sandra J. 1984. *The Culture of Education Policy*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Torgerson, Douglas. 1986. 'Interpretive Policy Inquiry. A Response to its Limitations', *Policy Sciences* 19(4): 397–405.

Weatherley, Richard. 1979. *Reforming Special Education*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Weldes, Jutta. 2006. 'High Politics and Low Data: Globalization Discourses and Popular Culture', in Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea (eds), *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn.* Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, pp. 176–86.

Yanow, Dvora. 1987. 'Toward a Policy Culture Approach to Implementation', *Policy Studies Review* 7(1): 103–15.

——. 1993. 'The Communication of Policy Meanings: Implementation as Interpretation and Text, *Policy Sciences* 26(1): 41–61.

——. 1995. 'Editorial. Practices of Policy Interpretation', *Policy Sciences* 28(2): 111–26.

——. 1996. *How Does a Policy Mean? Interpreting Policy and Organizational Actions*. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.

Yanow, Dvora and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea (eds). 2006. *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.