

Institutional Ethnography

Newsletter of the International Sociological Association Thematic Group 06



From the President...

Happy holidays to all. Here in Canada, it's the time of year when we hope to have some time to recharge and reflect on the past year. It's been a banner year for Thematic Group 06 – Institutional Ethnography. Our first conference as a TG was held in Buenos Aires, Argentina. Our inaugural sessions were diverse, interesting, and pushed our Institutional Ethnographic thinking and collaboration just that much further. I'm looking forward to the next opportunity for us to meet.



We've started planning for the Yokohama conference to be held in 2014 <http://www.isa-sociology.org/congress2014/>. We've been given 10 sessions to fill with research reports, workshops, discussion groups, and panel discussions. Please consider sending in an abstract for a paper, or a session, or As usual, we have a small amount of money to subsidize conference participation. And remember, in order to participate, you must join the ISA and our TG06! I know the fees seem high, but they are for four years. And, as they say on television, "We're worth it."

My thanks to Paul Luken, the Yokohama Program Chair, and Suzanne Vaughan, our Treasurer and Keeper of the Membership List. Our TG couldn't operate without them.

Alison Griffith

Board of Directors 2011-2014

President

Alison I. GRIFFITH, York University, Canada
agriffith@edu.yorku.ca

Vice-President

Paul C. LUKEN, University of West Georgia, USA
pluken@westga.edu

Secretary-Treasurer

Suzanne VAUGHAN, Arizona State University, USA
svaughan@asu.edu

Members

Barbara COMBER, Queensland University of Technology, Australia
Karin WIDERBERG, University of Oslo, Norway

Call For Sessions for 2014 World Congress

The Thematic Group on Institutional Ethnography plans to organize as many as 10 sessions for the 2014 World Congress of Sociology, Yokohama, Japan. Sessions are 110 minutes in length and members of the thematic group are encouraged to develop a variety of stimulating sessions, including some special sessions that address the issues of global inequality. Please send proposals to the Programme Coordinator.

Programme coordinator

Paul LUKEN, University of West Georgia, USA, pluken@bellsouth.net

Deadline: March 15, 2013

Submissions should include the following information:

1. Title of the session
2. Session format
 - Regular session – five papers and 20 minutes for discussion
 - Special session on the theme of the Forum
 - Joint session – with another identified RC, WG or TG
 - Featured or Keynote Speaker – 60 minute presentation followed by discussion
 - Author meets their critics – author(s) and commentators discuss a recent publication
 - Other types of sessions such as workshops or sessions on pedagogy
3. A 200-word description of the session
4. Language(s) of the session
5. Full name, affiliation and contact information of the session organizer(s) and/or session chair(s) if different.



An International Journey with Institutional Ethnography



***Graham Barnes** has been a Resource Specialist with the Battered Women's Justice Project in Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA since 2005. He consults with federal grantees nationally on developing their coordinated community response to domestic violence, trains for professional institutes such as the National Institute on The Prosecution of Domestic Violence, presents internationally, through The Advocates for Human Rights, and teaches Duluth's Creating a Process of Change For Men Who Batter Curriculum.*

Previously, Graham was Team Leader of the Domestic Abuse Intervention Project's National Training Project in Duluth, Minnesota where he developed local Duluth practices on domestic violence into training packages and resources for other communities nationally and internationally. He facilitated batterer intervention program classes in Duluth, and a class for men coming out of prison in Minneapolis.

Initially trained as a teacher, Graham has a Diploma in Teaching, a Bachelors Degree in Social Work, and 20 years experience in community organizing and domestic violence prevention. In 1990, Graham was the founding men's program coordinator at New Zealand's Hamilton Abuse Intervention Project, a national pilot that adapted the 'Duluth-Model' to a New Zealand cultural setting. He then trained practitioners in this model throughout New Zealand and in Australia. In 1996, Graham worked with Ellen Pence, whose obituary was in the last newsletter, on the development of the 'Domestic Violence Safety and Accountability Audit' in Duluth. Between 1998 and 2002, Graham worked for SHINE developing health sector responses to domestic violence in Auckland, and piloting DVFREE—an employer response to domestic violence. The approach to the work that he does, "institutional analysis," was developed largely by Ellen Pence. I spoke with Graham about institutional analysis and his collaboration with Ellen. – Paul Luken

P: Most people that I know who are aware of Ellen Pence's work start in academia, and first we find our way to Dorothy Smith's work. Then we find people who are applying her work, people like Ellen, but I have a sense that this was not your trajectory. What was your path?

G: I started out hearing about Ellen through colleagues who were working nationally in the stopping violence against women movement. I had been working in that field for about 10 years, and I worked my way up from local work, mostly anti-racism work that I was doing locally, and then I

worked doing organizing regionally for a while, and then I represented our network when we started doing stopping violence programs for men. I represented that network nationally in New Zealand. It's a small country and it's easy to get to know others who work nationally in a country that only has 4 million people. I got to know the people who worked in that field nationally through the women's refuge movement. They were looking for the people who were doing the most effective work internationally. And if you look around for who is doing the most effective work at collaborating between community organizations and

Continued from page 3

government, it was very clear that the work that was being done in Duluth, Minnesota, was by far the most effective to get the government agencies, particularly the judges and the police department, to listen really well to the shelters and to change their policies and procedures there. It was such a dramatic step forward in safety for victims, and we were impressed to see judges and law enforcement working so closely with community advocates, developing policy across disciplines together.

Because of that we managed to get the New Zealand government to look at that model and to fund an exploratory mission to Duluth to find if we could adapt that model to New Zealand and fund a national pilot project. In 1990 we set out a pilot in a small city about the size of Duluth. A small group of us were funded by the New Zealand government to model what they were doing in Duluth and adapting it to our local circumstances and evaluating it with the University to collect a baseline of data to see what we could take from Duluth and change the way we were working and measure to see if it really made a difference for safety for women. Because I was one of the ones who set that up, I went to Duluth to see what they were doing there and implement that back in Hamilton, our pilot site.

Academics from the University of Waikato worked closely with us to evaluate and implement that project. It was hard for them since there was no baseline data when they started, and evaluating this was quite controversial because no one was happy with how they were measuring it. Everyone was worried about it. It was a mixture of qualitative

and quantitative measuring and so no one was happy about that either. There were arguments between people who wanted it to be basic number crunching and then the concerns about it not measuring the qualitative experiences of the people. Safety is such a complex intervention to measure. And there is so many aspects to the intervention that it's difficult to measure how it affected people's lives because the systems that intervened are so complex. You can't just measure "Do men's programs make women safer?" because men's programs sit within a complex system, and if we are going to say, "Yes. Men's programs work," you have to think, "At what point do they work? Do they work within the physical place? Do they work from when the person enters the program?" There's so many points at which you have to measure from, and I think you have to measure all the points all the time, and it's just complex. Also, we hoped to include the sexual assault networks with us in this project. But they were ambivalent about being so closely tied to the criminal justice system, and ended up deciding not to take part. Personally I believe it was a lost opportunity to create systemic change. But I respected their decision – there are certainly problems with partnering so closely with institutions that tend to reflect hierarchical norms of society – which can be at odds with addressing the social inequalities underlying many if not most intimate partner violence cases.

P: I can understand the problem because people want a simple measure.

G: And the simple measures don't show the whole picture.

Continued from page 4

P: So you first established that one in Hamilton, New Zealand, and was it regarded as successful enough to continue?

G: Yes, it was. And it continued for many years, and it is actually still in place. But now it is vastly defunded, so it is really a shadow of its former self. But let me go back to connecting up with Ellen. We spent five weeks in Duluth on our original visit and looked really intensively at what Ellen and the team of people set up there. We did ride-alongs with law enforcement and observed every aspect of the Domestic Abuse Intervention Project, which was really only a team of about 10 people, and we looked at how they changed the way the criminal justice system intervened in people's lives. We looked at how government agencies had been changed by the community agencies, and we looked at all the interlocking policies and procedures that pertained to that. We talked to all the government people. We observed how they did their work. We rode a lot of nights. We observed all the community agencies and actions. And we took it all back to New Zealand and we adapted it to our local circumstances. And then we worked in that for a number of years in Hamilton. And then we brought those people from Duluth over to New Zealand as well for conferences and had them talk to all of our local people as well. For example, we brought judges and local agency people to New Zealand and toured them round the country.

An example was a judge that we brought from Duluth to New Zealand, and he said, "What do you want me to say to the judges?" And it was very heartening for a judge to say to a community organization person, "What do you

say?" What we wanted was for him to tell them what it was like before he began working with the community organizations, what changed, and what it was like afterwards. So that is exactly what he did, and he did that without us present. He talked judge to judge and he talked about what changed in his thinking and in his practice. I think that was one of the most effective change processes that you could do. We brought people from Duluth to New Zealand to talk about the change processes. We found that powerful people talking to their peers was very useful in creating system change. Having insiders talk to insiders was very useful, and it's best when it happens without us there. They could talk about all their doubts and fears and how they changed, what went wrong, what they don't like about it. They can be totally honest with friends. It created an environment in which no one was watching their words, and it was very effective. And it really took the load off us. We were always trying to argue our point, and we didn't have to argue our point when they were doing it for us. We were able to achieve so much by using insiders as our allies and they just talked about their experience of going through the change.

P: In another presentation you talked about stages in doing this type of work, what is now called "institutional analysis," and the first step was "forming the inter-agency team." From the beginning you are creating a process that is very different from the kind of program evaluation that we learn about in academia. Could you talk a little bit about how you go about forming the multi-agency team, how you determine who needs to be involved, how you recruit them?

G: To speak of forming a multi-agency team is to take a much longer process and shorten it. There are many things that you must consider.

Continued from page 5

One of them is the scope of the exploration. The scope is going to guide the size of the team and the members that you are going to include. For example, if you are going to look at a particular part of the criminal justice system, and I've been involved with looking at this system, you might choose the part from when a 911 call is made to when the first court hearing happens. If you are going to explore that part of the system, it will determine which part of the justice system you are going to have on your audit team. It's going to include prosecutors, 911 supervisors, probation officers who do pre-trial release, and others.

P: But how do you get the people to volunteer to work on this team?

G: There's a combination of things that you need to consider. Early on in the selection process you've got to get to know who is working in the system, and we find that it is useful to know who is working in your community coordinated response system. You don't want to choose your audit team until you know who is working in the system because you don't want to miss out on the best team members. We found out that we want to do some observations of the system. We want to do ride-alongs with police, to do observations of 911, watch what happens as cases go through the system. You want to observe all the players in action. Determining the potential audit team members is an informal process. You have to help from others, such as members of a nonprofit advocacy organization that want to have audit done, who also initially scope out the system. They will almost always be members of advocacy programs. They are also scouting out

potential audit team members. They are looking for smart people who think beyond their jobs and who ask questions. They might even be people who have an attitude, who are argumentative, who don't even want to do an audit. You've got to find the people who are totally questioning. Once you select them, then you've got to go to the bosses as well. Sometimes we invite them and the team who you think will be a lot of trouble, but the fact that they argue and question might help the team do a better job.

P: When you are approaching these people, are you open about why you are canvassing the community to put together the audit team? Do they even understand what this is?

G: You do a training about what the audit does and what the role of the audit team is. If you get the money to put together an audit team you do the training. They also learn about accountability and the role of the report and who the team is accountable to. We started using the term "institutional analysis" because the word "audit" has such baggage and people have bad assumptions about the word. Some people are suspicious of it, especially if there have been audits in the past, and they feel like they've been screwed by it. If it has been a reason to fire people, then they are very suspicious. Quite often these things are very top-down and people are asked a lot of questions and they don't get listened to. We have bottom-up process rather than a top-down one. People are often skeptical, and it is a hard sell sometimes. It takes a careful explanation. In my experience you have to make it clear that it is not about trying to screw people.

Continued from page 6

It is not going to work if someone on the audit team has a hidden agenda of trying to get rid of someone, or if it is trying to get rid of some department. It's not going to work in that kind of situation. So the audit organizer has to be very careful not to be used by someone else with a hidden agenda. That's not going to work.

P: What will this team's charge be? What are their real activities in the project?

G: Well overall the purpose of it is to improve the victim's safety and offender's accountability, if the audit is a "safety and accountability" audit. Of course it has been used for other things. It's good on any power issue. My son Alex has explored using aspects of it on Maori land issues in Aotearoa/New Zealand. And now he's doing it on indigenous education.

When setting up the audit team the coordinator must be sensitive enough to have representatives from the people whose experience is being represented, or whose agencies need to be involved. The members must be critical thinkers and they must have system knowledge of their own agencies. They must be able to critically understand how other agencies work as well.

The people really get into it. They love it once they do because it broadens their thinking. They love it when they get into the team. They love the way the audit team-teaches them to think, and once they've done that it changes the way they think about their work.

P: Do these people then become your primary data collectors? Are they the ones going out and doing interviews?

G: Yes. You see it's not just the data gathering,

But it takes a while to get them to think in that way. It takes a while to get that thinking. I think that others whom I've worked with for long periods of time are still more immersed in that way of thinking that I am. And I'm more immersed in it than some of my other colleagues. We get a laugh about this. But it's amazing to work with people who are more immersed. I'm sure you're aware of that when you work with people who are still in that process of becoming institutional ethnography thinkers.

P: Yes. You have to tell people that it's not about attitudes, it's not about individuals, it's not about beliefs. It's about the work that people do. It is very hard for people to keep that materialist orientation. But let me see if I'm understanding this so far. What you're doing is selecting an interagency team and training them to go about gathering information, to do interviews, to select people to interview, all that. But when they do interviews, what's next? Do they give that material to you?

G: What they usually do, they do interviews in pairs and they debrief together. Or they debrief in little teams, and they write it up. They do a whole bunch of stuff together. During audit week they are very tightly scheduled. They do a whole lot of interviews. They might do five or six interviews a day about people's work processes. Then they all come together and talk about what they learn from the interviews. They summarize those interviews and they write notes. They're collating this information as a team, and they are creating a whole bunch of data and information. There's usually someone whose job it is to write reports. And quite often

Continued from page 7

there is someone who's collecting all this into a database. Preferably it's not me, although quite often I'm writing draft reports. I quite like doing that. We're looking for themes and patterns.

For each interview we're doing there are usually two different disciplines. The reason we are working in pairs when we are doing these interviews is because debriefing and discussion is very important. For example, there's always advocates and someone else. So if you're going to interview someone from 911, there's going to be an advocate and a police officer or an advocate and a prosecutor. We always mix disciplines because we want to have interdisciplinary understanding of each person's job. We've learned that this cross-disciplinary understanding is important in grasping how the system is involved with people. We want the battered woman's experience of how the system intervenes. We want the advocates' experience of how the system intervenes.

We want to see to it the voice of the least powerful is brought to the top. In domestic violence situations, quite often the person with the least power is lost in the mix. Ellen had a wonderful knack of always bringing that to the top in every meeting. She sees to it that whenever we are analyzing how the system intervenes. It really changes the way everyone who's involved in the system thinks about how we bring about change. This is something that's done systemically when running the audit. Focus groups with battered women are really core to understanding how the system intervenes.

And more recently, listening to what makes change for offenders as well. It's been very

offenders. In Washington state we listened to offenders talk about what makes changes for them, what occurred when they were going through the system. We wanted to know "What were the things that made them come to think twice about using violence?" It was a really powerful thing to hear them talk about that. And I think we would not have done that 10 years ago. This is part of a change in the way we're thinking.

P: This makes me wonder if sometimes victims or offenders are involved in the research teams.

G: Sometimes the advocates that are involved previously had been victims. Offenders are not involved, not in my experience. It would be interesting to look around and see if any had been. I should ask that. We wouldn't say no to that. I just don't know if any had been involved. It's not that they couldn't be. Of course most offenders blame victims for their behavior, so we have involved offenders only in very careful ways.

P: When the women, the victims, are being interviewed, is that when you use the focus groups?

G: Yes. Sometimes, but not always. We use focus groups to gather practitioner experiences too.

P: Regarding the focus groups, are these run by the audit team or members of your organization?

G: It's usually members of the team. Quite often members of Praxis are also involved. Usually Praxis will help them do it. Praxis or the Battered Women's Justice Project will be involved in all these things. The team members

Continued from page 8

are usually not experienced. We work with the team because we have the experience. We're there to help the team to do it, but we don't do it for the team.

P: So it's not like you're training them and then leaving them out there on their own, cold, to do the work. You are with them along the way. Is that true also of all the forms and documents and the like that they gathered? Is it still the team members who are doing that?

G: The team does all that quite often. We are writing the report draft.

P: And what goes in the report is going to be largely what the team tells you. Right?

G: Exactly. But we will help them with the wording, because quite often it's the wording that needs careful thought. The wording of these reports can make a big difference. It becomes important to consider that political climate and say things in a manner in which they will be accepted. It's not about being mealy mouthed. It's about saying things in a way that people will hear it. Sometimes there are things that we walk through with the team and negotiate with them. And sometimes there has to be different versions of the report for different audiences.

P: Did you ever enter situations to do the audits and later realized that this is not the time or place, that it's not going to work, that the people are not going to cooperate, that there are not going to be resources? Did that ever happen?

G: Yes. And a small number of reports don't even get published. Some reports sat on the shelf for a while, but not usually. And one report that we did get an angry response. It's important

for the audit coordinator to read the groups properly and the people who are involved to make sure that they are ready to do this type of work. It takes a measure of cooperation for this to work, and in one case this cooperation and trust wasn't there quite enough. Some groups peeled off during the audit. It takes trust to keep people involved throughout the process. We got through this and we did a good report. Probably, with hindsight, we needed to do a bit more organizing to develop a greater level of commitment and common ground before we started, then that would have created a much stronger base. That would have helped.

P: it must be very difficult when you are going into an unfamiliar community.

G: I thought cooperation would've been higher in that particular community because that community had a name for being very collaborative. But it also had a name for being very political. Since the trust level wasn't there before hand, more groundwork should've been done; but there was no one there to do that. It turned out okay, but it could've been so much better.

Ellen said that you could use the audit to do the organizing, but I was always taught you needed to do the organizing before doing the safety and accountability audit. I can't imagine doing an audit without doing a whole lot of common ground building first, but she thought that you could do that while doing the audit. Maybe you could if you were her, because she was pretty smart.

A lot of the work that I do with the Battered Women's Justice Project involves bringing together government and community agencies and helping them to get to see why they would

Continued from page 9

want to work more closely together, and helping them begin to see what a coordinated community response is. Many of them think they already have it. I get them to think more deeply by giving them explicit practical examples, and they go away from that thinking, “Okay, now I see it a bit clearer.” It helps them to plan for what they can do. If they do that, then they’re in a better position to do an audit in a year or two.

P: Possibly Ellen combined the two when she was still developing this process herself.

G: When she first started doing this audit stuff, I was there. She was making it up in Duluth, and I was there. We were doing it together in Duluth. It was incredibly frustrating working with her when she was making it up. It was exciting, but she was making it up. She would say, “Here’s what I want you to do.” And I would go away and do it, and the next day I would come in and say, “Here, I did what you said.” And then she said, “Oh, I changed my mind now.” And then she would change her mind again and again. And it was exciting because each time she changed her mind things usually did get better. Each time it got better and I was so grateful to be a part of this, but, my God, it was driving me crazy because she kept changing her mind all the time. I felt like strangling her. I felt like telling her, “At the end of the week just tell me what the final one is, and I’ll go ahead and do that.” And then she would say, “I’m sorry.” It was kind of fun though.

P: Were you wondering why you came all the way from New Zealand?

G: Sometimes. At the same time she did make it fun. And we kept hanging in there because we knew she was making progress. You could see all those ideas spinning in her brain. It was really good, and it was such a privilege to work with her like that. You got to feel like you are

IE Social Activists Websites

Community Based Research Center for Gay Men’s Health

<http://www.cbrc.net/>

Praxis International

<http://www.praxisinternational.org/default.aspx>

Rural Women Making Change

<http://www.rwmc.uoguelph.ca/>

Women’s NGOs in Kyrgyzstan, International Funding, and the Social Organization of Gender

<http://web.uvic.ca/~mariecam/kgSite/welcome.html>

Membership and Treasurer's Report

Submitted by Suzanne Vaughan

T06 Secretary/Treasurer

Forum of Sociology

Buenos Aires, Argentina

August 2012

Currently we have 28 members in good standing. Following ISA's definition of good standing, T06 has 28 ISA members who have joined T06 and paid group dues. We have no affiliated members at this point. (These are members who have paid group dues, but are not members of ISA). Our members come from the following countries: Australia, Argentina, Canada, Chile, Colombia, India, Mexico, Norway, Pakistan, Portugal, Sweden, Tanzania, Turkey, Ukraine, and United States.

We have collected USD 650 in group dues to date. Group dues from ISA members are collected by the ISA Executive Office and managed by them until we ask them to download these monies to our account. There have been several inquiries over the last year from people who wish to become affiliated members, rather than members in good standing. This request has been a problem which has not been resolved at this point since T06 must have a bank account in order to accept dues from affiliated members.

Although my university in the U.S. was willing to set up an account and website to accept group dues from affiliated members and pay expenditures from our account, I was unable to do so since ISA does not hold non-profit status in the U.S., only in Spain. In order to set up an account, T06 would need to file for non-profit status in the U.S. and pay a filing fee between USD 400 and 850 depending upon our 3-year budget. After consulting with the T06 Board, I have encouraged those who have inquired about affiliated status to join ISA.

The lack of a bank account is likely to an ongoing problem for us. I suspect we will have more requests for affiliated status as we approach the World Congress in Yokohama in 2014 and we will be unable to expend any of our accumulated dues until we have an account. I have not had responses to inquiries I sent to other RCs, WGs, or TGs on how they have handled this.

Addendum 2/3/2013

Currently, we have 33 members in good standing and we have collected USD 840 in group dues.

Update on the Development of Institutional Ethnography in Chinese Worlds

By Frank Wang

IE is now moving into the everyday lives of the Chinese-speaking population. More than three hundred Taiwanese scholars, graduate students and practitioners participated in the IE conference, led by three key IE scholars, Dorothy Smith, Marie Campbell and Marj DeVault, in Taiwan in Nov. 22-23, 2012. This is the second time that Dorothy Smith visited Taiwan. Her last trip was eight years ago in 2004. Since her last visit, the application of IE in the Taiwanese context has flourished. This is the first big conference on IE in Taiwan that both IE major scholars and local Taiwanese scholars come together to



share their experiences of engaging with IE. This conference was organized by Dorothy's student, Frank Wang in Chengchi University and Marj's student, Li-Fang Liang in Yang Ming University.

Two IE books have been translated into Chinese. Griffith and Smith's book *Mothering for Schooling* was the first book to be translated into Chinese in 2007, while Campbell and Gregor's book *Mapping Social Relations* has just been translated by Frank Wang, Li-Fang Liang and others in 2012. Many participants brought the books for Dorothy and Marie to sign during conference breaks.

In the first day of the conference the three IE scholars, Dorothy Smith, Marie Campbell and Marj DeVault, shared their personal stories as feminist scholars and how they connect with IE. Their stories offered a wide spectrum of feminists from different generations and gave IE a human face – that IE is a collective effort among these women's actual lives. The second day of the conference was opened by Marie's introduction of IE, titled "Recognizing Our Place in the Everyday World: The Social Organization of One's Experience as a Basis for Doing Institutional Ethnography." Marj focused on ways of conducting IE research in her presentation titled "Fieldwork and Data Analysis in Institutional Ethnography." Dorothy's presentation "Text in Action" further illustrated how to analyze text in IE.

Three IE cases were presented at the end. Zheng-Fen Chen explored the experiences of migrant care workers in nursing homes, Yu-Hsuan Lin focused on the lives of academics under the point system, while Chen-Shuo Hong studied the invisible care in the day care center for older people. As the cases presented, the dialogue between IE and local struggles of marginalized groups in Taiwan began.

Overcoming the language and cultural barriers, IE ceases to be an academic jargon in the textbook but a way of re-thinking about our daily lives. Having the three IE scholars in the same room offers a rich combination of ways of interpreting IE, which proves to be very engaging for participants of different backgrounds. A participant said, “I used to think IE is difficult to understand, but I found it very feasible and interesting now.” This conference marks an important advancement of IE into the Chinese-speaking world, which 15% of the population uses in their daily lives, while English-speaking population is only 4.68%.

Additional comment from Marj DeVault:

It was very wonderful to meet so many Taiwanese scholars who are interested in feminist scholarship and IE. I was especially interested in the presentations by Taiwanese scholars who have adopted IE as a way of exploring the organization of carework and new accountability circuits in higher education. The details are different, of course, but their analyses certainly resonate with the concerns of my students in the U.S. It’s clear that we have much to learn from each other. I applaud the conference organizers, Frank Wang and Li-Fang Liang (and their indefatigable team of graduate student assistants!), for their thoughtful organization of the conference. By organizing a first day of more personal talks, they provided for us to get to know one another. And by providing simultaneous translation for participants who wanted it (and for us!), they helped us discuss together. I look forward to new IE studies from Taiwan and the larger Chinese-speaking world.

Institutional Ethnography Sessions and All Day Workshop at the Society for the Study of Social Problems Annual Meeting in New York City

The Institutional Ethnography Division will meet from August 9-11, 2013 as part of the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Society for the Study of Social Problems at The Westin New York at Times Square. Following the conference there will be a one-day Institutional Ethnography Workshop. The conference sessions being sponsored or co-sponsored by the IE Division are listed below. For more information about the conference and the IE Workshop, go to <http://www.sssp1.org/>.

IE Division Sessions

Title: New Directions in IE research Part I and Part II

This session provides a place to talk about ways of carrying out institutional ethnographic research and presenting analyses to various audiences (practitioners, academics, activists, policymakers, journalists). Aligned with IE’s emphasis on people’s work organized within complexes of social relations – presenters will discuss analysis that moves beyond social constructionism. The emphasis of the session is on trying new things and extending the range of institutional ethnography.

Organizers: Janet Rankin, jmrankin@ucalgary.ca and Paul Luken, pluken@westga.edu

Thematic Session (Critical dialogue; invited papers only)

Title: Re-imagining Governing: Critical Dialogue on E-Governance and the Everyday Work of the Front Line

There are growing similarities across the sites of front line work. The institutional technologies coordinating these changes are managerial technologies – technologies for framing up what is going on, coordinating and controlling front line work so that particular kinds of data are available and particular decisions can be made. Yet people work is not easily managed by these coordinative processes. In this session, re-imagining social problems and moving beyond social constructionism, institutional ethnographers describe the changes in front line work as e-governing technologies shape and reshape their everyday work. The session will bring into view the strong similarities in e-governance processes across institutional sites as well as the ways front line workers as diverse as health workers, educators, and community workers, both work with and interrupt those processes.

Organizer: Alison Griffith, agriffith@edu.yorku.ca

Title: Law, Policy and IE

Papers in this session utilize ethnographic methodologies and/or institutional ethnography to analyze law and/or policy activities. For example, research that examines the social organization of policy or the ways in which legal and policy processes organize individuals' lives would be appropriate for this session.

Organizer Lauren Eastwood, eastwole@plattsburgh.edu

Co-Sponsored Sessions

Title: The Social Organization of Health Professional Education

The aim of this session is to stimulate critical dialogue related to the social organization of health professional education. Emphasis will be placed on extending the current debates related to knowledge production for and in medical education and exploring the uneasy adoption of social science methodologies in medicine. Topics can include but are not limited to: issues of hidden curriculum; the often competing and conflicting roles of science, medicine and social science; the increasing importation of Western-based curriculum to low income countries; and critical perspectives on inter-professional education.

Co-Sponsors: IE and Educational Problems Divisions

Organizer: Fiona Webster fiona.webster@gmail.com

Title: Management and Ruling Relations

Relations of ruling are continually revised and extended through the activities of people in managerial positions. Managers routinely report on, account for, record and/or otherwise take note of particular aspects of the everyday work lives of the people they manage. This session is for institutional ethnographic researchers whose projects of inquiry shed light on the active part that people in managerial positions play in revising and extending the ruling relations. Regardless of whether managers are employed by a government, for-profit or not-for-profit organization, a great deal of their work involves practices of inscription – or the activities of working with, working from and/or working to produce texts of various kinds. Accordingly, this session will draw on Dorothy E. Smith's writing on the text-mediated social organization of knowledge.

Co-Sponsors: IE and Labour Studies Divisions

Organizer: Cheryl Zurawski cdz@arialassociates.com

Title: Institutional Ethnography Approaches to Gender, Race, Colonization and Migration in Transnational Contexts

This session provides opportunities to explore ways in which movements of capital and people transnationally interact and intersect with relations of dominance and subordination (e.g., gender, race, sexualisation, colonization, to name a few) historically and presently. Of special interest is the application of institutional ethnography to these relations, as capitalism shifts and evolves as a dynamic global system.

Co-Sponsors: IE and Global Divisions

Organizer: Samit Dipon Bordoloi, diponbordoloi@gmail.com

Title: Knowledge, Power and the Politics of Reality

This session explores contestations over knowledge and power in everyday life, professional practice, policy, and/or social problem construction. The papers consider the ways that texts—defined broadly to include both written and audio-visual texts, as well as both virtual and material texts—mediate knowledge of social reality and, in turn, the ways that power affects the forms that reality takes in those texts, as well as the prevailing meaning of them in everyday, institutional, and public discourses.

Co-Sponsors: IE and Social Theory Divisions

Organizer: Jared Rosso, jared.delrosso@du.edu

Title: IE as Activism

This session will open up a critical dialogue on the relationship between institutional ethnography and activism. To this end, papers on methodological and theoretical considerations on the relationship between institutional ethnography and activism are presented. The hope for this session is that the presenters and the audience can further the theorization and practice of institutional ethnography as an activist research method, and can promote the sharing and cross-pollination between various forms of activist ethnography.

Co-Sponsors: IE and Conflict, Social Action and Change Divisions

Organizer: Ian Hussey, ihussey@york.ca

Remembering Roxana Ng



We mourn the loss of Roxana Ng, who passed away on January 12, 2013. She was a Professor of Adult Education and Community Development and Program Head of the Center for Women's Studies in Education (CWSE) at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, Canada. Roxana was born in Hong Kong in 1951 and immigrated to Canada in 1970. She received a BA from University of British Columbia, and a PhD from University of Toronto. Since 1988, she has been a professor at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (University of Toronto). Roxana's extensive scholarship on race, gender and class; immigrant women and garment workers; and embodied learning and decolonizing pedagogy is part of the legacy she leaves.

Roxana was also a social activist. She co-founded the Vancouver Women's Research Centre in the early 1970s and went on to assist in the formation of immigrant women's organizations in other provinces. She was involved in Open the Borders, an association concerned with punitive changes to immigrant and refugee policies in Canada. She called on academics and social change activists to work together to promote national and international policies based on diversity, equality, and social and economic justice. Since 1999, Roxana has been on the Board of Inter Pares, an organization dedicated to promoting international social justice in Canada and overseas.

Selected Writings:

- Mathews, A., R. Ng, M. Patton, L. Waschuk & J. Wong. 2008. "Learning, Difference, Embodiment: Personal and Collective Transformations." *New Horizons in Education*, 56(1): 45-63, May.
- Church, K., E. Shragge, J.M. Fontan & R. Ng. 2008. "While No One Is Watching: Learning in Social Action Among People Who Are Excluded from the Labour Market." In K. Church, N. Bascia & E. Shragge (Eds.). *Learning Through Community: Exploring Participatory Practices*, pp. 97-116. Holland: Springer.
- Ng, R., P. Staton & J. Scane (Eds.). 1995. *Anti-Racism, Feminism, and Critical Approaches to Education*. Westport: Greenwood Publishers.
- Ng, R. 1995. "Multiculturalism as Ideology: A Textual Analysis." M. Campbell & A. Manicom (Eds.) *Knowledge, Experience and Ruling Relations: Studies in the Social Organization of Knowledge*, pp 35-48. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Ng, R., G. Walker & J. Muller (Eds.). 1990. *Community Organization and the Canadian State*. Toronto: Garamond Press.
- Vorst, J., T. Das Gupta, C. Gonick, R. Leah, A. Lennon, A. Muszynski, R. Ng, E. Silva, M. Steedman, S. Transken, D. Wilkinson (Eds.). 1989. *Race, Class, Gender: Bonds and Barriers*. Toronto: Between the Lines with Society for Socialist Studies. (2nd edition by Garamond Press, Toronto, 1991.)
- Ng, R. 1988 . *The Politics of Community Services: Immigrant Women, Class and State*. Toronto: Garamond Press. (2nd edition by Fernwood Books, Halifax, 1996.)
- Ng, R. & J. Ramirez. 1981. *Immigrant Housewives in Canada*. Toronto: Immigrant Women's Centre.

Sources: revised from <http://www.newediukfuneralhome.com/book-of-memories/1466304/Ng-Roxana/obituary.php>, <http://www.legacy.com/obituaries/thestar/obituary.aspx?pid=162391101#fbLoggedOut>, and http://www.oise.utoronto.ca/lhae/Faculty_Staff/1596/Roxana_Ng.html.



Newsletter of the International
Sociological Association Thematic Group
on Institutional Ethnography (TG06)

Send correspondence to:

TG06 Newsletter Editor

Paul Luken

Department of Sociology

University of West Georgia

Carrollton, GA 30118

You can find us on the web at:

<http://www.isa-sociology.org/tg06.htm>

The Thematic Group on Institutional Ethnography was established by the ISA in May 2011, and our first year has been a very busy one. During this time the membership has been steadily increasing. For most of you this is your first Institutional Ethnography newsletter. If you wish to see the earlier newsletter or find out more about TG06, I invite you to check out our web pages. The url is on the left. You may wish to bookmark it.

An aim of this group is to promote contacts and encourage exchanges among institutional ethnographers worldwide. Our meetings, web pages and newsletters are all means by which we can achieve our goals, and I invite you to participate in the meetings and to use the newsletter and web page. Please contact me if you have any information that you would like to share or if you have other questions about TG06.

Best wishes,
Paul Luken, Newsletter Editor