



**All you need is ... a network; the rise of interpretive public administration**

Journal:	<i>Public Administration</i>
Manuscript ID	PADM-21-10-00502.R1
Manuscript Type:	Special Issue Article
Keywords:	Interpretive theory, Continental Europe, Interpretive policy analysis, Public administration, Bevir and Rhodes

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

# ALL YOU NEED IS ... A NETWORK: THE RISE OF INTERPRETIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

## Introduction

The Beatles appeared at the Palladium on 4 November 1963 in front of Her Majesty the Queen Mother, Princes Margaret, and their entourage. John Lennon introduced the song 'Twist and Shout' saying,

For our last number, I'd like to ask your help. Will the people in the cheaper seats clap your hands? And for the rest of you if you'll just rattle your jewellery (Davies 1968: 191; and <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iWDFuVRWdn4>)

How do we interpret this story? At first sight it is just an instance of The Beatles' cheeky humour. It is more than that because Lennon is being irreverent, a working class oik mocking his betters. Such ridicule is the English way. The Beatles humour was anti-establishment and of a piece with the satirical TV programmes of the day. As one of the leading satirists put it: we 'challenged the same conventions ... In a way you could say that The Beatles were satirical, or at least sceptical' (Carpenter 2000: 219). Nothing was sacred anymore. They helped to create a spirit of the times, which contributed to the death of deference. The establishment was no longer respected. So, this story is about class, authority, and the decline of deference. Storytelling gets our attention because it is a serious business, a way of unpacking the meaning of everyday life. Unpacking meaning is at the heart of the interpretive endeavour.

For this 100<sup>th</sup> Anniversary issue of *Public Administration*, we review one of the more distinctive trends in the study of public administration – the rise of the interpretive approach. We could adopt a broad definition of interpretivism that covers not only anti-naturalism but

1  
2  
3 also Foucault's governmentality, post-Marxism, critical policy analysis, and some forms of  
4 social constructivism (see Bevir and Rhodes 2016: Part II). However, in this article, we tie  
5 interpretivism to an anti-naturalist historicism and humanism in contrast to the formalism and  
6 scientism of mainstream public administration. We review developments in Britain, Western  
7 Europe, and the USA, concluding there is a divide between the empiricist Anglo-Saxon  
8 approaches and Continental interpretive and critical approaches. However, for interpretive  
9 approaches, national boundaries are less relevant because there is an international academic  
10 network spanning countries.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

21  
22  
23         Against this backcloth, we argue that our interpretive approach differs from others  
24 because of its focus on philosophical arguments and its neutral approach to methods. We  
25 summarise our decentred approach with its focus on traditions, beliefs, practices, and  
26 dilemmas. We highlight its distinctive features compared with other interpretive approaches.  
27 We suggest the interpretive approach could develop by blurring genres and practicing  
28 bricolage.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

### 41         **Where are we now?** 42 43

44  
45         A long history lies behind the recent interpretive turn, dating back at least to the  
46 philosophical and empirical work of scholars such as Michel Foucault, Stuart Hall, Clifford  
47 Geertz, Hans-Georg Gadamer, and Charles Taylor. All these diverse thinkers, like many  
48 others in the latter half of the twentieth century, reacted against the behavioural revolution  
49 and the broader drift towards formalism and scientism that dominated research in the social  
50 sciences. They wanted the study of human life and society to be sensitive to meanings,  
51 culture, and history.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Some of our predecessors, notably Charles Taylor, described the dominant outlook of  
4 social scientists, with its formal and mechanistic explanations, as “naturalism” (Blakely 2016;  
5 Choi 2009). At its most general level, naturalism is a diffuse and influential worldview that  
6 attempts to model the study of human life on the concepts, methods, and explanations of the  
7 natural sciences. At a more concrete level, naturalists typically rely on formal explanations  
8 that appeal to models of allegedly rational behaviour, to correlations between behaviour and  
9 allegedly objective categories such as class, or to reified laws, rules, and norms. Crucially, all  
10 these formal explanations downplay the contingency and contestability of people’s reasoning  
11 and agency. It is no exaggeration to say that many naturalists consciously seek to wipe out  
12 contingency and particularity from their work. They want to look past this everyday ‘noise’  
13 and search for the underlying ‘signal’, that is, a set of invariant causal mechanisms and  
14 structures. Even when they introduce beliefs, desires, and other intentional states, they  
15 typically treat them formally, perhaps as fixed by an objective rational calculus, or as  
16 atomized units to be correlated with objective categories, or as fixed by reified institutions  
17 and norms. They sidestep the need to interpret people’s intentionality and look instead to  
18 verify their models or correlations by reference to behaviour.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 In sharp contrast, anti-naturalism treats actions as meaningful and meanings as  
42 holistic. Because meanings or beliefs are holistic, their analysis requires something like a  
43 hermeneutic circle: individual beliefs are only decipherable within wider social or  
44 intersubjective webs of meanings. Satisfactory social explanations must have two features.  
45 First, they must pass through an account of the beliefs or meanings of the relevant actors.  
46 They cannot let intentionality drop out of their story. Second, they must place these beliefs or  
47 meanings in wider webs, including their historical and cultural contexts. They cannot atomize  
48 meanings or beliefs, let alone reduce them to reified norms or a formal rationality. Because  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 naturalists fail to grasp the philosophical nature of an adequate social explanation, they cling  
4  
5 to flawed research programs riven by distortions and misunderstandings.  
6  
7

8  
9 On offer, then, are two contrasting approaches to public administration: one formal  
10 and often broadly institutional, the other interpretive and often broadly historicist. Naturalists  
11 seek stable and formal concepts, categories, and typologies. They try to operationalize these  
12 in comparisons, correlations, and models. Sometimes they themselves, or people influenced  
13 by them, translate these results into scientific expertise on issues of public policy. Anti-  
14 naturalists seek to recover the intentionality of actions. They try to understand beliefs and  
15 desires by locating them in webs of belief, intellectual traditions, and cultural contexts.  
16 Sometimes they themselves, or people influenced by them, draw on their understanding to  
17 engage people in dialogue and discussion. The question is whether this anti-naturalism has  
18 been able to establish a foothold in public administration in Britain, Continental Europe, and  
19 the USA? The short answer is ‘yes’ and in the next section we provide a brief overview of the  
20 key contributors.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

### 37 *Interpretivism in the UK and Continental Europe*

38  
39  
40

41 We will discuss our version of interpretivism later in this article, and we like to think  
42 it has contributed to the rise of a robust interpretivism within the UK.<sup>1</sup> For now, however, we  
43 would emphasize that we are not alone. There are, for example, several well-established  
44 authors in the interpretive genre in Continental Europe (see below). Bartels et al. (2020a:  
45 295) conclude there has been ‘a second wave of landmark texts suggesting that it has now  
46 “come of age”’. We identify five landmark contributions by interpretive approaches to the  
47 study of public administration: theory and methods, interpretive policy analysis, elites and  
48 their narratives, deliberative policy analysis, and discourse analysis (and for an overlapping  
49 but different classification, see Needham 2016: 342-5).<sup>2</sup>  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 First, there are several contributions to interpretive theory and methods. As well as  
4 our work (see the next section), we note especially the contributions of Paul Friusen 1999,  
5 Maarten Hajer (1995 and 2009), Colin Hay (2002, 2004, 2011, 2016), Henk Wagenaar  
6 (2011), and Dvora Yanow (see below). There have also been several handbooks surveying  
7 the field (see for example, Bevir 2010, Bevir and Rhodes 2016; Fischer et al. 2015). Finally,  
8 there are guides to interpretive methods (see for example, Boswell et al. 2019).<sup>3</sup>  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17

18 Second, there is the interpretive policy analysis literature, which comes in various  
19 guises and is *the* growth area of the past decade (and for an authoritative survey see Wagenaar  
20 2011). The study of street level bureaucrats has proliferated. Although Lipsey (1980) is the  
21 inspiration for such studies, more recent work has taken an interpretive turn (for an overview  
22 see Hupe and Hill 2015). For example, Durose (2009 and 2011) explores how front-line  
23 workers in British local government understand everyday work through storytelling and use  
24 this local knowledge to respond to the difficulties they confront (see also Bang and Sørensen,  
25 1999; Barnes and Prior 2009).  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

37 Third, there are case studies of specific policies; for example, Mol (2008) on the lived  
38 practices of caring in diabetes clinics compared with diabetes self-care, and Wagenaar et al.  
39 (2017) on the practices of local administrators that can undo national policymaking on  
40 prostitution.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

47 Fourth, there are a growing number of studies focusing on political and administrative  
48 elites and their narratives (see for example, Crewe 2005; Geddes 2020; Orr and Bennett  
49 2017; Rhodes 2011; Rhodes et al., 2007, van Hulst 2008 and 2013; Wilkinson 2011).  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

55 The last two landmark contributions of interpretivism are arguably less central as they  
56 overlap with, and at times are swamped by, other research agendas. The fourth landmark  
57 contribution is deliberative policy analysis (see for example, Fischer and Gottweis 2012;  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Bartels et al 2020b, Hajer and Wagenaar 2003, Hendricks et al. 2020). Deliberative policy  
4 analysis is in many ways a subset of the interpretive policy literature. The two share broad  
5 debts to hermeneutics, phenomenology, and ethnography. However, deliberative policy  
6 analysis explicitly combines these debts with a moral and political agenda taken from  
7 deliberative democracy, often from Jürgen Habermas. Deliberative policy analysts are,  
8 therefore, particularly likely either to focus on empirical cases of deliberation within policy or  
9 to use other cases to suggest the advantages of a deliberative approach.

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21 Finally, there is discourse analysis. Some examples of discourse analysis clearly draw  
22 inspiration from the interpretive policy literature discussed above (see van Bommel et al.  
23 2014, Hajer 1995 2005, Hajer and Versteeg 2005)). Other examples arguably draw more on  
24 post-Marxism with its debt to structuralism and its consequent use of concepts, such as  
25 signifier, that present languages and ideologies as systems that have formal or quasi-  
26 structural properties irrespective of the ways in which agents use them (see Howarth and  
27 Griggs 2012 and 2013, Howarth, Norval, and Stavrakakis 2000).

### 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 *Interpretivism in the USA*

38  
39  
40  
41 The interpretive turn is largely a European phenomenon but as always with such  
42 sweeping generalisations there are exceptions (Rhodes 2011b). Interpretive approaches are  
43 well established in comparative politics (see for example, MacKay and Levin 2017; Schatz  
44 2009; Wedeen 2010) but there are only pockets of dissent against naturalist public  
45 administration, mainly focused on theory and methods, interpretive policy analysis, and  
46 narrative analysis.

47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
According to Raadschelders (2011: 168-7), this ‘relativist perspective’ covers  
phenomenology, critical theory, and post-modernism. The American authors he describes as  
‘representative’ are Farmer (1995 and 2010), Fox and Miller (1995), Miller (2002), McSwite

1  
2  
3 (1997 and 2002) and Spicer (2001). We would add Fischer (2003) and Yanow (1996, 1999  
4 and 2012). Most self-identify with critical theory and post-modernism. Apart from Fischer  
5 and Yanow, they would not self-describe as ‘interpretivists.’ The leading books on  
6 interpretive methods are by Yanow and Schwartz-Shea 2006 and Schwartz-Shea and Yanow,  
7 2011.  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14

15  
16 The most substantial book we could find explicitly on interpretive public  
17 administration as distinct from public policy was Jun (2006). He argues that ‘current public  
18 administration practice tends to rely on one learned frame—an institutional, structural,  
19 functional, or political perspective’. The foundations of mainstream public administration are  
20 ‘efficiency, instrumental rationality, professionalism, positivistic and functionalist  
21 epistemology, and managerial leadership (Jun 2006: 12 and 33). He suggests there is a  
22 pervasive dualism in the study of public administration,  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32  
33 ‘most conspicuously in its epistemological and methodological  
34 approaches, which pit functionalist epistemology against interpretive  
35 epistemology, empirical and quantitative research against human science and  
36 qualitative research, and objective reality against subjective reality’ (Jun 2006:  
37 9).  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45 In place of ‘functionalism, institutionalism, systems theory, rational decision-making,  
46 public choice, pluralistic incrementalism, and contingency-management theories’, he favours  
47 an ‘interpretive perspective, which ... seeks to understand and explain the social world  
48 primarily from the viewpoint of the actors in a social situation’. He argues that ‘people  
49 construct meaning in the social world through social interactions, and through social  
50 interaction and the sharing of meanings, a revised (negotiated) meaning of action emerges  
51 Jun 2006: 48). The task when studying public administration is to ‘understand the  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 intersubjective relationships that constitute all forms of organizations and (Jun 2006: 49). So  
4  
5 far, so familiar.  
6  
7

8  
9         However, the most prominent American contributor to interpretivism is Dvora Yanow  
10  
11 1996, 1999 and 2015). She had some distinguished predecessors. Fischer and Forrester's  
12  
13 (1993) influential collection of essays introduced the linguistic turn to policy analysis and  
14  
15 underpinned the later development of deliberative policy analysis. Fischer and Gottweis  
16  
17 (2012) revisited this territory two decades later. Rein (1976) Roe (1994) and Stone (2012  
18  
19 [1997]) pioneered the use of narratives in policy analysis. Schon and Rein (1994) introduced  
20  
21 the notion of 'policy frames' that has been a constant in interpretive policy analysis ever  
22  
23 since. Although nowhere near as well known as the texts just cited, White (1999) explores the  
24  
25 storytelling foundations of public administration and provides a valuable exposition of the  
26  
27 *philosophical* foundations of research in public administration.  
28  
29  
30  
31

32  
33         Among our American contemporaries, there are studies of street-level bureaucrats  
34  
35 (Maynard-Moodie and Musheno 2003; Zacka 2017). There are studies of specific policy  
36  
37 areas; for example, Soss et al. 2011 on race and poverty, Lejano, et al. (2013) and Lejano and  
38  
39 Nero (2020) on environmental policy. Perhaps the most persistent strand of interpretive  
40  
41 thought running through this miscellany of studies is narrative analysis. For example, *Public*  
42  
43 *Administration Review* ran a three-part series of article on interpretive narrative inquiry  
44  
45 (Ospina and Dodge 1995a and 1995b; Dodge, Ospina and Foldy 1995).<sup>4</sup>  
46  
47  
48  
49

50  
51         For the most part, American work in the interpretive idiom attracts only cult  
52  
53 attention.<sup>5</sup> We were concerned with our inability to find more explicitly interpretive  
54  
55 American research. We consulted colleagues. It was reassuring to be told 'I think it is safe to  
56  
57 say it is a minority sport, where people mostly hang out with friends in other disciplines or  
58  
59 come to Europe during conference season to meet kindred spirits' (private correspondence 14  
60

1  
2  
3 October 2021). Comparing US public administration with its British and Continental  
4 European counterparts, it is clear there are two self-referential communities with limited  
5 intellectual engagement (Rhodes 2011b: 565). This divide between empiricist Anglo-Saxon  
6 approaches and Continental hermeneutics and interpretive approaches can be no great  
7 surprise. It is a longstanding difference (Bevir and Rhodes 2010: chapter1; Pyrez 2011: 117).  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14

15  
16 There is an important qualification to this conclusion that is hinted at in the earlier  
17 quote - there are now well-established research networks spanning not only Britain and the  
18 Continent but providing a collegial holiday home for like-minded American and other  
19 international colleagues.<sup>6</sup> The Netherlands has a strong claim to be the heartland of  
20 interpretive policy analysis in Western Europe (see van Bommel et al., 2014: 72-74). Of  
21 course, it is not exclusively a Dutch preserve, but every network needs a node. So, there is the  
22 internet group 'Interpretive Policy Analysis' which runs both its own annual conference, and  
23 the journal, *Critical Policy Studies*. There is also an interpretive political science group of the  
24 UK's Political Studies Association, and the ECPR's (European Consortium for Political  
25 Research) 'Standing Group on Theoretical Perspectives in Policy Analysis', both of which  
26 organise regular, and on occasion joint, workshops.<sup>7</sup> Finally, mainstream journals such as  
27 *Public Administration* published interpretive material (Needham 2016: 346).  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 For interpretive studies, national and disciplinary boundaries are arbitrary. Dvora  
45 Yanow is a good example of an academic who spans both. She does not self-identify as a  
46 public administration scholar but as, initially, interpretive policy studies and, latterly, as  
47 organization studies and interpretive methodologies. She is an American citizen residing in  
48 The Netherlands and a visiting professor at Wageningen University. She is not only an  
49 important contributor to interpretivism in her own right, but she was especially prominent in  
50 building its organizational presence within the USA in the 2000s and in spanning the  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 continental divide (see van Bommel et al. 72-74). In short, there is an established and  
4  
5 growing network of scholars spanning national boundaries who practice interpretivism.  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10

## 11 **What is decentred theory?**

12  
13  
14  
15  
16 In this section, we briefly outline our version of interpretivism (and for a fuller  
17  
18 account see Bevir and Rhodes 2003, 2006, and 2010; see also Bevir and Blakely 2018, and  
19  
20 Rhodes 2017). We argue for an anti-naturalist and historicist interpretivism that inspires a  
21  
22 decentred theory. The emphasis falls on individual actors, not institutions - on agency,  
23  
24 contingency, and context. We reject any notion that institutions have essential properties or  
25  
26 are driven by essential logics. The rationality of markets and the path dependency of  
27  
28 institutions do not determine, for example, whether policies are adopted. Instead, we decentre  
29  
30 institutions and practices. Bureaucratic and political life are contingent constructions by  
31  
32 actors with competing beliefs. Such beliefs are rooted in different traditions. They change in  
33  
34 response to different dilemmas. It is often claimed that such accounts are idiographic and  
35  
36 may increase understanding but cannot explain. Decentred theory explains changing patterns  
37  
38 of public administration by focusing on the actors' own interpretations of their actions and by  
39  
40 locating these interpretations in historical contexts. People act for reasons. A decentred  
41  
42 approach aims to uncover those reasons to explain their actions. Table 1.2 provides  
43  
44 definitions for the main concepts that appear in our decentred theory.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

55 INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Table 1: Decentred Theory: a summary

Concept	Definition
Beliefs	Beliefs are the basic unit of analysis in that they are the interpretations of individuals of their world and their surroundings. Their webs of belief and are the source of the reasons they give to explain their actions.
Practices	A set of actions that often exhibits a stable pattern across time. Practices are the ways in which beliefs and traditions manifest themselves in everyday life.
Traditions	Traditions are ‘webs of belief’ and form the background of ideas in which agents find themselves. Agents will adopt beliefs from traditions as a starting point but may amend them.
Situated agency	Individuals are situated in wider webs of beliefs, or traditions, which largely shape their beliefs. Yet they keep a capacity for agency in that they respond to traditions, beliefs, and dilemmas in novel ways
Dilemmas	A dilemma is an idea that stands in contradiction to other beliefs, posing a problem. Dilemmas are resolved by accommodating the new belief in the present web of beliefs or replacing old beliefs with new beliefs.

Source: modified from Geddes and Rhodes 2019: 95.

Decentred theory begins with the reasons of actors and locates these in the agents’ webs of belief. It explains these webs of belief by locating them in their historical context. We explore the context by identifying the traditions in which the beliefs are located and the dilemmas actors confront that challenge those traditions. In short, we interpret beliefs by relating them to other beliefs, traditions, and dilemmas.

Our explanations for revolve around two sets of concepts. The first set includes concepts such as tradition, structure, and paradigm, which explore the social context in which individuals think and act. The second set includes the concepts of dilemma, anomaly, and agency. These concepts explore how beliefs and practices change and the role individual agency plays in such change.

1  
2  
3 We define a tradition as a set of understandings an actor receives during socialization.  
4  
5 A tradition is a starting point. It does not determine later actions. A tradition is ever present  
6  
7 but leaves a role for agency. A tradition is mainly a first influence on people. It will affect  
8  
9 their later actions only if their agency has not led to changes, In principle, every part of a  
10  
11 tradition is open to change. Social contexts only ever influence – as distinct from defines –  
12  
13 individuals and their actions. Traditions are products of individual agency. Just because  
14  
15 individuals start out from an inherited tradition does not imply that they cannot adjust it.  
16  
17 When people confront the unfamiliar, they must extend or change their heritage to encompass  
18  
19 it. In so doing, they develop that heritage. Human agency can produce change even when  
20  
21 people think they are acting within their tradition.  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 We use the concept of dilemma to think about the role of individual agency in  
27  
28 changing traditions. When an idea contradicts other beliefs, it poses a problem. How do  
29  
30 people adjust their existing beliefs and practices to make way for the newcomer? There is no  
31  
32 inevitability about adjusting to new beliefs. People choose. We explain change in traditions,  
33  
34 therefore, by referring to the relevant dilemmas and people's choices in response to those  
35  
36 dilemmas.  
37  
38  
39

40 Dilemmas do not arise from allegedly objective pressures in the world. People change  
41  
42 their beliefs in response to any new idea irrespective of whether that new idea reflects real  
43  
44 pressures. We do not privilege social scientists account of the world. What matters is the  
45  
46 subjective and intersubjective understandings of (say) bureaucratic actors, not scholarly  
47  
48 accounts of allegedly real pressures in the world. Our task is to recover the shared  
49  
50 intersubjective dilemmas of the relevant actors.<sup>8</sup>  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56

57 **How is decentred theory different?**  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Decentred theory differs from other interpretive approaches because it insists that the  
4 case for interpretation is philosophical. It rests on philosophical arguments *against* naturalism  
5 and *for* anti-naturalism, and it extends these arguments to promote humanist and historicist  
6 explanations. Also, it rejects all attempts to map these philosophical arguments on to  
7 questions about methods. There is no straightforward correspondence between naturalism and  
8 one set of methods or between anti-naturalism and another set of methods. Most so-called  
9 methods are just techniques for gathering data or analysing patterns in data. Interviews and  
10 participation observation are both ways of getting data about what people believe. We see no  
11 reason to challenge any widely accepted method. Unless the researcher misunderstands or  
12 misapplies the method, an interviewer will report the answers given, the ethnographer will  
13 report the behaviour seen, and the statistician will report the mathematical relationship. We  
14 do not question the validity of quantitative methods as ways of getting data and finding  
15 patterns in data. Rather, we regret the division of public administration into professional  
16 camps based on methodological preferences, and we would include mixed methods as just  
17 one more such camp. These various camps view the key issues as methodological, not  
18 philosophical. We would suggest that the interpretive turn with its anti-naturalism corrects  
19 this view. Our interpretivism is a set of philosophical claims about the nature of meaning,  
20 action, and political and administrative life. It derives from philosophy, not canonizing a  
21 particular way of doing research. Debates about methods are often a distraction from the core  
22 philosophical issues that define approaches to public administration.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50 Political scientists ought to be divided over philosophy, not method. This view  
51 challenges the fashionable stress on methods by so many in political science and public  
52 administration. Even many interpretive political scientists either define interpretivism in  
53 methodological terms or at least argue that interpretive philosophy requires us to adopt some  
54 methods and reject others (Yanow and Schwartz-Shea 2006; Schwartz-Shea and Yanow,  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 2012). We too would accept that some methods are better suited than others to recovering  
4 beliefs as webs of belief. We ourselves rely on ethnographic and, to a lesser extent, historical  
5 methods in our case studies. We simply want to stress that no method is inherently either  
6 interpretive or naturalistic. Philosophical analyses of causation and explanation neither  
7 require nor exclude the use of specific methods to collect data or to analyse patterns in the  
8 data. Methods are largely neutral tools for getting data and finding patterns in data.  
9

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17 Interpretivists can make careful use of many methods (see below).  
18  
19

20  
21 Decentred theory changes the kinds of explanations social scientists offer. It  
22 downplays efforts to create causal inferences that supposedly uncover laws or mechanisms  
23 and turns instead to people's reasoning. Decentred theory thus brings a cultural and historical  
24 focus that ties political science and public administration more closely to the humanities.  
25 Although this focus does not require specific methods, it opens a vast space for the inventive  
26 and imaginative use of what we will call "genres". The humanities offer a plethora of  
27 strategies for exploring and reporting on people's actions, reasons, and beliefs, and for  
28 locating them in their cultural and historical contexts. These strategies do not secure data with  
29 allegedly pure experiences, nor do they close the ineradicable gap between data and  
30 explanation. Rather, they provide researchers with ways of engaging the world, ways of  
31 getting, checking, and revising information, and ways of presenting, explaining, and narrating  
32 that information.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49  
50 Although anti-naturalism does not require specific methods, nonetheless it provides a  
51 dual challenge to methodological orthodoxy. First, it insists that no method can secure certain  
52 facts let alone causal explanations. Philosophers have long since rejected the naïve positivist  
53 belief in pure facts. Second, and perhaps because it rejects pure facts, anti-naturalism expands  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 the repertoire of methods to embrace those more often associated with the humanities. One of  
4  
5 our core ambitions is, indeed, to promote such blurring.  
6  
7  
8  
9

### 10 11 12 **Where to from here -blurring genres and bricolage?** 13 14

15  
16 Our alternative approach leads public administration away from a naturalist and  
17  
18 lukewarm positivism towards an anti-naturalist interpretivism that is widespread in the  
19  
20 humanities. There is a shared focus on the recovery of meaning and historical contingency.  
21  
22 So, what can public administration learn from the humanities?  
23  
24

#### 25 26 *Blurring Genres* 27 28

29  
30 We acknowledge we stand on the shoulders of giants, notably Clifford Geertz. Geertz  
31  
32 argues that anthropologists practice ethnography to discover weaves of meaning.  
33  
34 Ethnography involves selecting informants, transcribing texts, and keeping field notes. The  
35  
36 resulting ‘thick descriptions’ are often microscopic interpretations of the flow of social  
37  
38 discourse. The task is to set down the meanings that actions have for social actors and then  
39  
40 say what these thick descriptions tells us about the society in which they are found -  
41  
42 recovering and recounting meaning. For Geertz (1983: 21) these tasks benefit from genre  
43  
44 mixing. He suggests that social scientists turn ‘away from a laws and instances ideal of  
45  
46 explanation towards a cases and interpretations one’. He suggests we draw on ‘analogies  
47  
48 drawn from the humanities’ within which ‘society is less and less represented as an elaborate  
49  
50 machine or quasi-organism and more as a serious game, a sidewalk drama, or a behavioural  
51  
52 text’. The task is to recover the meaning of games, dramas, and texts and to tease out their  
53  
54 consequences. We believe the task of blurring genres – of learning from the humanities – is  
55  
56 an exciting challenge for political scientists. It takes us out of our comfort zone by asking us  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 what we want to know and providing new ways of finding out. It is not about replacing but  
4  
5 adding to the political scientists' toolkit. It is about opening a conversation with the  
6  
7 humanities that enlarges our organizing perspective and broadens our toolkit (see for example  
8  
9 Rhodes and Hodgett 2021).

### 13 *Bricoleurs*

16  
17 A *bricoleur* is, someone who pieces 'together sets of representations that are fitted to  
18  
19 the specifics of a complex situation' using whatever tools are available (Denzin and Lincoln  
20  
21 2011: 4). A *bricoleur* employs a ragbag of tools; what works is best (Levi-Strauss 1966: 16-  
22  
23 17; and see Hammersley 1999 for a discussion of other uses of the term). The aim is to  
24  
25 understand the lived experience of politicians, and administrators using whatever means are  
26  
27 both available and work (for an overview of the range of available qualitative methods see  
28  
29 Bernard and Gravlee 2015, and Denzin and Lincoln 2011). As bricoleurs, we recover  
30  
31 evidence in the form of stories, and we then recount our interpretations of these stories using  
32  
33 different genres. Geertz (1983: 19-20) encourages us to present research as if it is a game, a  
34  
35 drama, or a text. He gives several examples including, baroque fantasies presented as  
36  
37 deadpan empirical observations (Jorge Luis Borges), parables presented as ethnographies  
38  
39 (Carlos Castenada) and epistemological studies presented as political tracts (Paul  
40  
41 Feyerabend). In our forthcoming book (Bevir and Rhodes 2022), we are less baroque in our  
42  
43 choices, using the examples of storytelling by and about chiefs of staff to the Australian  
44  
45 prime minister, an historical narrative about the rise of New Labour in British party politics,  
46  
47 thick descriptions of the court politics of British prime ministers, and an autoethnography of  
48  
49 life as Dean of a social science faculty. Whatever the example, the common denominator is a  
50  
51 social and political drama presented using the narrative devices more common in the  
52  
53 humanities than the social sciences.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Conclusion

From the standpoint of mainstream Anglo-Saxon political science and public administration journals, interpretive approaches remain conspicuous for their absence. From the 1970s to the early 2000s, quantitative research dominated (Bennett, Barth, Rutherford 2003: 373-8). Of one thousand articles published in the *American Journal of Political Science* and the *American Political Science Review* between 1996 and 2005, only one relies on ethnographic research (Auyero and Joseph 2007: 2). The conclusion that interpretivism is an example of 'patterned isolationism' seems inescapable. It does not 'fit' in the disciplinary mainstream. At best, these alternative theories and methods sit alongside, and at worst outside, established disciplines and departments (Collini 2001: 299).

Change the standpoint, look to Continental Europe, and for networks that span the Anglo-Saxon and Continental European worlds, and a different picture emerges. There are established, thriving networks behind which lies the nineteenth century European tradition of hermeneutics and idealism. The observation by Mr Spock that there is 'no life as we know it', applies. It is not life as understood by the naturalist mainstream. It is a different way of life and it is a noble endeavour because the study of public administration rooted in the humanities enables us to:

remind the society of its contradictions, articulate salient emotional states, detect changing cultural premises, confront their culture's deepest moral dilemmas, and document the unpredictable events that punctuate a life or historical era (Kagan 2009: 231).

1  
2  
3 Looking back over 100 years of *Public Administration*, the journal can take pride in helping  
4 to pioneer this development (Needham 2016: 346). We hope the journal will continue to spot  
5 exciting new trends and continue to give space to creative, eccentric contributions to the field  
6 for the next hundred years.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For Peer Review

## References

Auyero, J., and Joseph, L. (2007). "Introduction: Politics under the Ethnographic Microscope". In L. Joseph, M. Mahler, and J. Auyero (Eds.) *New Perspectives in Political Ethnography*. New York: Springer, pp.1-13.

Bang, H. and Sørensen, E. (1999) 'The Everyday Maker', *Administrative Theory and Praxis* 21: 325-42.

Barnes, M. and Prior, D. (2000) *Subversive Citizens: Power, Agency and Resistance in Public Services*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Bartels, Koen P. R., Hendrik Wagenaar and Ya Li (2020a) 'Introduction: towards deliberative policy analysis 2.0', *Policy Studies*, 41: 295-306.

Bartels, Koen P.R., Hendrik Wagenaar and Ya Li (Eds.) (2020b) 'Special Issue: Revisiting Deliberative Policy Analysis, Part 2', *Policy Studies*, 41 (4).

Bennett, A., Barth, A., and Rutherford, K. (2003) 'Do We Preach What We Practice? A Survey of Methods in Political Science Journals and Curricula,' *PS: Political Science and Politics* 36: 373-78.

Bernard, H. R. and Gravlee, C. C. (Eds.) (2015) *Handbook of Methods in Cultural Anthropology*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.

Bevir, M. (Ed.) (2010) *Interpretive Political Science*. London: Sage.

Bevir, M. (2011) 'Public Administration as Storytelling', *Public Administration*, 89: 183–195.

1  
2  
3 Bevir, M., and Blakely, J. (2018) *Interpretive Social Science*. Oxford: Oxford  
4  
5 University Press.

6  
7  
8 Bevir, M. and Rhodes, R. A. W. (2003) *Interpreting British Governance*. London:  
9  
10 Routledge.

11  
12  
13 Bevir, M. and Rhodes, R. A. W. (2006) *Governance Stories*. London: Routledge.

14  
15  
16 Bevir, M. and Rhodes, R. A. W. (2010) *The State as Cultural Practice*. Oxford:  
17  
18 Oxford University Press.

19  
20  
21 Bevir, M. and Rhodes, R. A. W. (Eds.) (2016) *Routledge Handbook of Interpretive  
22  
23 Political Science*. Abingdon: Routledge.

24  
25  
26 Bevir, M. and Rhodes, R. A. W. (2022) *Genres of Political Science*. Oxford: Oxford  
27  
28 University Press.

29  
30  
31 Blakely, J. (2016) *Alasdair MacIntyre, Charles Taylor, and the Demise of  
32  
33 Naturalism*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

34  
35  
36 Boswell, J., J. Corbett, and R. A. W. Rhodes. (2019) *The Art and Craft of  
37  
38 Comparison*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

39  
40  
41 Carpenter, Humphrey (2000) *That Was Satire That Was. The Satire Boom of the  
42  
43 1960s*. London: Gollancz.

44  
45  
46 Choi, N. (2009) "Defending Anti-Naturalism after the Interpretive Turn: Charles  
47  
48 Taylor and the Human Sciences", *History of Political Thought* 30:693-718.

49  
50  
51 Collini, S. (2001) 'Postscript: Disciplines, Canons, and Publics; the History of "The  
52  
53 History of Political Thought" in Comparative Perspective'. In D. Castiglione and I.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Hampshire-Monk (Eds.), *The History of Political Thought in National Context*. Cambridge:  
4  
5 Cambridge University Press: pp. 280-302.  
6  
7

8  
9 Corbett, J. (2015) *Being Political: Leadership and Democracy in the Pacific Islands*.  
10  
11 Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.  
12  
13

14  
15 Crewe, E. (2005) *Lords of Parliament. Manners, Rituals Politics*, Manchester:  
16  
17 Manchester University Press.  
18  
19

20  
21 Davies, Hunter S. (1968) *The Beatles. The Authorised Biography*. London: Heineman.  
22

23  
24 Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.) (2011) [1994] *Handbook of Qualitative*  
25  
26 *Research*, 4th edition, London: Sage.  
27  
28

29  
30 Dodge, J., Ospina, S.M. and Foldy, E.G. (2005), 'Integrating Rigor and Relevance in  
31  
32 Public Administration Scholarship: The Contribution of Narrative Inquiry'. *Public*  
33  
34 *Administration Review*, 65: 286-300.  
35  
36

37  
38 Dryzek, John (2002) *Deliberative democracy and beyond: Liberals, critics,*  
39  
40 *contestations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.  
41  
42

43  
44 Durose, C. (2009), 'Front-line Workers and "Local Knowledge": Neighbourhood  
45  
46 Stories in Contemporary UK Local Governance', *Public Administration*, 87: 35-49.  
47  
48

49  
50 Durose, C. (2011) 'Re-visiting Lipsky: front line work in UK local governance',  
51  
52 *Political Studies* 59(4) 978-995.  
53  
54

55  
56 Farmer, David J. (1995) *The Language of Public Administration: Bureaucracy,*  
57  
58 *Modernity and Postmodernity*. Tuscaloosa, Al.: University of Alabama Press.  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Farmer, David J. (2010) *Public Administration in Perspective: Theory and Practice*  
4  
5 *Through Multiple Lenses*. New York: M. E. Sharpe.  
6  
7

8 Fischer, F. (2003) *Reframing Policy Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.  
9  
10

11 Fischer, F. and Forester, J. (Eds.) (1993) *The Argumentative Turn in Policy Analysis*  
12  
13 *and Planning*, Durham: Duck University Press.  
14  
15  
16

17 Fischer, F., and H. Gottweis. (Eds.) (2012) *The Argumentative Turn Revisited. Public*  
18  
19 *Policy as Communicative Practice*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.  
20  
21  
22

23 Fischer, F., D. Torgerson, A. Durnova, and M. Orsini. (Eds.) (2015) *Handbook of*  
24  
25 *Critical Policy Studies*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.  
26  
27

28 Fox, C. J. and Hugh T. Miller 1995. *Postmodern Public Administration: Towards*  
29  
30 *Discourse*. Thousand Oaks, Ca.: Sage.  
31  
32

33 Frissen, P. H. A. (1999) *Politics, Governance and Technology: A Postmodern*  
34  
35 *Narrative on the Virtual State*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar  
36  
37  
38

39 Geddes, M. (2020) *Dramas at Westminster: select committees and the quest for*  
40  
41 *accountability*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.  
42  
43  
44

45 Geddes, M. and Rhodes, R. A. W. (2019) 'Towards an Interpretive Parliamentary  
46  
47 Studies'. In Jennifer Brichzin, Damien Krichewsky, Leopold Ringel, and Jan Schank (Eds.)  
48  
49 *The Sociology of Parliaments*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, pp. 87-107.  
50  
51  
52

53 Geertz, C. (1983) 'Blurred Genres. The Refiguration of Social Thought', in Geertz,  
54  
55 C., *Local Knowledge: Further essays in interpretive anthropology*, New York: Basic Books,  
56  
57 pp. 19-35.  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Hajer, M. A. (1995) *The Politics of Environmental Discourse: Ecological*  
4  
5 *Modernization and the Policy Process*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.  
6

7  
8  
9 Hajer, M.A. and Versteeg, W. (2005) 'A Decade of Discourse Analysis of  
10  
11 Environmental Politics: Achievements, Challenges, Perspectives', *Journal of Environmental*  
12  
13 *Policy and Planning* 7(3): 175–84.  
14

15  
16  
17 Hajer, M. A. (2009) *Authoritative Governance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.  
18

19  
20 Hajer, M. A. and Wagenaar, H. (Eds.) (2003). *Deliberative Policy Analysis.*  
21  
22 *Understanding Governance in A Networked Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University  
23  
24 Press.  
25

26  
27  
28 Howarth, D. and Griggs, S. (2012) 'Poststructuralist Policy Analysis: Discourse,  
29  
30 Hegemony, and Critical Explanation'. In Frank Fischer and Herbert Gottweis (Eds.) *The*  
31  
32 *Argumentative Turn Revisited: Public Policy as Communicative Practice*. New York: Duke  
33  
34 University Press, pp. 305-342.  
35

36  
37  
38 Howarth, D. and Griggs, S., (2013) *The Politics of Airport Expansion in the United*  
39  
40 *Kingdom: Hegemony, Policy and the Rhetoric of 'Sustainable Aviation'*. Manchester:  
41  
42 Manchester University Press.  
43

44  
45  
46 Howarth, D., Norval, A.J. and Stavrakakis, Y. (Eds.) (2000). *Discourse Theory and*  
47  
48 *Political Analysis Identities, Hegemonies and Social Change*. Manchester: Manchester  
49  
50 University Press.  
51

52  
53  
54 Hammersley, M. (1992) 'Not Bricolage but Boat Building. Exploring Two Metaphors  
55  
56 for Thinking about Ethnography', *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 28 (5): 574-85.  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 Harmon, M. (2003) 'PAT-Net turns twenty-five: a short history of the Public  
4 Administration theory Network', *Administrative Theory & Praxis* 25 (2): 157-72.  
5  
6  
7

8 Hay, C. (2002) *Political Analysis*, Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan.  
9  
10

11 Hay, C. (2004) 'The Return to Interpretivism in Public Administration', *Public*  
12 *Administration* 82 (2): 525–545.  
13  
14  
15

16 Hay, C. (2011) Interpreting interpretivism interpreting interpretations: the new  
17 hermeneutics of public administration. *Public Administration*, 89: 167-182.  
18  
19  
20

21 Hay, C. (2016) 'Good in a Crisis: The Ontological Institutionalism of Social  
22 Constructivism', *New Political Economy* 21: 520-35.  
23  
24  
25

26 Hendriks, Carolyn M., Selen A. Ercan, and John Boswell (2020) *Mending*  
27 *Democracy. Democratic Repair in Disconnected Times*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.  
28  
29  
30

31 Hupe, P., Michael Hill, and Aurélien Buffat (Eds.) (2015) *Understanding Street-Level*  
32 *Bureaucracy*. Bristol Policy Press.  
33  
34  
35

36 Jones, Michael D., and Mark K. McBeth (2010) 'A Narrative Policy Framework:  
37 Clear Enough to Be Wrong?' *Policy Studies Journal* 38: 329–53.  
38  
39  
40

41 Jones, M. D., Shanahan, E. A. and McBeth, M. K. (Eds.) (2014) *The Science of*  
42 *Stories* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.  
43  
44  
45

46 Jun, Jong S. (2006) *The Social Construction of Public Administration: Interpretive*  
47 *and Critical Perspectives*. SUNY Press.  
48  
49  
50

1  
2  
3 Kagan, J. (2009). *The Three Cultures. Natural Sciences, Social Sciences and the*  
4  
5 *Humanities in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. Revisiting C.P. Snow.* Cambridge: Cambridge University  
6  
7 Press.

8  
9  
10 Lejano, R., Ingram, M. and Ingram, H. (2013) *The Power of Narrative in*  
11  
12 *Environmental Networks.* MIT Press

13  
14  
15 Lejano, R. and Nero, S. (2020). *The Power of Narrative: Climate Skepticism and the*  
16  
17 *Deconstruction of Science.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

18  
19  
20  
21  
22 Levi-Strauss, C. (1966) *The Savage Mind.* London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.

23  
24  
25 Lipsky, M. (1980) *Street-level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public*

26  
27  
28  
29 MacKay, Joseph and Jamie Levin (2017) 'Immersive Politics and the Ethnographic  
30  
31 Encounter: Anthropology and Political Science'. In Simon Coleman, Susan B. Hyatt, and  
32  
33 Ann Kingsolver (Eds.) *The Routledge Companion to Contemporary Anthropology,*  
34  
35 Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 439-55.

36  
37  
38  
39 Maynard-Moody, S. and Musheno, M. (2003) *Cops, Teachers, Counselors: Stories*  
40  
41 *from the Front Lines of Public Service.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

42  
43  
44  
45 McSwite, O. C. (1997) *Legitimacy in Public Administration: A Discourse Analysis*  
46  
47 Thousand Oaks, Ca.: Sage.

48  
49  
50 McSwite, O. C. (2002) *Invitation to Public Administration.* New York: M. E. Sharpe.

51  
52  
53  
54 Miller, Hugh T. (2002) *Postmodern Public Policy.* Albany: State University of New  
55  
56 York Press.

1  
2  
3 Moll, Annemarie (2008) *The Logic of Care: Health and the Problem of Patient*  
4 *Choice*. London: Routledge.  
5  
6

7  
8 Needham, Catherine (2015) 'Public Administration' In Mark Bevir and R. A. W.  
9 Rhodes (Eds.) *Routledge Handbook of Interpretive Political Science*. Abingdon: Routledge,  
10 pp. 338-351.  
11  
12  
13

14  
15  
16 Orr, K. and Bennett, M. (2017), 'Relational Leadership, Storytelling, and Narratives:  
17 Practices of Local Government Chief Executives'. *Public Administration Review*, 77: 515-  
18 527.  
19  
20  
21

22  
23  
24 Ospina, S.M. and Dodge, J. (2005a), 'It's About Time: Catching Method Up to  
25 Meaning—The Usefulness of Narrative Inquiry in Public Administration Research'. *Public*  
26 *Administration Review*, 65: 143-157.  
27  
28  
29

30  
31  
32 Ospina, S.M. and Dodge, J. (2005b), 'Narrative Inquiry and the Search for  
33 Connectedness: Practitioners and Academics Developing Public Administration Scholarship'.  
34 *Public Administration Review*, 65: 409-423.  
35  
36  
37

38  
39  
40 Pyrez, G. (2011) *The Study of Politics. A Short Survey of Core Approaches*. Toronto:  
41 University of Toronto Press  
42  
43  
44

45  
46 Raadschelders, J. C. N. (2011) *Public Administration: The Interdisciplinary Study of*  
47 *Government*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.  
48  
49

50  
51 Rein, M. (1976) *Social Science and Public Policy*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.  
52  
53

54  
55 Rhodes, R. A. W. (2011a) *Everyday Life in British Government*. Oxford: Oxford  
56 University Press.  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Rhodes, R. A. W. (2011b) 'One-way, Two-way or Dead-end street: the British influence  
4 on American public administration', *Public Administration Review*, 71 (4) July/August 2011: 559-  
5  
6  
7  
8 71.  
9

10  
11 Rhodes, R. A. W. (2017) *Interpretive Political Science. Selected Essays*. Oxford: Oxford  
12  
13 University Press.  
14

15  
16 Rhodes, R. A. W. (Ed.) (2018) *Narrative Policy Analysis*. Cham CH: Springer  
17  
18 International Publishing.  
19

20  
21  
22 Rhodes, R. A. W. (2019) Public Administration, the Interpretive Turn and  
23  
24 Storytelling'. In A, Massey (Ed.), *A Research Agenda for Public Administration*.  
25  
26 Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 12-27.  
27  
28

29  
30 Rhodes, R. A. W., 't Hart, P. and Noordegraaf, M. (Eds.) (2007) *Observing*  
31  
32 *Government Elites: Up Close and Personal*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan.  
33  
34

35  
36 Rhodes R. A. W. and Hodgett, Susan (Eds.) (2021) *What Political Science can*  
37  
38 *learn from the Humanities: Blurring Genres*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave  
39  
40 Macmillan.  
41

42  
43  
44 Roe, E. (1994) *Narrative Policy Analysis*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.  
45

46  
47 Sabatier, Paul A. (2000) 'Clear Enough to be Wrong.' *Journal of European Public*  
48  
49 *Policy* 7 (1): 135–40.  
50

51  
52  
53 Schatz, E. (Ed.) (2009) *Political Ethnography: What Immersion Contributes to the*  
54  
55 *Study of Power*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.  
56

57  
58  
59 Schon, D. and Rein, M. (1994) *Frame Reflection*. New York: Basic Books.  
60

1  
2  
3 Schwartz-Shea, Peregrine and Yanow, Dvora (2012) *Interpretive Research Design: Concepts and processes*. New York: Routledge.  
4  
5  
6  
7

8 Soss, J., Fording, R. C. and Schram, S. F (2011) *Disciplining the Poor. Neoliberal Paternalism and the Persistent Power of Race*. Chicago, Ill. The University of Chicago Press  
9  
10  
11  
12

13 Spicer, M. W. (2001) *Public Administration and the State: A Postmodern Perspective*. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

19 Stone, D. (2012) [1988] *Policy Paradox: The Art of Political Decision Making*. Third edition New York: W.W. Norton and Co.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 Turnbull, N. (2016a) 'Introduction: Interpreting Governance, High Politics and Public Policy'. In Nick Turnbull (Ed.) *Interpreting Governance, High Politics and Public Policy*. Abingdon, Oxon and New York: Routledge, pp. 1-16.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 Turnbull, N. (Ed.) (2016b) *Interpreting Governance, High Politics and Public Policy*. Abingdon, Oxon and New York: Routledge  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 van Bommel, S., van Hulst, M., and Yanow, D. (2014) 'Interpretive policy analysis in the Netherlands'. In Frans van Nispen and Peter Scholten (Eds.) *Policy Analysis in the Netherlands*. Bristol: Policy Press, pp. 69–86.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

47 Van Hulst, Merlijn (2008) *Town Hall Tales. Culture as Storytelling in Local Government*. Delft: Eburon Publishers.  
48  
49  
50  
51

52 Van Hulst, M.J. (2013) 'Storytelling at the Police Station: The Canteen Culture Revisited', *British Journal of Criminology* 53: 624–42.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Wagenaar, H. (2011) *Meaning in Action: Interpretation and Dialogue in Policy*  
4  
5 *Analysis*. New York: M. E. Sharpe.

6  
7  
8  
9 Wagenaar, H., Amesberger, H. and Altink S. (2017) *Designing Prostitution Policy:*  
10  
11 *Intention and Reality in the Sex Trade*. Bristol: Policy Press.

12  
13  
14 Wedeen, L. (2010) 'Reflections on Ethnographic Work in Political Science', *Annual*  
15  
16 *Review of Political Science* 13, 255-72.

17  
18  
19  
20 White J. D. (1999) *Taking Language Seriously the Narrative Foundations of Public*  
21  
22 *Administration Research*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

23  
24  
25  
26 Wilkinson, K. (2011) 'Organised Chaos: An Interpretive Approach to Evidence-  
27  
28 Based Policy Making in Defra', *Political Studies* 59 (4): 959-977.

29  
30  
31 Yanow, D. (1996) *How does a policy mean? Interpreting policy and organizational*  
32  
33 *actions*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press,

34  
35  
36 Yanow, D. (1999) *Conducting Interpretive Policy Analysis*, Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

37  
38  
39  
40 Yanow, Dvora (2015) [2003] *Constructing Race and Ethnicity in America: Category-*  
41  
42 *making in Public Policy and Administration*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

43  
44  
45  
46 Yanow, Dvora and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea (Eds.) (2006) *Interpretation and*  
47  
48 *Method: Empirical research methods and the interpretive turn*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

49  
50  
51  
52 Zacka, B. (2017) *When the State Meets the Street: Public Service and Moral Agency*.  
53  
54 Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For Peer Review

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Needham (2016: 346) observes that ‘the many debates on interpretivism prompted by Bevir and Rhodes in disciplinary journals ... have raised the profile of interpretive approaches to public administration.’ In a similar vein, Turnbull (2016a: 1) argues that, although interpretive approaches have been around for a long time, they ‘have gained significant ground over the last decade’ and ‘in the United Kingdom the interpretivist flag in political science and public administration has been carried most prominently by Mark Bevir and R. A. W. Rhodes’.

<sup>2</sup> Although we are convinced that interpretive public administration is relevant to practitioners, in this article we focus on its contribution to the study of public administration.

<sup>3</sup> Our citations are illustrative not comprehensive for the simple reason that we are illustrating an argument not compiling a bibliography.

<sup>4</sup> The debate between naturalist and anti-naturalists occurs in narrative analysis. See the response by Jones et al. (2010 and 2014); to Sabatier (2000).

<sup>5</sup> The Public Administration Theory Network (PAT-Net) and its journal, *Administrative Theory and Praxis* provide a home for these various approaches. See <http://www.pattheory.org> (accessed 7 October 2021). See Harmon 2003 for a short history of the group. There is also the Institute for Qualitative and Multi-Method Research (IQMR) at the Maxwell School of Citizenship & Public Affairs, Syracuse University, which runs an annual summer school with several interpretive strands.



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

---

<sup>6</sup> There is an antipodean wing with John Dryzek (2002) and Hendriks, Ercan, and Boswell (2020) prominent contributors on deliberative democracy, and Jack Corbett (2015) a leading authority on leadership in small states.

<sup>7</sup> See respectively, See: <https://ipa.science/>; <https://www.psa.ac.uk/specialist-groups/interpretive-political-science>; and See: <https://standinggroups.ecpr.eu/tppa/news/>. All last accessed 11 October 2021.

<sup>8</sup> There are various challenges to our approach and in our view, the most perceptive and constructive critiques are by Hay (2011), Turnbull (2016b), and Wagenaar (2011).