INTRODUCTION

Genealogy and Ethnography: Fruitful Encounters or Dangerous Liaisons?

Maria Tamboukou and Stephen J. Ball

> It is no longer possible to think in our days other than in the void left by man's disappearance. For this void does not create a deficiency; it does not constitute a lacuna that must be filled. It is nothing more, and nothing less, than the unfolding of a space in which it is once more possible to think. (Foucault, 1970, p.342)

Foucault's analyses have been unfolded in the spatial void of the crisis of modernity, along with other theories that have explored the relation between language, subjectivity, social organisation, and power. Foucault has widely criticised what he has called 'the sciences of the man' [sic] and has revealed the disciplinary and normalizing procedures inherent in the various epistemologies revolving around them. Despite these criticisms, however, there is a growing interest recently in the impact of Foucault's theoretical work on many areas within the social sciences.[1]

It seems that researchers in the social sciences have taken seriously Foucault's generous invitation for his theories to be used as a tool of analysis rather than as a closed theoretical framework, as well as his assertion about the need for new genealogies to be written.[2] It also seems that ethnographers have been particularly seduced by the Foucauldian challenge, in our view, not accidentally.[3] Exploring 'ethnographic trends in

the postmodern era', Andrea Fontana (1994, p. 213) points to a proliferation of new ethnographic modes co-existing with 'the old' and calling into question notions such as 'correspondence, co-operation, negotiation, and intersubjective understanding'. Fontana identifies three areas of postmodern ethnographies: (1) the postmodern fieldwork, where the status of the ethnographer appears to be the major epistemological concern; (2) the multitextual ethnographies, which attempt to make use of new types of data, such as films, television, fiction, dreams; and (3) the feminist trend, seeking to recover the importance of gender as an analytical category in ethnographic research.

In this introductory chapter, we will trace meeting points between genealogy and ethnography as well as points of tension between them. These 'similarities' and/or 'differences' will be examined on both theoretical and methodological grounds. The distinction between theory and methodology is only heuristic and is being used to facilitate the discussion of this chapter.

Exploration of the theoretical and methodological dimensions of genealogy is no easy task to undertake, particularly as there is no such thing as a unified Foucauldian 'theory', let alone methodology. Rather, Foucault has interrogated the boundaries of certain disciplines and he has problematized the borders around their methods and methodologies, leaving them open to change. As Braidotti (1991, p. 3) has commented, rather than presenting totalized and closed theoretical and/or methodological systems, the work of contemporary French philosophers, such as Foucault and Deleuze, offers 'tools of analysis'.

In exploring the possible relations and/or tensions between genealogy and ethnography, we are not trying to integrate ethnography and genealogy or subsume one within the other. Our attempt is a strategic mapping that will allow work to be done across and between these traditions of research, work that will interweave a careful path between the pitfalls of one or the other. This rests upon an awareness of their irreducibility. It is an 'intellectual border crossing' full of dangers, a sort of transgressive practice. We do not propose any kind of resolution of differences. Nonetheless, we do want to argue that researchers have a lot to gain from opening their minds to the yet 'unthought' and drawing upon and combining the possibilities of different theoretical and methodological traditions—thinking 'neo' and 'post' together as (Apple, 1996) puts it. Such a 'combining' addresses the multifarious and complex ways in which things are happening around us in the 'run-away' world. This complexity defies the conceits and simplicities of singular perspectives and invites

interdisciplinary approaches to the analysis of the historical and social conditions that define and constitute the lives of human subjects.

Nonetheless, we recognize the dangerous territories upon which we tread and the risks involved in the exercise. In breaching the lines of clarity which separate modernist and postmodernist academic practices, a profane exercise, we may well bring down wrath upon our heads from those eager to maintain the purity of divisions. However, as Wanda Pillow asks (2000, p.20), 'What would it mean to be clear' about genealogy or ethnography (or any other theory or methodology)? As Pillow has pointed out, 'The calls for clarity have been widely criticised' (2000, p.22), while Patti Lather notes that our 'era is characterised by the loss of certainties and absolute frames of reference' (1994, p.36). Moreover, it has been suggested that social researchers should go on working, being aware of and comfortable with the idea that there are 'myriad of ways social research is (un)graspable, (im)possible, (un)intelligible, (un)knowable and provisional' (Pillow, 2000, p.22).

Theoretical Affinities

To state the obvious, genealogy and ethnography draw on different theoretical traditions. Ethnography is deeply rooted in modernism but has already begun to make an impact on postmodern research practices. Genealogy, by contrast, oscillates between modernism and postmodernism, occupying ambivalent positions around which a great deal of debate has already accumulated.[4] Despite their differences, however, genealogy and ethnography share several orientations and points of reference. While these 'meeting points' are not always discernible or easy to classify, we will attempt to categorize them. This classification is used as a device to facilitate our discussion. It is by no means closed, complete, or unchangeable. It is rather like a sketch of points and lines that, although deployed in a certain network of ideas and problematizations, could always take different forms. We will therefore argue that both genealogy and ethnography:

- interrogate the validity and universal authority of scientific knowledge
- adopt a context-bound critical perspective
- transgress closed theoretical and methodological systems
- point to the limits of dominant power/knowledge regimes

- recover excluded subjects and silenced voices
- highlight the centrality of the body in sociohistorical analyses
- restore the political dimension of research.

As our discussion of the theoretical meeting points between genealogy and ethnography develops, we point to the fact that neither of them can be theorized in isolation. They build upon each other and are closely interrelated. It is difficult if not impossible to separate them out. But let us look more closely at these tentatively proposed affinities.

Interrogating the validity and universal authority of scientific knowledge. One major meeting point between ethnography and genealogy is represented in the view that the social world cannot be understood in terms of causal relationships or by the subsumption of social events under universal laws. Genealogy is concerned with the processes, procedures, and apparatuses whereby truth and knowledge are produced. Instead of asking in which kinds of discourse we are entitled to believe, genealogies pose the question of which kinds of practices, linked to which kinds of external conditions, determine the different knowledges in which we ourselves figure. In a similar way, ethnography 'can offer a more complicated version of how life is lived' (Britzman, 1995, p.231) and can document how 'some powerful groups are able to impose their definitions of reality on others' (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1983, p.12). In this light, both ethnography and genealogy introduce scepticism about universalist dogmas of truth, objectivity, and pure scientific reason, and interrogate the supposed interconnections between reason, knowledge, progress, and freedom.

Adopting context-bound critical perspectives. In genealogical analysis, reason is a complex phenomenon which can neither be rejected nor accepted wholesale. Knowledge and truth exist but only as they apply to specific situations. Thus, the genealogical perspective is embedded in 'the relation between forms of discourse, the historical struggle in which they are immersed, the institutional practices to which they are linked, and the forms of authority they presuppose' (Dean, 1994, p.71). In adopting context-bound critical perspectives, ethnography turns its attention to the micro level, and its natural terrain of deployment is the case study. It focuses on the micro-operations of power, being sensitive to local struggles and the achievement of local solutions. Rather than imposing limitations, the partiality of genealogy and ethnography makes it possible for previously unthought connections to occur in both research and theory. As Donna

Haraway expresses it: 'The only way to find a larger vision is to be somewhere in particular' (1991, p.196).

Transgressing closed theoretical and methodological systems. Foucault suggested genealogy as a research project, but he persistently resisted framing it within any closed theoretical system. On the contrary, he was against all closed theoretical systems and/or methodologies and was instead continually avoiding theoretical commitment. His intellectual work has been, rather a move to go 'beyond' the existing systems of thought. Ethnographic analysis is not restricted within closed theoretical and methodological systems either. Ethnography has been characterized and/or criticized for its unwillingness to accept a model of scientific practice which is defined by the development and testing of theories, although some ethnographers have made considerable efforts to recover ethnography into the fold of positivism.[5] Both genealogists and ethnographers are likely agreed with the assertion that 'the attempt to think in terms of a totality has in fact proved a hindrance to research' (Foucault, 1980, p.81).

Pointing to the limits of dominant power/knowledge regimes. The genealogical approach isolates the contingent power relations which make it possible for particular assertions to operate as absolute truths. It is 'the history of problematizations, that is the history of the way in which things become a problem' (Foucault, 1996, p.414). Genealogical investigation can disrupt the periodizations and unity of domains embedded in traditional history. Genealogy reveals discontinuities, recurrences, and unexpected backlashes as well as unexpected continuities; 'the unearthing of discontinuities between systems of knowledge is not an assumption of [Foucault's] method, but a consequence of it' (Davidson, 1986, p.223). Genealogy is a history without constants. 'Ethnography is in turn a way of engaging with and developing divergent interpretations/accounts of the real. Like genealogy, it is disruptive, it is about the play of power-knowledge relations in local and specific settings. It enables the analyst 'to focus upon and explore "events", spaces which divide those in struggle' (Ball, 1994, p.4).

Recovering excluded subjects and silenced voices. In contrast to the traditional focus on grand historical events and 'immobile forms', the genealogical search concerns itself with 'lowly beginnings' detail and trivia, the ephemeral, with what has remained unnoticed and unrecorded in the narratives of mainstream history. In searching in the maze of dispersed and forgotten events, it provides a conduit for submerged voices which are obscured and

marginalized by specific power-knowledge arrangements. In the same vein, ethnography is often deeply concerned with giving voice to the unheard and oppressed; 'it is very much about local memories and marginalized perspectives' (Ball, 1994, p.4). This is what Marcus (1986) refers to as 'the ethnographer as midwife' and it can involve 'being at risk in the face of the practices and discourse into which one inquires' (Haraway, 1997, p.190).

Highlighting the centrality of the body in sociohistorical analyses: genealogy as embodied history, ethnography as embodied knowledge. Genealogy highlights the importance of the body as a site of interaction of material and symbolic forces, a battlefield of power relations and antagonistic discourses. It reveals the total inscription of history on the body and everything that touches and surrounds the body. As Foucault notes: 'Genealogy, [...] is situated within the articulation of the body and history. Its task is to expose a body totally imprinted by history and the process of history's destruction of the body' (1986b, p.83).

Both French and English-speaking theorists have drawn our attention to the crucial role played by the body in the genealogical method.[6] The genealogical focus on bio-politics and the problematization of everything about and around the body have opened vast areas of feminist research examining the various ways the female body has been moulded, constructed, and exploited in human history.[7]

In ethnography, the body has been absent until recently as indeed it has been invisible in sociological theory in general.[8] However, there is nowadays a growing body of research and literature recovering the body in sociology which has subsequently affected ethnographic research and analysis. As Amanda Coffey points out, 'The body has been reframed as a legitimate area of social inquiry and social theorizing. [...] It has been recast as a site of discourse and action; as a form of representation; as intimately linked to biography and the crafting of the self' (1999, p.58). According to Coffey, discourse, action, representation, and auto/biography are all key aspects of ethnographic research and, since 'fieldwork is necessarily an embodied activity' (1999, p.58), ethnography relies on embodied knowledge.

Restoring the political dimension of research. In its testing of the limits of power and truth, genealogy is clearly a project of political critique. By stressing the circulation of power within structures of domination, it informs practical reasoning and opens up possibilities for political resistance. Foucault himself has stated: 'I would like in short to resituate the production of true and false at the heart of historical analysis and political critique' (Foucault,

1991, p.77). Similarly, ethnography is committed to the project of highlighting subversive activities in the process of social formations. Ethnography, in different forms and guises, presents itself as an emancipatory project: it attempts to widen the possibilities of critical social science and to develop research approaches which empower the subjects that are involved in the social phenomena under scrutiny (Lather, 1999).

So we have begun a cartography of some common ground, or have at least identified some contiguities and overlaps between genealogy and ethnography which are enacted as research practices. However, at the beginning of this section, we pointed to the very different traditions from which genealogy and ethnography have emerged. We now want to look more closely into these differences.

Looking into the Differences: Power and the Subject

Popkewitz and Brennan (1998, p.6) have identified two important ideological legacies of the nineteenth century social thought in contemporary social theory, first 'the inscription of progress as a foundational assumption of intellectual knowledge' and second 'the assumption that disciplinary knowledge has a subject'. The ethnographic tradition draws on these legacies in their interrelation. The latter is fundamental to ethnographic ontology. The redemptive project of the former is represented most particularly in what has been defined as critical ethnography. As Jim Thomas (1991, p.4) puts it, 'Conventional ethnography describes what is; critical ethnography asks what could be…critical ethnographers use their work to aid emancipatory goals or to negate the repressive influences that lead to unnecessary social domination'.

As has already been suggested, ethnography is, in general terms, just another version of modernist science. It is taken for granted that exploration, analysis, and interpretation of the 'findings' of the ethnographic work will lead to the achievement of systematic knowledge and this in turn will 'construct' the reason that directs social action and ensures further progress in human history. However, as already pointed out, the theoretical concepts deriving from the analysis of the ethnographic data are not inscribed in any system of universal norms or principles, nor can they serve as global guidelines directing social action towards progressive change. In this rejection of universalistic notions, categories, and principles, ethnography seems to be 'approaching' genealogy. However, there is a certain line that marks a significant difference between genealogy and

ethnography, and this lies in the different conception of *power as sovereignty* in ethnography, and *power as deployment* in genealogy.[9]

Power as sovereignty in Popkewitz and Brennan (1998, p.18) creates a dichotomous world in which domination is exercised over individuals and/or social groups from 'above'. In this sovereign approach, there is a crucial difference between those who hold power and exercise it and those who are submissive and dominated. Usually the latter are the ones who, in resisting power, will ultimately mobilize social change and progress. Both social groups—oppressors and resisters—are, within the ethnographic project, active agents.

Genealogy is concerned with the *deployment of power* (Popkewitz and Brennan 1998, p.18). In such an approach, power is analyzed as something which functions in the form of a chain. It is never fixed, localized, and/or appropriated. Individuals circulate in a network of relations as both subjects and/or objects of power. Genealogy is not after the *who* or *whom* of power. It is the *how* of power that interests genealogy. Genealogy focuses upon the relations and forces of power connected to discursive practices. This focus on the *how* of power does not exclude people but rather seeks to analyze the complex ways they are constituted within historically and culturally specific sites where power, truth, and knowledge are interrelated. However, Foucault did not intend to detach these two forms or limits. Rather, he saw them as 'juxtaposed' or 'encountering' one another, in their heterogeneous forms, as a form of legal right and a set of disciplinary techniques. As Foucault showed, these are two discourses, through which 'in our times power is exercised simultaneously' (1980, p.107) and which together explain the functioning of 'a society of normalization'.

Bridging the Differences

The dance between power and resistance.[10] In rethinking power and resistance, we must again face the question: Are these interpretive stances implacably and irredeemably opposed, or is there any *topos* between them? Borrowing Foucault's rhetoric, we have to admit that this is at the very least a difficult question to answer. This does not mean, however, that we cannot ask the question (Foucault, 1981, p.238) and struggle with the issues it raises. Foucault has pointed out differentiations between relations of power—as fields of games in which freedom can be exercised—and relations of domination, which sometimes remain blocked and frozen and which need to be resisted: 'when I say that power establishes a network through which

it freely circulates, this is true only up to a certain point. …I do not believe that one should conclude from that that power is the best distributed thing in the world' (Foucault, 1980, p.99). This distinction represents some kind of rebuttal of those critics who assert that his theorization of power leaves no possibility of freedom and, whatever its ambiguities,[11] it opens up the possibility of establishing an analytical *topos* between the two conceptions of *power as sovereignty* and *power as deployment* (Popkewitz and Brennan, 1998, p.18). In critically rethinking the notion of sovereign power, we can better focus on the asymmetric distribution of power, but in employing genealogy at the same time, we can better understand and analyze how power/knowledge regimes are created and sustained, to further produce a discursive context of domination and resistance—a kind of 'peopling' of discourses.

Foucault, in his *History of Sexuality,* refers to the possibility of reverse discourse, the 'complex and unstable process whereby discourse can be both an instrument and an effect of power, but also a hindrance, a stumbling-block, a point of resistance and a starting point for an opposing strategy' (Foucault, 1990, p.101). We thus argue that a critical rethinking of the relations between the two conceptions of power further enlightens Foucault's argument that within relations of power, individuals and groups can find space to resist domination, exercise freedom, and pursue their interests (Foucault, 1990, p.101). Resistance, however, is not about replacing those who hold power with a previously oppressed group, nor is it about establishing new systems of universal values and truths: 'If one wants to struggle against disciplines and disciplinary power, it is not towards the ancient right of sovereignty that one should turn, but towards the possibility of a new form of right, one which must indeed be anti-disciplinarian, but at the same time liberated from the principle of sovereignty' (Foucault, 1980, p.108). That is, to 'think otherwise' about power. Resistance, then, is about continually interrogating the conditions of our lives, problematizing the stories we are told and those we tell: 'I think that the ethico-political choice we have to make every day is to determine which is the main danger' (Foucault, 1986a, p.343). It is about attempting to become 'other' of what we are already. It is about disowning the ways in which we are spoken, about disidentification.

Thus, again, Britzman argues that 'ethnographic narratives should trace how power circulates and surprises, theorize how subjects spring from the discourses that incite them, and question the belief in representation even as one must practice representation as a way to intervene critically in the constitutive constraints of discourses' (Britzman, 1995, p. 236). Given the

complexity and rapidly changing events of our actuality, we suggest that there is an urgent need to listen to the epistemological and political agendas of different traditions of historical and social research. The point is not to 'stir well' and add 'a little of genealogy' or 'a little of ethnography', but to create differentiated tools of analysis which will be effective in sociological analyses within related theoretical and epistemological fields. The tensions produced by epistemological incongruities can be used creatively to escape from theory or research 'as usual' and to evade the seductive tyrannies of comfortable binaries. The point of postmodernist critique is not to replace one form of 'normal science' with the strictures of a scientific abnormality but to introduce a constant instability into our assumptions about 'doing research' and making theory. We must learn to research and to act without the comfort of epistemological certainties.

Generating a community of subjects. As already mentioned, traditional ethnography is committed to the project of bringing to the foreground the intent and purposes of social actors, whose agency, from this perspective, intervenes in the making of history. The absence of a visible agent implies, perhaps, a deterministic world that has no possibility of change. However, critical ethnography is more sceptical about the 'naturalness' that saturates the agency of the individuals and is more sensitive to the missed agendas and categories that are hidden behind the centrality of the subjects of history.

Genealogy refers to subjectivities rather than subjects and conceives og human reality not as an originary force, but as an effect of the interweaving of certain historical and cultural practices which it sets out to trace and explore. The subject in the genealogical analysis is socially constructed in discursive practices but, at the same time, in some versions of discourse, is able to reflect upon these very discursive relations that constitute it, capable of resistance, and able to choose from the options produced out of the clash between contradictory subject positions and practices (Davies, 1990). The subject is removed from her pedestal but is not eliminated. She is decentered so that the multiple issues of power that are hidden in the rhetorical constructions of her centrality can be revealed. Thus, rather than celebrating heroes and heroic actions, the genealogical approach generates a community of action; a community that 'derives its essential meaning from the co-presence of other communities, all seen as agencies' (Bauman, 1988, p.800).

Methodological Affinities

It is indeed impossible to isolate methodology, in its proper sense, from theory, since, as Harding (1987, p.2) has clearly put it, 'a research method is a technique for (or way of proceeding in) gathering evidence', while methodology 'is a theory and analysis of how research does or should proceed' (p.3). We will therefore repeat here that examining methodological affinities between genealogy and ethnography is always schematic and strategic in the development of this introduction and should always be related to the theoretical affinities we have already discussed.

Genealogy and ethnography as open methodological projects. Foucault's work has been criticized by writers from mainstream social and political theory for failing to employ recognizable methodologies. And, indeed, 'rather than following [*a priori*] methodological principles, Foucault's genealogies create a methodological rhythm of their own, weaving around a set of crucial questions […] questions which create unexplored and even unthought areas of investigation. Foucault's genealogies do not offer methodological "certainties". They persistently evade classification, but they do encourage and inspire the making of new questions to interrogate the truths of our world' (Tamboukou, 1999, p.215); perhaps they are 'more a matter of knowing what is inappropriate' (Meadmore, Hatcher, and McWilliam 2000, p.465).

In contrast and somewhat paradoxically, ethnography is increasingly hemmed in by a barrage of specifications and precisions, although it remains theoretically promiscuous; neo-Marxist (Willis, 1977); anti-racist (Fordham, 1996); queer (Rhoads, 2000) and feminist (Henry, 1990). It carries the possibility for different inflections both theoretical and methodological. Ethnography is a stance or an attitude to research. It is purposefully unpredictable, preeminently a responsive methodology, accommodative and infinitely renewable.

Involvement and distance. In ethnography, while the researcher is part of what she is studying, she can also be reflective about it by distancing herself from what is happening. Or, rather, ethnography is defined by a tension between involvement and distance, 'stranger and friend', 'being there' and 'standing back'. Ethnography is about both technique and self-deployment. It is a 'blurred genre' (Coffey, 1999). It brings with it, as Britzman (1995) describes it, 'tangles of implication'. The ethnographer both does and is the research (Coffey, 1999). 'Qualitative researchers find their lives consumed

by their work as they seek understanding and connections. Personal commitment, trust and time are key to rich data and useful interpretations (Glesne and Peshkin, 1992, pp.173–174). The objectivity of detachment, the assumption that the stranger acquires a certain objectivity not available to culture members (in Hammersley and Atkinson, 1983, pp.7–8), which is central to some versions of ethnography, grates and clashes with the subjectivity of 'passing', of identification and risk, which are central in others. Again, ethnography is not a unitary position or practice. Nonetheless, typically the ethnographer will seek a position of privilege—inside or outside—from which to undertake research.

The self-reflexive stance of the ethnographer has interesting commonalities with the genealogical strategy[12] in as much that in searching for the problem the genealogical analyst identifies some socially shared 'discomfort' about how things are going, but at the same time retains what Nietzsche has described as 'pathos for distance' (Diprose, 1993, p.6). While participating, she has to distance herself, attempting to retreat to a transitional space that can accommodate both her involvement and her need for detachment and reflection; although the genealogical perspective also involves a scepticism towards the nature of the researcher's 'distance', that is, towards the possibility of ever standing outside 'the social'. The management of this involvement/distance tension is a most 'dangerous' and risky task for both the ethnographer and the genealogist. In addressing the tension between 'being there', and 'standing back', a dilemma, which has very much to do with certain claims to objectivity as well as the will to speak about the real world, which is 'out there' anyway, we can draw on the concept of genealogy as 'interpretive analytics' (Dreyfus and Rabinow, 1982). According to Dreyfus and Rabinow, the objectives of Foucault's genealogies are insistently pragmatic. They start from a problem of the present and they are, according to Foucault (1986b) 'histories of the present'. However, as Dreyfus and Rabinow lucidly put it:

> while the analysis of our present practices is a disciplined, concrete demonstration which could serve as the basis of a research program, the diagnosis that the increasing organization of everything is the central issue of our time is not in any way empirically demonstrable, but rather emerges as an interpretation. (1982, p.xii)

Drawing on this analytical framework, the genealogist must accept that the centrality of the social problem she has chosen to explore 'emerges' as an interpretation and 'can therefore be contested by other interpretations growing out of other concerns' (Dreyfus and Rabinow, 1982, p.xii). 'All of this rests upon a primary assumption of complexity rather than profundity

as the object and purpose of research' (Jones and Ball, 1995, p.46). It is in the process of interpretation, however, that the genealogist has to stand back, disengage herself from the turbulence of the problem and indulge in her 'pathos for distance'. Moreover, this confession of interpretation also goes a long way in preempting the necessity of pretending that our 'problems' are 'out there' waiting to be 'located'. As it is now more and more widely accepted, to all intents and purposes, our disciplines and procedures produce the problems that they address. Foucault at one time described his work as 'several fragments of autobiography' derived from his experience of 'something cracked, dully jarring or disfunctioning in things I saw in the institutions in which I dealt with my relations with others' (quoted in Rajchman, 1985, p.36) or, as he put it on another occasion: 'I think that the ethico-political choice we have to make every day is to determine which is the main danger (1986a, p.343). This is, of course, very directly opposed to ethnography's 'orientation to discovery', but Woods (1986 p. 169) also sees the ethnographic art as underpinned by both 'discipline, control, and method' and 'liberation, creativity, and imagination'. Ethnography may be realist but may be not that realist.

The art of cartography. The analysis of texts in ethnography involves generating codes and concepts, theoretical models, and astringent categories; developing typologies; establishing themes, patterns, and relationships. These processes can be represented as and are facilitated by what Strauss (1987) calls 'diagramming'. For Strauss, 'diagramming' plays a number of roles in the analysis of ethnographic data, particularly in the integration of 'separate, if cumulative, analyses' (p.170). It is one of a number of 'integrative mechanisms' laid out in his pedagogy of qualitative research. The explicitness of such procedures contrasts sharply with the elusiveness of the genealogical method. In doing genealogical research: 'procedure is very much a matter of knowing what would be inappropriate given the epistemological and ontological assumptions being made by Foucauldian scholars' (Meadmore, Hatcher, and McWilliam, 2000, p.466).

In a different way, Deleuze (1992) sees genealogy as the act of drawing maps or a cartography of social diagrams. At the heart of this diagram is a conception of power as a system of relations that co-exist in a social matrix. Genealogy provides a functional microanalysis of power relations, operating on the smallest and most insignificant details. Like ethnography, genealogy is the exemplary means to generate theory from practice. Nonetheless, analytically, there is also a major contrast between a genealogical concern with the 'surface' of things and ethnography's revelatory epistemology. As

Woods (1986, p. 91) explains '… ethnographic description differs from ordinary description in that the researcher's aim is to penetrate beneath surface appearances and reveal the hidden realities there concealed'. Drawing on its Nietzschean tradition, however, genealogy rejects the search for hidden truths. One critical point of genealogy is that there are no final 'truths' about our nature or the norms our reason dictates to us. In this line of analysis, the genealogist does not look beyond, behind, or under the surface of social practices. The aim is, rather, to look more closely at the workings of those practices. Instead of going deep, looking for origins and hidden meanings, the analyst is working on the surface, constructing 'a polygon or rather a polyhedron' (Foucault, 1991, p.77) of various minor processes that surround the 'problem' under scrutiny. What is to be remembered is the fact that the more the analysis breaks down practices, the easier it becomes to find out more about their interrelation, though this process can never have an absolute conclusion— in contrast to the 'theoretical saturation' of ethnography. As Paul Veyne has seen it, practice in Foucault's thought 'is not some mysterious agency, some substratum of history, some hidden engine; it is what people do (the word says just what it means)' (1997, p.153). Abandoning the search for an ultimate truth does not, however, mean rejecting truth altogether. As Foucault puts it: 'I believe too much in truth not to suppose that there are different truths and different ways of speaking the truth. (1988, p.51)

Genealogy, notes Foucault, 'requires patience and a knowledge of details, and it depends on a vast accumulation of source material' (1986b, p.76). In analyzing this polymorphous and diverse map of documents and sources, Foucault is careful with minor textual details: he scrupulously cites his examples, commenting on their structure. He further follows the 'order of discourse' of the texts he cites: he compares them, juxtaposes them, and traces their repetition, recurrence, or even disappearance. Genealogical texts are relatively short but rigorous and dense. 'Despite or perhaps because of his continuous criticism of categorizations, Foucault turns out to be exceptionally effective in forming structures, groups and categories and placing them in an order' (Tamboukou, 1999, p.214). The Foucauldian genealogical texts are full of meticulous diagrams, sketches, and outlines and they give precise and elaborate definitions. In writing his genealogies, Foucault is careful enough to discern subtle variations; he always systematizes his otherwise overflowing thought and his conclusions are concise. Concomitantly, Woods (1986, p.166) suggests that ethnographic ideas emerge from a mixture of 'scrupulous attention to detail' and an ability 'to 'let go' the hold of this rigorous application, to rise above it, as it

were, to 'play' with it'. Foucault weaves systematically the nexus of the power relations, the historical and cultural conditions, and the practices under scrutiny by drawing new lines and making interconnections among the different points of his constructed diagrams. Finally, the genealogical analysis stresses the limits imposed by the social conditions within which practices of the self are cultivated. Foucault's originality lies in his strategic use of different discourses and approaches in the writing of his genealogies. Each reading of these genealogies reveals hidden layers of attentive and detailed research with and across an immense variety of data.[13]

Ethnography also uses different sources of data: the heard, seen, written, enacted, and shared. In analyzing her data, the ethnographer organizes analytical frames, makes charts, constructs models of structures and typologies, and develops codes and sub-codes. Ethnographic coding has been the target of scathing postmodern critique and, it has to be said, its positioning within the hermeneutic tradition seems to place it at some distance from the genealogical insistence of sticking to the surface of things. As a result, perhaps, many but not all genealogical ethnographies eschew the sort of categorizations that were basic to Foucault's practice.

The problematics of writing: common grounds and tensions. It goes without saying that in discussing methodological affinities, we cannot but be concerned with the problem of writing. While doing genealogy is almost inseparable from writing genealogy, the distinction between doing ethnography and writing ethnography throws up a variety of difficult issues and unsolved problems which have been the subject of much recent debate.[14] The recentness of the recognition of a doing/writing distinction is significant in itself. As James Clifford has pointed out, ethnography has long drawn on 'an ideology claiming transparency of representation and immediacy of experience' (1986, p.2). Writing was considered to be a pure problem of method. It would be an unproblematic and practical skill, as long as the ethnographer was able to keep good field notes, was careful, and was systematic in organizing her data and clear and precise in writing up' her 'findings'. This, however, is only one very modernist version of ethnography, which, as Deborah Britzman (1995, p.230) comments, 'depends upon the rationality and stability of writers and readers and upon noncontradictory subjects who say what they mean and mean what they say'. Poststructural and postmodern approaches to ethnography have radically questioned the unproblematic immediacy that mainstream ethnography advocates and have demonstrated that the exploration of ethnographic textual practices inevitably reaches 'beyond texts to contexts

of power, resistance, institutional constraint, and innovation' (Clifford, 1986, p.2). Writing is now a major preoccupation in and of itself within ethnography, rather than a simple medium for ethnographic practice. As Davis comments, 'we may have the sense that, however much we change our literary underwear, the postmodernist bus will get us in the end' (1992, p. 217).

Writing is also a preoccupation for Foucault. As with his other intellectual moves in writing his genealogies, Foucault wishes to shift attention from writing as medium to writing as object. He sees writing unfolding 'like a game that invariably goes beyond its own rules and transgresses its limits' (Foucault, 1998, p.206). In the writing of genealogy, the traditional question of how the author/researcher can break down her data and give it meaning is no longer valid. Instead, the question is reformulated as: how, under what conditions and in what forms, can the genealogist 'appear in the order of discourse?' How will she reveal herself in the discursive context of that she is writing about? What different roles will she admit performing? Which institutional constraints will she accept and what rules will she have to obey? There is no place of privilege from which to do research. The problem here is not that she will have to try hard to excavate precious hidden meanings and 'write them up'. It is, rather, the opposite: how will she navigate the multiplicity of meanings surrounding her research and arrive at something that can stand as 'findings' or conclusions or at least perspective—while avoiding closure? As Foucault eloquently puts it, it is a problem of seeing the genealogist as 'the principle of thrift in the proliferation of meaning […] a functional principle by which, in our culture, one limits, excludes and chooses' (1998, p.221). This is again Britzman's point about selection, noted earlier.

Clearly there are parallels here with the attempts of some ethnographers to problematize ethnographic texts and deconstruct the tropes of ethnographic writing.[15] In exploring aspects of postmodern ethnography, Tyler focuses on the ethical nature of its rhetoric and the textual technologies of its various forms. He sees it as 'a cooperatively evolved text consisting of fragments of discourse intended to evoke in the minds of reader and writer an emergent fantasy of a possible world of commonsense reality' (1986, p.125). In this light, postmodern ethnography is written at the limit rather than within the limit. It is a 'mediative vehicle' that enables the transcendence of commonsense reality, which it attempts to recapture. Britzman has reexamined the epistemological grounds of ethnography by questioning three kinds of ethnographic authority: (1) the authority of empiricism, (2) the authority of language, and (3) the authority of reading or

understanding (1995, p.230). In her analysis, subjects are seen as 'tellers of experience' and 'experience as a discourse'. In Britzman's words, ethnographic writing should 'point to the contradictions that structure the uneasy dialogue between humanism and postructuralism, between what is taken as lived experience and the afterthought of interpretive efforts, between the real subjects and their textual identities' (1995, p. 232–233). She is also then roaming in unmarked territories.

In entering 'the battle of writing', both genealogy and ethnography have sought to distance themselves from the ontology of writing that predominates in positivist modern social science. But this distancing appears, at least at first sight, to move them in opposite directions. For Foucault, authorship is a problem; we must, he argues, 'locate the space left empty by the author's disappearance, follow the distribution of gaps and breaches, and watch for the opening this disappearance uncovers' (Foucault, 1998, p.209). Foucault wanted to displace or desacralize the 'author-function' as a convention of discourse. The author-function distinguishes certain discourses from others, privileges them, in effect. Authorship is also an appropriation of discourse and Foucault challenges the unity of the 'I' represented within the text. It is perhaps here interesting to note that one of the paradoxes of Foucault's work and the work of some postmodern scholars in education is that, in their attempts to write 'otherwise', their escapes from convention mark them out as very identifiable 'authors' of 'eccentric' texts which can be read very differently from the theoretical and epistemological claims they espouse. But while Foucault problematizes authorship, in contemporary ethnographic practice there is a 'celebration' of the author as 'we choreograph, depict, and rescript stories and meanings from what we are examining' (Ely et al., 1997, p.38). Ely and colleagues pose the ethnographic writer a problem: 'How can I come across as a person and as a person who is a researcher?' Perhaps in some ways close to Foucault they are attempting to demystify the author and reinterpolate her in the text as a person; but this is dramatically different from Foucault's plea in the introduction to the *Archaeology of Knowledge* that: 'I am no doubt not the only one who writes in order to have no face' (1989, p.17). However, Foucault's face is, as we know, very recognizable (oddly and interestingly, his iconic head appears on many of his texts and texts about him), his authorship is rarely in doubt and in a somewhat different expression of his relationship to his own texts, as already noted, he describes his attempts 'to do theoretical work' as several fragments of autobiography (in Rajchman, 1985, p.36). Here in another kind of 'reversal' the author lives the text, is the text. We make these brief

comments not to reveal inconsistency nor to suggest any kind of simple elision between the writing of ethnography and genealogy, but to point to a shared interest in the 'problem' of the author-function and a common scepticism towards the possibility of an unreflective reading of academic texts.

Genealogical and Ethnographic Influences

Thomas has noted that positivist educational inquiry 'follows predictable routes and leads often to uninteresting findings' (1998, p.141), adding that 'there has been developed a technology of rationality associated with educational research—as it is practiced both by students and educational researchers—which is destructive of imagination, curiosity, and innovation…Fertility is sacrificed to orderliness in contemporary educational inquiry' (p. 143). At moments like these, the refusals of genealogical research intersect with struggles of the ethnographic imagination in a common rejection of the iron cages of positivism. Perhaps a genealogical awareness influences the ethnographer's choices, the elements, facts, people, practices, or phenomena that attract the ethnographer's attention, the way she moves in the field, the things she observes and writes down, the notes she keeps, the connections she makes. Being genealogically driven can mould the ethnographer's sociological imagination in new forms and further incite her towards historicizing her findings and continually interrogating the factuality of their existence. In the same vein, the writing up of or writing about/around data may be deeply influenced by a genealogical sensibility. Or, in another kind of relationship, Foucault did not intend that his work would replace other modes of inquiry, that is, he intended not to 'supplant or invalidate such parallel investigations as those of historical sociology and ethnology but to make available to historical analysis a whole additional range of objects and relations' (Gordon, 1980, p.236). In therefore considering the possibility of doing ethnography within a genealogical framework, or of writing genealogies using ethnographical techniques, the question comes: how can these stances work and what value can genealogy and/or ethnography add to the other? There are five issues to be considered:

1) the deployment of the research question
2) the appearance of new analytical perspectives

3) the shattering of norms and certainties about what can or should be researched
4) the interrogation of how we define what counts as knowledge, truth, objectivity, and/or scientific research?—who is the 'other' hidden away or marginalized in these normalizing procedures
5) the writing of the research.

In all these respects, genealogy involves and demands that we struggle against our own way of reasoning. We will now see, very schematically, how these issues have been reworked in the theoretical and methodological topos that is tentatively and experimentally opened up between ethnography and genealogy.

The genealogical influence on ethnography: shaking certainties. We have argued that the use of genealogical strategies helps the researcher:

1) create new problems
2) open previously unthought areas of investigation
3) pose challenging questions.

These are all useful strategic stages in any research project. After locating her area of interest, however, the researcher has to go out there, in the field. She has to collect her data. However, how does she act in the light of the attempt to shatter given certainties? At this point, genealogy may make her rethink certain methodological choices and decisions. More specifically, she has to be more sceptical about:

1) how she locates the field of investigation
2) how she chooses key informants.

Within the genealogical framework, there is a decisive challenge for the researcher to become more sceptical about what she thinks she can 'see', a requirement to look more closely at neglected details, to listen to the silences, as well as to the voices, of the speakers/subject under investigation. Once the data begins to accumulate, there are further challenges:

1) How does the researcher assess and codify her data?

2) Does she interrogate what counts as good/bad, hot/indifferent data? We must guard against the temptation to recognise ourselves in the data.

In this light, the researcher problematizes her findings in two ways:

1) by becoming more critical about what counts as data and about what does not and
2) by being more sceptical about the selection of data that will be used in the construction of an account.[16]

Although the methodological tools involved here nominally remain the same, they function in different ways. The ethnographic interview for example, is always an ethnographic interview, but the analytical questions have changed. As already shown, there is here a tendency to become more sceptical about the interpretational procedures and analytical strategies of the researcher. The researcher-analyst attempts to see and describe things in terms of her approach and to do this in concrete terms and in relation to specific situations, remaining always aware of the specificity of 'discreet truths'. There is the need to state clearly who she is and from which standpoint she is talking. In this way she attempts:

1) to constitute *situated subjects* within *situated systems* of power and knowledge—to maintain a sense of the relations of history, power, and knowledge.
2) to become politically stronger and theoretically more accessible, more persuasive, and more attractive.

Thus, while what the researcher 'sees' and/or notes have changed, she still keeps on seeing, noting, interviewing, keeping a field diary. The researcher is still acting, planning, performing like an ethnographer, but she thinks, analyses, and writes like a genealogist. Moreover, she is more sceptical about what she does, how she does it. That which appears obvious in ethnography is made not so obvious at all.

The ethnographic influence on genealogy: weaving the materiality of ideas. The issues that are examined here revolve around these questions:

1) Who are these subjects we are talking about? Are they real? Do they exist? Where? In what circumstances?

2) How do they cope? What are their problems? How do they feel? How do they react? Can we see them? How? Can we talk to them? How?

One of the seductions of ethnography is that it provides a fantasy of action, being where the action is for the researcher. The rush which comes from 'being there' is set alongside the analyst's sense of creativity, of building a theory where no theory existed before, of being a theorist of the 'real' world. The colourful chronotopics of fieldwork stand starkly against the grey network of the power of the text, and the vast detail and insignificance which is the stuff of genealogy. Yet, like so many binaries, this one obscures as much as it reveals. The task of the genealogist is, as Foucault saw it, preeminently vital and real, her role 'is to tell us who we are, what our present is, what that is, today' (Foucault, 1996, p.407) and thus to make 'things more fragile' (p.412). That is, to undermine the solidity of unquestioned rationales and institutional matrices. In practice, there is an increasing body of work which seeks to elide these two endeavours, to create, if you like, a 'genealogy of action'. The question is not whether this is right or orthodox; the question is whether it is viable and sustainable and productive.

Working in the Topos of Ethnography and Genealogy

In this final introductory overview, we will use the chapters that follow, and their representations of the interplay between genealogical strategies and various ethnographic methods, as a basis for thinking about the theorization of the research act. This interplay between ethnography and genealogy is an encounter between two sets of flexible, even unstable, practices. Genealogy is an emerging research tradition still in the process of discovering itself or making itself up. It has a certain elusiveness and impenetrability. Ethnography—or ethnographies—is an embedded but 'fractured' (Smith, 1990) practice made up of different traditions and styles of work drawn from sociology, anthropology, and philosophy. Ethnography is denoted by a certain methodological promiscuity. It is certainly, by definition, responsive and adaptive rather than prescriptive. It requires a practical inventiveness. We want to look more closely at what may happen, what is actually happening, or what has already happened by this encounter.

The contributors to this collection are theorists but also practitioners who have applied genealogical drives to their ethnographic inquiries. They

come from different countries, continents, and research areas. Their concerns, and their relationships to research practice and 'the field', also differ. In several cases, their methodological reflections and their deployment of genealogical techniques are means of getting at and getting away from the embedded and stultifying assumptions of stance, method, and relationships to the social within which their practice is framed.

In 'Top of Their Class? On the Subject of "Education" Doctorates', Sue Middleton is looking backwards to her research and writing, which spans over twenty years, to 'realize' that although not explicitly acknowledged at the time, she has been working along lines of the genealogical project, particularly addressing Foucault's question of 'how are the human sciences possible, and what are the historical consequences of their existence'. Transferred to education as a field of human sciences, this question has motivated a genealogical analysis of life-history interviews as well as of the policy documents that framed the discursive context from which they emerged. Sue Middleton has always been 'doing genealogy'; for her, genealogy is a way of bringing together the different aspects of her long-term project her particular contribution to this collection focuses on a recently completed project on the first fifty years of Ph.D. degrees in New Zealand. Included in this project was what Sue Middleton calls 'a genealogical history of Education'. It was on 'grey documents' (Foucault, 1986b) that this genealogical history drew, cartographing previous 'maps' of educational research, forming typologies, and making classifications. The variety of data and themes of this project resonated some of the methodological strategies and moments to which we have already pointed (see introduction) and attempted to explore 'local memories' that have perhaps remained in the peripheries of central and dominant codes of meaning framing current understandings of doctoral research issues and problems in New Zealand. The chapter is organized into four parts: introducing the subject of education, tracing connections as well as tensions between genealogy and life-history, applying these connections to the particular project, and, finally, testing the consistency of the research project as it was deployed within the field of genealogical strategies. Interestingly enough, her contribution is a genealogy per se of her research projects and modes of inquiry—a double move. Amongst the wide range of genealogical themes with which she deals, there is an attention to the dispersion of the subjects who are interviewed and recount their life-stories, a surface and horizontal reading of her data, an attempt to reach the 'erudite knowledge' and local memories genealogy is after, an interest in descriptions, the 'how' rather than explanations, the 'why' of the stories emerging from her data.

Finally, it is her insistence on the use of genealogy as a 'toolkit' rather than a closed methodological framework that makes her contribution an important moment in the genealogy/lifehistory encounter. Middleton's work highlights the mutual adaptability of two contrasting methodologies around a set of fundamental questions about the possibility of the social and its orderings.

In 'Writing Up, Writing Down: Authenticity and Irony in Educational Research', Erica McWilliam tackles the writing moment of the genealogy/ethnography encounter. In particular, she counterpoises authenticity to irony, placing the first in the methodological domain of ethnography and the latter to that of genealogy. In recognizing useful points of convergence but also difficult tensions between the epistemological traditions of genealogy and ethnography, she goes on to trace their encounter in the process of writing research. Both practices are totalizing and reflexive, they envelop the research process from conception through to writing. What is irony about, and how does it relate to genealogy? McWilliam sees their interrelation in the genealogical imperative to problematize concepts, ideas, and notions that have for so long been taken for granted. It is difficult, unsettling, and disappointing for researchers—especially young ones—to accept the need to trouble or dispense with basic tenets of stance and method. She argues that to do this, researchers have to come to terms 'with irony as a fundamental condition in which we live, work, and create the knowledge objects that we think with' (p. 63). Confronting and accepting this means getting used to using and troubling, at the same time, theories, concepts, traditions, and notions that have actually shaped our intellectual and social and political identities. Drawing on the theoretical ground opened up by Richard Rorty's influential work (1989), McWilliam elaborates irony as an uncomfortable yet inevitable matrix of thinking, performing, researching, and ultimately writing. McWilliam's contribution emphasizes the surprise element, so fundamental in the genealogical project; we only need to remember here Foucault's statement that he would never start any work if he knew from the beginning its outcome: 'the game is worthwhile insofar as we don't know what will be the end' (Foucault, 1988, p.9). Being ready for the unexpected, McWilliam suggests, consequently influences the design of the research field, the configuration of problems, the questions raised and the kind of analysis undertaken. This has its counterpart in ethnography's 'orientation to discovery'. 'Most importantly', she argues, citing Rorty, 'the possibility of a final vocabulary of explanation is diminished', identifying this as one of the key conditions for working 'as an ironist' (p.62); an unwillingness to

move to closure, to settle for parsimony. McWilliam's construction of the irony/genealogy nexus is, we suggest, a choreographic moment in the 'pas de deux' dance between genealogy and ethnography we have portrayed earlier on in this introduction.

Stephanie Brown's contribution, 'Desire in Ethnography: Discovering Meaning in the Social Sciences', draws on ethnographic research carried out by the Institute for the Study of Community Based Services in San Francisco, and explores the problematic 'compatibility' of genealogy and ethnography and their mutual contribution in discovering meaning in the social sciences. Her project is about developing methods that can serve 'the goals of anti-humanist social research' (p. 73). To this end, she focuses on genealogy's juxtaposition to traditional history, particularly stressing the genealogical insistence on multiplicities and disparity, which as discussed in the introduction, are part of the genealogical strands of *descent* and *emergence*. It is the anti-foundationalist traits of genealogy that Brown draws upon in parallel with recent criticisms of foundationalism in anthropology. She considers the problem of interpretation and its contradictory relation to the genealogical notion of emergence, claiming the very process of knowledge production as the object of anti-foundationalist ethnography. Her argument is that the genealogical project is not defined just by its method, 'but by object: the production of knowledge, the competition among epistemologies'; she shows how this can be done: making space for failures, being aware of the production of the 'uncanny', attending to the tensions between the real and what is left outside it, finally being reflexive of how 'humanism constructs its objects, and how it fails.' Having set out the theoretical ground of her research, Brown goes on to demonstrate how the anti-humanist project can work in the context of knowledge production about the categories 'child' and 'adolescent' in the United States, how this knowledge informs social policies addressing problems of teenagers in crisis, and how, finally, this matrix of discourses, knowledges, and practices can be seen reflected in the case of Alice, a young girl referred to a crisis shelter for teenagers outside San Francisco, California. Moving from theory to praxis, Brown's contribution clearly illuminates 'the production of the real' in a surface analysis, which carefully avoids interpretations and in-depth digging. In sticking to the genealogical task of mapping the surface, this kind of analysis reveals improbable complexities, pays attention to 'insignificant' details, and shows the inherent fallibility of making diagnoses, as well as the impossibility of targeting 'the truth'. Brown's project of analysis keeps making vertical connections in a network where tracing

Alice's subjectivity becomes a ghost haunting, ultimately producing Alice as the 'uncanny'.

The genealogical strategy of surface analysis is pursued again in Debra Hayes's exercise of 'Getting Rid of the Subject: A Technique for Understanding how Gendered Subjectivities Form and Function in Educational Discourses'. Hayes uses the metaphor of underground maps to point up the evaluative and generative function of discourses, and their limited possibility of explaining 'the real' as well as their continuous constituting of the objects of which they speak. In tracing parallels between the functioning of maps and the functioning of discourse, she examines intersecting lines of analysis between genealogy and ethnography, highlighting omissions and interrupting the flow of dominant discourses and master narratives. 'Getting rid of the subject' is a disrupting technique that responds to the assumption that the subject is a representation of the real. Drawing on contemporary theorizations of subjectivities as effects of complex networks of discourses and practices, Hayes turns her focus on gendered and disadvantaged subjectivities in educational discourses in Australia. She particularly considers the discursive construction of boys as the educationally disadvantaged subject in education, a recent formation that is apparent not only in Australia but also in many advanced capitalist societies. What she demonstrates is the way in which this map of disadvantaged masculinities has been and continues to be configured in a map of shifting appearances and subjectivities. She points to the critical ways that crude generalizations, non-accidental omissions, and persistent silences are used to locate statistics in the right positions on the map, portraying boys as the disadvantaged educational subjects. In describing the 'new ways' of mapping the educationally disadvantaged subject, she traces backlashes and recurrences framed by the supposedly forgotten arguments of biological determinism. As pointed out in the introduction, genealogy is not only about discontinuities but also about unexpected and surprising continuities. Finally, Hayes turns her attention to political tactics that have been deployed within gender equity discourses in education and, in relating them to the map metaphor, she classifies them as 'three broad categories of technologies of power: rejection, accommodation, and revisioning' (p. 108). Hayes's contribution is about disrupting epistemological and methodological certainties focused around the educational subject, and getting used not to doing without it but, rather, with too many versions and shifting appearances of it.

In 'Disability, *Flânerie*, and the Spectacle of Normalcy', Susan Peters and Lynn Fendler make a genealogical investigation in the discursive regime of

Disability, exploring how difference and various discourses of normalcy are interwoven in its construction. Disability is indeed a grey area long kept in the peripheries of sociological research. It is this marginality that also makes it such an immensely interesting area of genealogical explorations—a genealogical *dispositif* par excellence. It goes without saying that the discourses around the Disabled body lie at the heart of the various analyses that have revolved around Disability. In this context, counterdiscourses resisting the medicalization and institutionalization of Disability and the Disabled subject have significantly marked the 'first wave' of criticism. What is significant in the most recent scholarly work addressing Disability, however, is what Peters and Fendler identify as 'an aesthetic search for meaning and positive disability identity' (p.120). Attention to those self-practices that the subject uses to makes sense of herself as 'the Disabled', but also to resist her construction within narrow and stereotypical schemas of abnormality, has been crucial to this inward turn. In this newly emerging plane of thinking, the Disabled body escapes both essentialist and social constructionist analytical schemas and attempts to speak of and for itself. Voices and textual narratives deriving from the lived experiences of Disabled people formulate the research field where genealogy and ethnography meet. In coping with their problematic encounter, Peters and Fendler use *flânerie* as a theoretical medium to open up space where the tensions between genealogy and ethnography can be accommodated and deployed for new meanings of Disability and multiple views of 'the norm' to emerge. As *flâneurs*, they take up the risky route of losing themselves in the crowds of notions, concepts, methodologies, and strategies that they will encounter in travelling around the theoretical grounds of these two traditions. Following genealogical lines, they thus analyze Disability as a complex social function, a political tactic, and a set of power/knowledge practices—the technologies of Disability, including voice, visibility, and body politic. To this end, and following the Foucauldian legacy, they draw on a rich variety of data, including genres of autobiography, film, and academic literature. In sketching a discursive map of Disability, viewpoints from Sociology and also from the Arts and Humanities are brought strategically together. What is particularly powerful in this genealogical act of bricolage are those voices representing bodily experiences of Disabled subjects who are simultaneously scholars in Disability Studies, the first author of this chapter included in this exceptional group of 'specific intellectuals'. *Flânerie* is therefore not only about 'losing themselves in the crowds' of methodological strategies but also 'in the crowds' of a rich variety and complexity of data. As Peters and Fendler argue, it is the voices

of 'the Disabled' emerging from these layers of data that ultimately call attention to the multi-dimensions of the ethnographic gaze itself, its potential to problematize dominant representations of Disability. Informed by genealogical insights, the ethnographic project can rid itself of simplistic dichotomies and engage in the project of what counts as Disability, how it is represented, and who can speak for it.

Following traces of desacralization already employed in McWilliam's irony and Peter and Fendler's *flâneurism*, Kari Dehli's chapter ' *"Making"* the Parent and the Researcher: Genealogy meets Ethnography in Research on Contemporary School Reform' touches the sacred area of parental involvement in education. In interrogating the making of the figure of the parent in the matrix of educational discourses, Dehli undertakes the risky task of moving in between 'involvement and distance' focusing on the interplay between 'the making of the parent' and 'the making of the researcher'; she is herself as 'a researcher', included in this reflexive practice informed by both genealogical and ethnographic problematics and issues. The route she follows to do this takes an unexpected turn in the very writing of the chapter, making its production a moment encompassing and demonstrating the joy of the surprise, the unexpected, the previously non-imagined possibilities that, as we have argued, can open up for researchers working on the shaky grounds where genealogy and ethnography interweave. Dehli starts with a series of imaginary investigations a 'classic' genealogist would have undertaken: interrogating the conditions of possibility for 'parental involvement' to emerge as an indisputable and commonsense necessity, a hegemonic discourse. These kinds of investigations tend to become part of 'the genealogical canon', if such a formulation could ever exist. However, Dehli's disturbance of that boring monotony is what her contribution is about. Moving off the beaten track, she shifts her interest to a genealogical investigation of her own research practices, seeking to reveal how they contributed to the ultimate production of the subjects they were attempting to problematize in the first place. In the same way that de Lauretis has argued that the construction of gender is effected by its deconstruction (1987), Dehli shows how the constructions of 'the parent' and 'the researcher' are similarly effected by their deconstruction. This is obviously a brilliant idea to have but a difficult task to pursue. Dehli sets about her task by encompassing discontinuities, difficulties, hesitations, and weak links in the very text she produces instead of creating a meta-narrative of continuities, an undisrupted flow of ideas. It is Foucault's ethico-political project that she follows in choosing to 'force into view those tendencies in our thought to naturalize positions we

endorse' (p.145) and to reveal the 'games of truth' she is inevitably involved as a researcher. A critical task following from this 'politics-as-ethics' (p. 145) is for researchers 'to rethink their/our affiliations with and commitment to political communities'. Dehli's suggestion is that perhaps working ethnography and genealogy together might be one of the possible routes for doing that.

Wayne Martino's chapter, 'Researching Masculinities: The Implication and Uses of Foucauldian Analyses in Undertaking Ethnographic Investigations into Adolescent Boys' Lives at School', also examines the ethnography/genealogy encounter in the analysis of the construction of gendered subjectivities, but it focuses on the formation of technologies of the self around masculinities, and concerns itself with the lives of adolescent boys at school. Clearly, this is a broad area of genealogical investigation, but Martino concentrates on how practices of embodied masculinity are deployed in the intersubjective space between the ethnographer/genealogist and the researched. Doing masculinity in research is problematized with reference to the seldom-considered significance of the anxieties produced in the research process when the researcher is seen to transgress widely accepted norms of masculinity. Martino argues that it is at this point that adopting a Foucauldian interpretive analytic becomes particularly relevant for the ethnographic investigation in process. Using genealogical lenses to interrogate the effects of embodied masculinity within the ethnographic research process draws on Foucault's deployment of sexuality within a certain discursive regime. In this context, what is particularly interesting, Martino argues, is the analysis of those specific practices within which the individual, in his case the ethnographer and adolescent boys, are incited to relate to themselves, making strategic use of what Foucault has defined as technologies of the self. Martino goes on to construct a set of research questions that derive from the researcher's engagement with genealogical strategies addressing various subject positions that the ethnographer and the adolescent boys can find themselves taking up in the matrix of the research process. What is particularly interesting here is the way Martino's lived experiences as an ethnographer, researching masculinities, is intertwined with the epistemological and methodological questions his contribution raises, highlighting the attention to the body, which as we pointed out earlier, in this introduction, is a theoretical and methodological topos of genealogy and ethnography. Martino's analysis moves from a detailed and in-depth reading of Foucault to demonstrating the practicalities of such theoretical considerations as they are applied to ethnographic moments of adolescent boys' lives.

In a very different social setting, Erica Southgate, in her chapter, 'Liquid Handcuffs: A Tale of Power, Subjectivity, Risk, and the Drug Treatment Clinic', addresses the discursive field of methadone maintenance treatment (MMT). As she admits, her field is a difficult one to investigate, let alone to live. For the reader, we would add, it is perhaps a difficult one to come to terms with, and, in acknowledging this, Southgate begins with a detailed description of the policies and practices of methadone treatment, particularly focusing on the geopolitical, social, and cultural context of Australia, identifying MMT as a key element of the country's 'harm minimization' drug policy. For Southgate, it is exactly around this 'harm minimization' issue that the discursive field she wants to investigate revolves. The genealogical approach she employed in her ethnographic research enabled her to listen to loud silences, challenge open secrets, look in the interstices of oxymoronic and contradictory discourses, but, most importantly, to turn her—and indeed our—attention to the subjugated knowledges of those subjected to MMT: patients, recovering addicts, and wily junkies. Southgate scrutinizes the various, contradictory, and often incompatible subject positions that are constructed for MMT users in the discursive field of MMT. She also considers a range of counternarratives that disrupt existing images which construct the subject position of the cynical user, a performative role in the power game around MMT policies, discourses, and practices. Southgate raises a number of questions around the practice of methadone injection, considering in particular how risk, pleasure, and resistance are interwoven in the spiral revolving around it. Finally, she theorizes how power and subjectivity can be reinscribed in alternative social forms that move away from the imperative of combining treatment and punishment, as is the case within the MMT framework. Like previous contributions, Southgate's analysis carefully remains on the surface of things, showing how, rather than why, they happen the way they do, as well as attempting to reveal their conditions of possibility, cartographing the genealogy of their emergence in the discursive field that is the object of her ethnographic work.

In 'Genealogy/Ethnography: Finding the Rhythm', Maria Tamboukou revisits her writing of a genealogy of women teachers in the United Kingdom in an attempt to map various methodological planes wherein genealogical strategies have been supported and sustained by ethnographic practices. A critical question that Tamboukou addresses is that of the specific intellectual 'findings' that a genealogical approach can bring forward in the analysis of women teachers' practices of self-representation. She argues that there are two concerns that the genealogical approach

forcefully brings to the fore. First, it is the catalytic role of space in the ways women teachers make sense of their lives and use autobiographical practices, both to represent these lives, but also to act upon them and attempt to become different. In Tamboukou's analysis, women's practices of self-representation can be seen as a set of Foucauldian technologies of the self, which, however, deviate from the male tradition Foucault has traced, forming two new sub-groups, which she classifies as 'technologies of space' and 'technologies of resistance' (pp.207–8). Second are embodied practices of self-representation that genealogical analysis opens up, particularly as these stand over and against dominant discourses of passionlessness, which have long framed women teachers' (a)sexuality. Tamboukou then moves on to consider the deployment of genealogical strategies, theorizing the analytical trails of *descent* and *emergence,* highlighting in particular the research effects they produce when applied to women teachers' life narratives. It is in the construction of the genealogical dispositif, focusing on a problem of our actuality, Tamboukou argues, that ethnographic practices have emerged to enliven the grey documents of genealogy, enlighten and problematize our present. Tamboukou considers a variety of ethnographic practices, particularly participant observation and the secondary analysis of existing ethnographic data. In her final argument, she uses the metaphor of musical rhythm to illustrate how working in the topos of genealogy and ethnography can be like finding the rhythm in a musical piece of improvisation where notes/practices can be brought together only temporarily and provisionally as an effect of inventing, experimenting, and ultimately thinking differently.

NOTES

1. See, amongst others Ball, (1990, 1994), Chambon et al. (1999), Dean (1994), Dickens and Fontana (1994), Gitlin (1994), Lather (1991), Lloyd and Thacker (1997), Meadmore et al. (2000), Popkewitz and Brennan (1998).
2. See Sawicki (1991, p.15)
3. See Ball (1994), Davies (1990), Fontana (1994) Lather (1994), Pignatelli (1993).
4. See, amongst others, Ashenden and Owen (1999), the debate between Bogard and Denzin (1986, pp.206–211), Dreyfus and Rabinow (1982), Kelly (1998), Pillow (2000), and St. Pierre (1997).
5. See Hammersley and Atkinson (1983, pp. 22–24).

6. Francois Ewald has noted that 'genealogy adopts the point of view of the body, that of the tortured, trained, branded, mutilated, decomposed, constrained, subjected body, that of the body which is divided, organized, separated, and reunited' (Mahon, 1992 p.9). Sheridan (1990) has commented extensively on what he calls the 'power-body' conjunction in Foucault.
7. See Weedon (1987), Diamond and Quinby (1988) Nicholson (1990), Butler (1990), Sawicki (1991), McNay (1992, 1994), Patton (1993), Probyn (1993).
8. See, amongst others, Featherstone (1991), Shilling (1993), Coffey (1999).
9. "Power as sovereignty" and "power as deployment" are terms used by Thomas Popkewitz and Marie Brennan (1998, pp.16–18). We have borrowed them and relate the first with ethnography and the latter with genealogy.
10. The metaphor of dance has already been used in theoretical analyses on genealogy. See Conway (1999).
11. As it has been suggested: 'where do the various medical, psychiatric and carceral systems of surveillance and discipline, detailed in *Discipline and Punish* and elsewhere, stand in relation to that distinction?' (Maggil, 1997, p.66).
12. As Dean has commented, genealogy 'studies what is closest, but so as to seize it at a distance' (1994, p.89). As influential commentators on Foucault's methodology have pointed out, 'interpretive understanding can only be obtained by someone who shares the actor's involvement, but distances himself [sic] from it' (Dreyfus and Rabinow, 1982, p.124).
13. For a more detailed description of the genealogical strategies, see Tamboukou (1999).
14. See Britzman (1995), Clifford and Marcus (1986), Fontana (1994), Gitlin (1994), Lather (1991).
15. Atkinson (1992), Clifford and Marcus (1986).
16. See again Britzman (1995).

REFERENCES

APPLE, M. (1996) Power, Meaning and Identity: Critical Sociology of Education in the United States. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 17*(2), 125–144.

ASHENDEN, S., and OWEN, D. (1999) *Foucault contra Habermas* (London: Sage).

ATKINSON, P. (1992) *Understanding Ethnographic Texts* (Newbury Park, CA: Sage).

BALL, S. J. (Ed.) (1990) *Foucault and Education* (London: Routledge).

——— (1994) *Education Reform, A Critical and Post-structural Approach,* (Buckingham: Open University Press).

BAUMAN, Z. (1988) Sociology and Postmodernity. *Sociological Review,* 38, 790 –813.

BOGARD, W. (1986) Reply to Denzin: Postmodern Social Theory. *Sociological Theory* (4), 206–208.

BRAIDOTTI, R. (1991) *Patterns of Dissonance* (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press).

BRITZMAN, D (1995) The Question of Belief: Writing Poststructural Ethnography. *Qualitative Studies in Education,* 8 (3) 229–238.

BUTLER, J. (1990) *Gender Trouble* (London: Routledge).

CHAMBON, A., IRVING, A. and EPSTEIN L. (1999) *Reading Foucault for Social Work* (New York: Columbia University Press).

CLIFFORD, J. (1986) Introduction: Partial Truths. In J. CLIFFORD and G. E. MARCUS (Eds.) *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography* (Berkeley: University of California Press), 1–26.

CLIFFORD, J. and MARCUS, G. E. (Eds.) (1986) *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography* (Berkeley: University of California Press).

COFFEY, A. (1999) *The Ethnographic Self: Fieldwork and the Representation of Identity* (London: Sage).

CONWAY, D. W. (1999) Pas de Deux: Habermas and Foucault in Genealogical Communication. In S. ASHENDEN and D. OWEN (Eds.) (1999) *Foucault contra Habermas* (London: Sage), 60–89.

DAVIDSON, A. (1986) Archaeology, Genealogy, Ethics. In D. Hoy (Ed.), *Foucault: A Critical Reader* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell), 221–233.

DAVIES, B. (1990) Agency as a Form of Discursive Practice: A Classroom Scene Observed. *British Journal of Sociology of Education,11*(3), 341-261.

DAVIS, J. (1992) Tense in Ethnography: Some Practical Considerations. In J. OKELY and H. CALLAWAY (Eds.), *Anthropology and Autobiography* (London: Routledge), 205–220.

DEAN, M. (1994) *Critical and Effective Histories: Foucault's Methods and Historical Sociology* (London: Routledge).

DE LAURETIS, T. (1987) *Technologies of Gender: Essays on Theory, Film and Fiction* (Basingstoke: Macmillan Press).

DELEUZE, G. (1992) What is a dispositif? In T. J. ARMSTRONG (Trans.), *Michel Foucault, Philosopher: Essays Translated from the French and German by Timothy J. Armstrong* (London: Harvester Wheatsheaf), 159–168.

DENZIN, N. (1986) Postmodern Social Theory in Ethnographic Practice. *Sociological Theory,* (4), 194–204.

DIAMOND, I., and QUINBY, L. (Eds.) (1988) *Feminism and Foucault: Reflections on Resistance* (Boston: Northeastern University Press).

DICKENS, D. and FONTANA, A. (1994) *Postmodernism and Social Inquiry* (London: University College London Press).

DIPROSE, R. (1993) Nietzsche and the pathos for distance. In P. PATTON (Ed.)*, Nietzsche, Feminism and Political Theory* (London: Routledge), 1–26.

DREYFUS, H. and RABINOW, P. (1982) *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics* (Chicago: Chicago University Press).

ELY, M., VINZ, R., DOWNING, M., ANZUL, M., (1997) *On Writing Qualitative Research: Living by Words* (London: Falmer Press).

FEATHERSTONE, M. (1991) *The Body, Social Process and Cultural Theory* (London: Sage).

FONTANA, A. (1994) Ethnographic Trends in the Postmodern Era. In D. DICKENS and A. FONTANA, (Eds.), *Postmodernism and Social Inquiry* (London: University College London Press), 203–224.

FORDHAM, S. (1996) *Blacked Out* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

FOUCAULT, M. (1970) *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences* (London: Tavistock).

——— (1980) Two Lectures. In C. GORDON (Ed.), *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977* (London: Harvester Wheatsheaf), 78–108.

——— (1981) Omnes et Singulatim: Towards a Criticism of 'Political Reason'. In S. MCMURRIN (Ed.), *The Tanner Lectures on Human Values II* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press), 223–254.

——— (1986a) On the Genealogy of Ethics: An Overview of Work in Progress. In PAUL RABINOW, (Ed.), *The Foucault Reader* (Harmondsworth: Peregrine), 340–372

——— (1986b) Nietzsche, Genealogy, History. In P. RABINOW, (Ed.), *The Foucault Reader* (Harmondsworth: Peregrine), 76–100.

——— (1988) An Aesthetics of Existence. In L. KRITZMAN, (Ed.), *Michel Foucault, Politics Philosophy, Culture* (London: Routledge), 47–53.

——— (1989) *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (London: Routledge).

——— (1990) *The History of Sexuality, An Introduction,* Vol. 1 (Harmondsworth: Penguin).

——— (1991) Questions of method. In G. BURCHELL, C. GORDON, AND P. MILLER, (Eds.) *The Foucault Effect* (London: Harvester Wheatsheaf), 73–86.

——— (1996). *Foucault Live: Collected Interviews, 1961–84, Ed. S. LOTRINGER* (New York: Semiotext[e]).

——— (1998) What is an Author? In P. RABINOW (Ed.), *Michel Foucault, Aesthetics, Method and Epistemology, the Essential Works of Michel Foucault, 1954 –1984, Vol. II* (Harmondsworth: Penguin), 205–222.

GITLIN, A. (Ed.) (1994) *Power and Method: Political Activism and Educational Research* (London: Routledge).

GLESNE, C., and PESHKIN, A. (1992) *Becoming Qualitative Researchers: An Introduction* (London: Longman).

GORDON, C. (1980) Afterword. In C. GORDON (Ed.), *Michel Foucault Power/Knowledge* (Longman: Harlow).

HAMMERSLEY, M., and ATKINSON, P. (1983) *Ethnography: Principles and Practice* (London: Tavistock).

HARAWAY, D. (1991) *Simians, Cyborgs and Women: The Reinvention of Nature* (London: Free Association Books).

———. (1997) *Modest_Witness@Second_Millenium.FemaleMan© _Meets_ OncoMouse™* (New York and London, Routledge).

HARDING, S. (1987) Introduction: Is there a feminist method? In S. HARDING (Ed.), *Feminism and methodology* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press), 1–14.

HENRY, M. (1990) Voices of Academic Women on Feminine Gender Scripts. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 11*(2), 121–136.

JONES, D., and BALL, S. J. (1995) Michel Foucault and the Discourse of Education. In P. MCLAREN, and J. M. GIARELLI (Eds.), *Critical Theory and Educational Researc*h (Albany: SUNY Press), 39–51.

KELLY, M. (1998) *Critique and power: Recasting the Foucault/Habermas Debate* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press).

LATHER, P. (1991) *Getting smart: Feminist Research and Pedagogy within the Postmodern* (London: Routledge), 36–60.

——— (1994) Fertile Obsession: Validity after Poststructuralism. In ANDREW GITLIN (Ed.), *Power and Method: Political Activism and Educational Research* (London: Routledge).

——— (1999) *Authorship/Ownership/Methods and Ethics in Research on Teaching and Teacher Education.* Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Montreal, April, 19–23.

LLOYD, M., and THACKER, A. (1997) *The Impact of Michel Foucault on the Social Sciences and Humanities* (Basingstoke: Macmillan Press).

MAGGIL, K. (1997) Surveillance-Free-Subjects. In M. LLOYD and A. THACKER (Eds.) *The Impact of Michel Foucault on the Social Sciences and Humanities* (Basingstoke: Macmillan Press), 54–77.

MAHON, M. (1992) *Foucault's Nietzschean Genealogy, Truth, Power, and the Subject* (Albany: State University of New York Press).

MARCUS, G. E. (1986) Contemporary Problems of Ethnography in the Modern World System. In J. CLIFFORD and G. E. MARCUS (Eds.), *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography* (Berkeley: University of California Press), 165–193.

MCNAY, L. (1992) *Foucault and Feminism* (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press).

——— (1994) *Foucault: A Critical Introduction* (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press).

MEADMORE, D., HATCHER, C., and MCWILLIAM, E. (2000) Getting tense and Genealogy. *Qualitative Studies in Education,* 13(5), 463-476.

NICHOLSON, L. (Ed.) (1990) *Feminism/Postmodernism* (London: Routledge).

PATTON, P. (Ed.) (1993) *Nietzsche, Feminism, and Political Theory* (London: Routledge).

PIGNATELLI, F. (1993) What Can I Do? Foucault on Freedom and the Question of Teacher Agency. *Educational Theory,* 43(4), 411– 432.

PILLOW, W. (2000) Deciphering attempts to Decipher Postmodern Educational Research. *Educational Researcher,* 29(5), 20–24.

POPKEWITZ, T., and BRENNAN, M. (Eds.) (1998) *Foucault's Challenge: Discourse, Knowledge and Power in Education,* (New York: Teachers College Press).

PROBYN, E. (1993) *Sexing the Self: Gendered Positions in Cultural Studies* (London: Routledge).

RAJCHMAN, J. (1985) *Michel Foucault: The Freedom of Philosophy* (New York: Columbia University Press).

RHOADS, R. (2000) Crossing Sexual Orientation Borders: Collaborative Strategies for Dealing with Issues of Positionality and Representation. In S. J. BALL (Ed.), *Sociology of Education: Major Themes,* Vol. 1 (London: Routledge, Falmer), 80–102.

RORTY, R. (1989) *Contingency, Irony, and Solidarity* (New York: Cambridge University Press).

SAWICKI, J. (1991) *Disciplining Foucault* (London: Routledge).

SHERIDAN, A. (1990) *Michel Foucault: The Will to Truth* (London: Routledge).

SHILLING, C. (1993) *The Body and Social Theory* (London: Sage).

SMITH, L. M. (1990) Critical Introduction. In M. HAMMERSLEY (Ed.) *Classroom Ethnography* (Buckingham: Open University Press).

ST.PIERRE, E., (1997) 'Nomadic inquiry in the smooth spaces of the field' *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education,* 10 (3) 365-383.

STRAUSS, A. (1987) *Qualitative Data Analysis for Social Scientists* (New York: Cambridge University Press).

TAMBOUKOU, M. (1999) Writing genealogies: an exploration of Foucault's Strategies for Doing Research. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, *20*(2), 201–218.

THOMAS, G. (1998) The myth of rational research. In *British Educational Research Journal, 24*(2), 141–161.

THOMAS, J. (1991). *Doing Critical Ethnography* (Newbury, CA: Sage).

TYLER, S. (1986) Post-Modern Ethnography: From Documents of the Occult to Occult Document. In J. CLIFFORD and G. E. MARCUS (Eds.) *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography* (Berkeley: University of California Press), 99–122.

VEYNE, P. (1997) Foucault Revolutionizes History. In ARNOLD DAVIDSON (Ed.), *Foucault and his Interlocutors* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press), 146–182.

WEEDON, C. (1987) *Feminist Practice and Postructuralist Theory* (New York: Basil Blackwell).

WILLIS, P. (1977) *Learning to Labour: How Working Class Kids Get Working Class Jobs* (Farnborough: Saxon House).

WOODS, P. (1986) *Inside Schools: Ethnography in Educational Research* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul).