

Handbook of Public Policy Analysis

**Theory, Politics,
and Methods**

Edited by

**Frank Fischer
Gerald J. Miller
Mara S. Sidney**



CRC Press
Taylor & Francis Group

Handbook of Public Policy Analysis

**Theory, Politics,
and Methods**

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND PUBLIC POLICY

A Comprehensive Publication Program

Executive Editor

JACK RABIN

Professor of Public Administration and Public Policy
School of Public Affairs
The Capital College
The Pennsylvania State University—Harrisburg
Middletown, Pennsylvania

Assistant to the Executive Editor

T. Aaron Wachhaus, Jr.

1. *Public Administration as a Developing Discipline*, Robert T. Golembiewski
2. *Comparative National Policies on Health Care*, Milton I. Roemer, M.D.
3. *Exclusionary Injustice: The Problem of Illegally Obtained Evidence*, Steven R. Schlesinger
5. *Organization Development in Public Administration*, edited by Robert T. Golembiewski and William B. Eddy
7. *Approaches to Planned Change*, Robert T. Golembiewski
8. *Program Evaluation at HEW*, edited by James G. Abert
9. *The States and the Metropolis*, Patricia S. Florestano and Vincent L. Marando
11. *Changing Bureaucracies: Understanding the Organization before Selecting the Approach*, William A. Medina
12. *Handbook on Public Budgeting and Financial Management*, edited by Jack Rabin and Thomas D. Lynch
15. *Handbook on Public Personnel Administration and Labor Relations*, edited by Jack Rabin, Thomas Vocino, W. Bartley Hildreth, and Gerald J. Miller
19. *Handbook of Organization Management*, edited by William B. Eddy
22. *Politics and Administration: Woodrow Wilson and American Public Administration*, edited by Jack Rabin and James S. Bowman
23. *Making and Managing Policy: Formulation, Analysis, Evaluation*, edited by G. Ronald Gilbert
25. *Decision Making in the Public Sector*, edited by Lloyd G. Nigro
26. *Managing Administration*, edited by Jack Rabin, Samuel Humes, and Brian S. Morgan
27. *Public Personnel Update*, edited by Michael Cohen and Robert T. Golembiewski
28. *State and Local Government Administration*, edited by Jack Rabin and Don Dodd
29. *Public Administration: A Bibliographic Guide to the Literature*, Howard E. McCurdy
31. *Handbook of Information Resource Management*, edited by Jack Rabin and Edward M. Jackowski
32. *Public Administration in Developed Democracies: A Comparative Study*, edited by Donald C. Rowat
33. *The Politics of Terrorism: Third Edition*, edited by Michael Stohl

34. *Handbook on Human Services Administration*, edited by Jack Rabin and Marcia B. Steinhauer
36. *Ethics for Bureaucrats: An Essay on Law and Values, Second Edition*, John A. Rohr
37. *The Guide to the Foundations of Public Administration*, Daniel W. Martin
39. *Terrorism and Emergency Management: Policy and Administration*, William L. Waugh, Jr.
40. *Organizational Behavior and Public Management: Second Edition*, Michael L. Vasu, Debra W. Stewart, and G. David Garson
43. *Government Financial Management Theory*, Gerald J. Miller
46. *Handbook of Public Budgeting*, edited by Jack Rabin
49. *Handbook of Court Administration and Management*, edited by Steven W. Hays and Cole Blease Graham, Jr.
50. *Handbook of Comparative Public Budgeting and Financial Management*, edited by Thomas D. Lynch and Lawrence L. Martin
53. *Encyclopedia of Policy Studies: Second Edition*, edited by Stuart S. Nagel
54. *Handbook of Regulation and Administrative Law*, edited by David H. Rosenbloom and Richard D. Schwartz
55. *Handbook of Bureaucracy*, edited by Ali Farazmand
56. *Handbook of Public Sector Labor Relations*, edited by Jack Rabin, Thomas Vocino, W. Bartley Hildreth, and Gerald J. Miller
57. *Practical Public Management*, Robert T. Golembiewski
58. *Handbook of Public Personnel Administration*, edited by Jack Rabin, Thomas Vocino, W. Bartley Hildreth, and Gerald J. Miller
60. *Handbook of Debt Management*, edited by Gerald J. Miller
61. *Public Administration and Law: Second Edition*, David H. Rosenbloom and Rosemary O'Leary
62. *Handbook of Local Government Administration*, edited by John J. Gargan
63. *Handbook of Administrative Communication*, edited by James L. Garnett and Alexander Kouzmin
64. *Public Budgeting and Finance: Fourth Edition*, edited by Robert T. Golembiewski and Jack Rabin
67. *Handbook of Public Finance*, edited by Fred Thompson and Mark T. Green
68. *Organizational Behavior and Public Management: Third Edition*, Michael L. Vasu, Debra W. Stewart, and G. David Garson
69. *Handbook of Economic Development*, edited by Kuotsai Tom Liou
70. *Handbook of Health Administration and Policy*, edited by Anne Osborne Kilpatrick and James A. Johnson
71. *Handbook of Research Methods in Public Administration*, edited by Gerald J. Miller and Marcia L. Whicker
72. *Handbook on Taxation*, edited by W. Bartley Hildreth and James A. Richardson
73. *Handbook of Comparative Public Administration in the Asia-Pacific Basin*, edited by Hoi-kwok Wong and Hon S. Chan
74. *Handbook of Global Environmental Policy and Administration*, edited by Dennis L. Soden and Brent S. Steel
75. *Handbook of State Government Administration*, edited by John J. Gargan
76. *Handbook of Global Legal Policy*, edited by Stuart S. Nagel
78. *Handbook of Global Economic Policy*, edited by Stuart S. Nagel
79. *Handbook of Strategic Management: Second Edition*, edited by Jack Rabin, Gerald J. Miller, and W. Bartley Hildreth
80. *Handbook of Global International Policy*, edited by Stuart S. Nagel

81. *Handbook of Organizational Consultation: Second Edition*, edited by Robert T. Golembiewski
82. *Handbook of Global Political Policy*, edited by Stuart S. Nagel
83. *Handbook of Global Technology Policy*, edited by Stuart S. Nagel
84. *Handbook of Criminal Justice Administration*, edited by M. A. DuPont-Morales, Michael K. Hooper, and Judy H. Schmidt
85. *Labor Relations in the Public Sector: Third Edition*, edited by Richard C. Kearney
86. *Handbook of Administrative Ethics: Second Edition*, edited by Terry L. Cooper
87. *Handbook of Organizational Behavior: Second Edition*, edited by Robert T. Golembiewski
88. *Handbook of Global Social Policy*, edited by Stuart S. Nagel and Amy Robb
89. *Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective, Sixth Edition*, Ferrel Heady
90. *Handbook of Public Quality Management*, edited by Ronald J. Stupak and Peter M. Leitner
91. *Handbook of Public Management Practice and Reform*, edited by Kuotsai Tom Liou
92. *Personnel Management in Government: Politics and Process, Fifth Edition*, Jay M. Shafritz, Norma M. Riccucci, David H. Rosenbloom, Katherine C. Naff, and Albert C. Hyde
93. *Handbook of Crisis and Emergency Management*, edited by Ali Farazmand
94. *Handbook of Comparative and Development Public Administration: Second Edition*, edited by Ali Farazmand
95. *Financial Planning and Management in Public Organizations*, Alan Walter Steiss and Emeka O. Cyprian Nwagwu
96. *Handbook of International Health Care Systems*, edited by Khi V. Thai, Edward T. Wimberley, and Sharon M. McManus
97. *Handbook of Monetary Policy*, edited by Jack Rabin and Glenn L. Stevens
98. *Handbook of Fiscal Policy*, edited by Jack Rabin and Glenn L. Stevens
99. *Public Administration: An Interdisciplinary Critical Analysis*, edited by Eran Vigoda
100. *Ironies in Organizational Development: Second Edition, Revised and Expanded*, edited by Robert T. Golembiewski
101. *Science and Technology of Terrorism and Counterterrorism*, edited by Tushar K. Ghosh, Mark A. Prelas, Dabir S. Viswanath, and Sudarshan K. Loyalka
102. *Strategic Management for Public and Nonprofit Organizations*, Alan Walter Steiss
103. *Case Studies in Public Budgeting and Financial Management: Second Edition*, edited by Aman Khan and W. Bartley Hildreth
104. *Handbook of Conflict Management*, edited by William J. Pammer, Jr. and Jerri Killian
105. *Chaos Organization and Disaster Management*, Alan Kirschenbaum
106. *Handbook of Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Administration and Policy*, edited by Wallace Swan
107. *Public Productivity Handbook: Second Edition*, edited by Marc Holzer
108. *Handbook of Developmental Policy Studies*, edited by Gedeon M. Mudacumura, Desta Mebratu and M. Shamsul Haque
109. *Bioterrorism in Medical and Healthcare Administration*, Laure Paquette
110. *International Public Policy and Management: Policy Learning Beyond Regional, Cultural, and Political Boundaries*, edited by David Levi-Faur and Eran Vigoda-Gadot
111. *Handbook of Public Information Systems, Second Edition*, edited by G. David Garson
112. *Handbook of Public Sector Economics*, edited by Donijo Robbins

113. *Handbook of Public Administration and Policy in the European Union*, edited by M. Peter van der Hoek
114. *Nonproliferation Issues for Weapons of Mass Destruction*, Mark A. Prelas and Michael S. Peck
115. *Common Ground, Common Future: Moral Agency in Public Administration, Professions, and Citizenship*, Charles Garofalo and Dean Geuras
116. *Handbook of Organization Theory and Management: The Philosophical Approach, Second Edition*, edited by Thomas D. Lynch and Peter L. Cruise
117. *International Development Governance*, edited by Ahmed Shafiqul Huque and Habib Zafarullah
118. *Sustainable Development Policy and Administration*, edited by Gedeon M. Mudacumura, Desta Mebratu, and M. Shamsul Haque
119. *Public Financial Management*, edited by Howard A. Frank
120. *Handbook of Juvenile Justice: Theory and Practice*, edited by Barbara Sims and Pamela Preston
121. *Emerging Infectious Diseases and the Threat to Occupational Health in the U.S. and Canada*, edited by William Charney
122. *Handbook of Technology Management in Public Administration*, edited by David Greisler and Ronald J. Stupak
123. *Handbook of Decision Making*, edited by Göktuğ Morçöl
124. *Handbook of Public Administration, Third Edition*, edited by Jack Rabin, W. Bartley Hildreth, and Gerald J. Miller
125. *Handbook of Public Policy Analysis: Theory, Politics, and Methods*, edited by Frank Fischer, Gerald J. Miller, and Mara S. Sidney
126. *Elements of Effective Governance: Measurement, Accountability and Participation*, Kathe Callahan

Available Electronically

Principles and Practices of Public Administration, edited by Jack Rabin, Robert F. Munzenrider, and Sherrie M. Bartell



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Handbook of Public Policy Analysis

Theory, Politics, and Methods

Edited by

Frank Fischer

*Rutgers University
Newark, New Jersey, U.S.A.*

Gerald J. Miller

*Rutgers University
Newark, New Jersey, U.S.A.*

Mara S. Sidney

*Rutgers University
Newark, New Jersey, U.S.A.*



CRC Press

Taylor & Francis Group

Boca Raton London New York

CRC Press is an imprint of the
Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

CRC Press
Taylor & Francis Group
6000 Broken Sound Parkway NW, Suite 300
Boca Raton, FL 33487-2742

© 2007 by Taylor & Francis Group, LLC
CRC Press is an imprint of Taylor & Francis Group, an Informa business

No claim to original U.S. Government works
Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper
10 9 8 7 6 5 4

International Standard Book Number-10: 1-57444-561-8 (Hardcover)
International Standard Book Number-13: 978-1-57444-561-9 (Hardcover)

This book contains information obtained from authentic and highly regarded sources. Reprinted material is quoted with permission, and sources are indicated. A wide variety of references are listed. Reasonable efforts have been made to publish reliable data and information, but the author and the publisher cannot assume responsibility for the validity of all materials or for the consequences of their use.

No part of this book may be reprinted, reproduced, transmitted, or utilized in any form by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying, microfilming, and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without written permission from the publishers.

For permission to photocopy or use material electronically from this work, please access www.copyright.com (<http://www.copyright.com/>) or contact the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc. (CCC) 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923, 978-750-8400. CCC is a not-for-profit organization that provides licenses and registration for a variety of users. For organizations that have been granted a photocopy license by the CCC, a separate system of payment has been arranged.

Trademark Notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Handbook of public policy analysis: theory, politics, and methods / edited by Frank Fischer, Gerald J. Miller, and Mara S. Sidney.

p. cm. -- (Public administration and public policy ; 125)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN-13: 978-1-57444-561-9 (alk. paper)

ISBN-10: 1-57444-561-8 (alk. paper)

1. Policy sciences--Handbooks, manuals, etc. 2. Public administration--Handbooks, manuals, etc.
I. Fischer, Frank, 1942- II. Miller, Gerald. III. Sidney, Mara S., 1964- IV. Title. V. Series.

H97.H3583 2007

352.3'4--dc22

2006031906

Visit the Taylor & Francis Web site at
<http://www.taylorandfrancis.com>

and the CRC Press Web site at
<http://www.crcpress.com>

Contributors

Clinton J. Andrews is an associate professor in the Edward J. Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy at Rutgers University and director of the Urban Planning Program. He has published widely on energy and environmental management and policy, and his most recent book is *Humble Analysis*.

Thomas A. Birkland directs the Center for Policy Research, State University of New York at Albany, where he is also a professor. He is the author of *After Disaster: Agenda Setting, Public Policy, and Focusing Events*.

Susan E. Clarke is professor of political science at the University of Colorado at Boulder. She teaches a graduate seminar on context-sensitive research methods. She is an editor of *Urban Affairs Review*. Her most recent book is *The Work of Cities* (co-authored with Gary Gaile).

Caroline Danielson is a policy analyst at the Public Policy Institute of California, in San Francisco. She earned her doctorate in political science from the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

Peter deLeon earned his Ph.D. from the Rand Graduate School. Dr. deLeon is the author of *Democracy and the Policy Sciences* as well as *Advice and Consent*.

Tansu Demir, PhD, is assistant professor in the Department of Public Administration at the University of Central Florida. He received his Ph.D. in public administration from Florida Atlantic University in 2005.

Frank Fischer is professor of political science and member of the faculty of the Edward J. Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy at Rutgers University. His recent publications include *Reframing Public Policy: Discursive Politics and Deliberative Practice*, and *Citizens, Experts, and the Environment: The Politics of Local Knowledge*.

John Forester is professor of city and regional planning at Cornell University. His best known work includes *The Deliberative Practitioner*, *Planning in the Face of Power* (University of California Press, 1989), and *The Argumentative Turn in Policy Analysis and Planning* (co-edited with Frank Fischer).

Jan-Eric Furubo, an evaluator and has been at the National Audit Office in Sweden, is the author of many articles and publications in the field of decision making, and was co-editor of the *International Atlas of Evaluation* (2002). He is president of the Swedish Evaluation Society.

Yaakov Garb is a lecturer at the Jacob Blaustein Institutes for Desert Research at the Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, and a visiting assistant professor in the Global Environmental Program at the Watson Institute for International Studies, Brown University. He has worked on a range of environmental and urban issues internationally, often drawing on perspectives from Science and Technology Studies (STS). He has recently completed essays on the “construction of inevitability” in megaprojects, on changing retail travel patterns in Central Europe, and on the politics of mobility in Israel and Palestine.

Herbert Gottweis is director at the Department of Political Science of the University of Vienna. His publications include *Governing Molecules: The Discursive Politics of Genetic Engineering in Europe and in the United States*.

Steven Griggs is lecturer in public policy at the Institute of Local Government Studies at the University of Birmingham in the UK. His current research centres on discourses of community protest campaigns against the expansion of airports in the UK.

John Grin is a professor of policy science at the Department of Political Science at the University of Amsterdam. He is also Director of the Amsterdam School for Social Science Research, and co-director of the Dutch Knowledge Network on System Innovations, a research program on fundamental transitions to a sustainable society.

Hubert Heinelt is professor for public administration, public policy and urban and regional research at Darmstadt University of Technology. He is a member of the executive committee of the European Urban Research Association and the Standing Group on Urban Research of the German Political Science Association.

Robert Hoppe is a professor in the Faculty of Business, Public Administration, and Technology (BBT), University of Twente, Netherlands. He is chair of Policy and Knowledge and editor-in-chief of *Beleidswetenschap*. His key research interests are in methods of policy analysis and science/policy boundary work.

Helen Ingram is Warmington Endowed Chair of Social Ecology at the University of California at Irvine. She has joint appointments in the Departments of Planning, Policy and Design, Political Science, and Criminology, Law and Society.

Werner Jann holds the chair for Political Science, Administration and Organisation at the University of Potsdam, Germany. He was associate professor at the Postgraduate School of Administrative Sciences Speyer, and has been research fellow at the University of California, Berkeley.

Patrick Kenis is professor at Tilburg University, the Netherlands, where he is also head of Department Organisation Studies. He earned his Ph.D. in social and political sciences from the European University Institute in Florence, Italy.

David Laws is principal research scientist and lecturer in the Department of Urban Studies and Planning at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. His recent publications include *Reframing Regulation: Changing Forms of Law and Practice in U.S. Environmental Policy*, and *The Practice of Innovation: Institutions, Policy, and Technology Development*.

Anne Loeber is a post-doctoral researcher and lecturer in public policy at the Department of Political Science at the University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands. She is also a member of the Technology Assessment steering committee, an independent advisory body to the Dutch Ministry of Agriculture, Nature Management, and Fisheries.

Martin Lodge is lecturer in political science and public policy at the Department of Government and the ESRC Centre for Analysis of Risk and Regulation, London School of Economics and Political Science. His key research interests are in comparative executive government, in particular in the area of regulation.

Miriam Manon is a graduate of the University of Massachusetts, Amherst's Commonwealth Honors College, where she earned an interdisciplinary B.A. in social justice and the environment. She completed a semester at the Arava Institute for Environmental Studies in Israel and plans to continue her studies on the interface of environmental and social issues.

Kuldeep Mathur recently retired as academic director at the Centre for the Study of Law and Governance, and professor at the Centre for Political Studies, Jawaharal Nehru University (JNU), New Delhi, India. He was formerly rector at JNU and director of India's National Institute of Education Planning and Administration.

Navdeep Mathur is research fellow at the Institute of Local Government Studies, School of Public Policy, University of Birmingham, UK. He is also forums editor of the *Journal of Critical Policy Analysis*.

Igor Mayer is an associate professor in the faculty of Technology, Policy and Management at Delft University of Technology, the Netherlands. He is also the director of the Delft-Rotterdam Centre for Process Management and Simulation.

Gerald J. Miller is professor of public administration at Rutgers University, where he teaches government and nonprofit budgeting and financial management. He has published numerous books and research articles, including *The Handbook of Debt Management* and *Government Financial Management Theory*.

Hugh T. Miller is professor of public administration and director of the School of Public Administration at Florida Atlantic University. His most recent books are *Postmodern Public Administration: Revised Edition*, with the late Charles J. Fox and *Tampering with Tradition: The Unrealized Authority of Democratic Agency*, co-edited with Peter Bogason and Sandra Kensen.

Jerry Mitchell is professor of public affairs at Baruch College, The City University of New York. His is the author of a new book published by SUNY Press, *The Business of BIDS*.

Changhwan Mo is currently a research fellow at the Korea Transport Institute and has been advisor at the Regulatory Reform Group in the Prime Minister's Office in South Korea. He is the author or co-author of several articles in the areas of public policy, budgeting, and globalization.

Wayne Parsons is professor of public policy at Queen Mary, University of London. Amongst his publications are *The Political Economy of British Regional Policy*; *The Power of the Financial Press: Keynes and the Quest for a Moral Science*, and *Public Policy* and he is editor of the New Horizons in Public Policy series for Edward Elgar.

Deike Peters is currently a German Research Foundation (DFG) fellow with the Center for Metropolitan Studies at the Technical University in Berlin. She has a Ph.D. in planning and policy development from Rutgers University and master's degrees in urban planning and international affairs from Columbia University.

Helga Püzl is currently a post-doctoral researcher at the Department of Economics and Social Sciences at the University of Natural Resources and Applied Life Sciences, Vienna (BOKU). In addition she is a lecturer in comparative politics at the Department of Political Science at the University of Vienna.

Jörg Raab is assistant professor of policy and organisation studies at Tilburg University, the Netherlands. His research focuses mainly on governance mechanisms in the state, economy and society and on different topics in organization theory with an emphasis on inter-organizational networks.

Bernard Reber is research fellow on moral and political philosophy at CNRS-University Paris V. He has also taught at l'Ecole Nationale Supérieure des Mines de Paris, Sorbonne. He is the coeditor of *Pluralisme moral, juridique et politique* and *Les sciences humaines et sociales à l'heure des TIC*.

Donijo Robbins is associate professor for the School of Public & Nonprofit Administration at Grand Valley State University in Grand Rapids, Michigan, where she teaches graduate and undergraduate courses in public budgeting, financial management, and research methods. She holds a Ph.D. in public administration from Rutgers University.

Paul A. Sabatier is professor in the Department of Environment and Policy at the University of California, Davis. He has published *Theories of the Policy Process*.

Alan R. Sadovnik is professor of education, public affairs and administration, and sociology at Rutgers University. Among his publications are *Equity and Excellence in Higher Education*; *Exploring Education: An Introduction to the Foundations of Education*; and *Knowledge and Pedagogy: The Sociology of Basil Bernstein*.

Thomas Saretzki is professor of environmental policy and politics at the Center for the Study of Democracy, University of Lueneburg (Germany). Currently he is visiting research scholar at Northwestern University in Evanston, Illinois.

Anne Larason Schneider is professor, School of Justice and Department of Political Science, Arizona State University, Tempe. She is co-editor (with Helen Ingram) of *Deserving and Entitled* and co-author (also with Helen Ingram) of *Policy Design for Democracy* (University Press of Kansas, 1997).

Mary Segers is professor of political science at Rutgers University. Her books include *A Wall of Separation? Debating the Role of Religion in American Public Life* (1998) and *Abortion Politics In American States* (1995, co-edited with Timothy Byrnes).

Mara S. Sidney is Associate Professor of Political Science at Rutgers University, Newark. She is the author of *Unfair Housing: How National Policy Shapes Local Action*.

Diane Stone is Marie Curie Chair in the Center for Policy Studies at the Central European University in Budapest, and reader in Politics and International Studies at the University of Warwick. Among her books is *Global Knowledge Networks and International Development* (with Simon Maxwell). She co-edits the journal *Global Governance*.

Eileen Sullivan is a lecturer of political science at Rutgers University. She has been a research director for the New York City Department of Employment, the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO), and the Vera Institute of Justice; and she has served as research consultant to the New York City Economic Development Corporation.

Douglas Torgerson is professor of politics at Trent University in Canada. He is a past editor of the journal *Policy Sciences*, and his publications include several critical studies on the theory and history of the field.

Oliver Treib is assistant professor in the Department of Political Science, Institute for Advanced Studies, Vienna. His research topics include EU social policy, new modes of governance and political cleavage structures in international politics.

Michel J.G. van Eeten is an associate professor in the School of Technology, Policy and Management, Delft University of Technology, the Netherlands. He is also a winner of the Raymond Vernon Prize of the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management and the author (with Emery Roe) of *Ecology, Engineering, and Management*.

Danielle M. Vogenbeck, Ph.D., public affairs, University of Colorado at Denver, is an associate behavioral scientist at RAND, where she specializes in applying social network analysis to organizational change, network governance, and community development projects.

Hendrik Wagenaar is a professor of public policy with the Department of Public Administration at Leiden University. He is the author of *Government Institutions* (Kluwer) and co-editor (with M. A. Hajer) of *Deliberative Policy Analysis* (Cambridge University Press).

Peter Wagner is professor of social and political theory at the European University Institute in Florence, Italy, and professor of sociology at the University of Warwick, UK. His recent book publications include *Varieties of World-Making: Beyond Globalization* (co-edited with Nathalie Karagiannis, 2006) and *A History and Theory of the Social Sciences*.

Christopher M. Weible is an assistant professor in the School of Public Policy, Georgia Institute of Technology in Atlanta. His research interests focus on policy processes and environmental politics, and his work has been published in the *Policy Studies Journal*, *Political Research Quarterly*, and *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*.

Kai Wegrich is senior policy analyst at RAND Europe. He received his Ph.D. from Potsdam University. His areas of special interest include public sector reform and regulation.

Hellmut Wollmann is professor (emeritus) of public policy and public administration at the Institute of Social Science of Humboldt University, Berlin, Germany. He was a co-founder and president (1998/1999) of the European Evaluation Society. He is editor of *Evaluation in Public Sector Reform* (2003, with V. Hoffmann-Martinot), *Comparing Public Sector Reform in France and Germany* (2006), and *The Comparative Study of Local Government and Politics* (2006, with H. Baldersheim).

Kaifeng Yang is assistant professor in public administration at Askew School of Public Administration and Policy, Florida State University. He is research associate at the National Center for Public Productivity at Rutgers University and the DeVoe Moore Center for Economic Development at Florida State University.

Dvora Yanow holds the Strategic Chair in Meaning and Method at the Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam. She is the author of *How Does a Policy Mean?; Conducting Interpretive Policy Analysis; Constructing American "Race" and "Ethnicity"* and co-editor of *Knowing in Organizations and Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*.



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Contents

Introduction	xix
--------------------	-----

Part I **Historical Perspectives**

Chapter 1 The Policy Sciences at the Crossroads	3
<i>Peter deLeon and Danielle M. Vogenbeck</i>	
Chapter 2 Promoting the Policy Orientation: Lasswell in Context.....	15
<i>Douglas Torgerson</i>	
Chapter 3 Public Policy, Social Science, and the State: An Historical Perspective.....	29
<i>Peter Wagner</i>	

Part II **Policy Processes**

Chapter 4 Theories of the Policy Cycle	43
<i>Werner Jann and Kai Wegrich</i>	
Chapter 5 Agenda Setting in Public Policy.....	63
<i>Thomas A. Birkland</i>	
Chapter 6 Policy Formulation: Design and Tools	79
<i>Mara S. Sidney</i>	
Chapter 7 Implementing Public Policy	89
<i>Helga Püzl and Oliver Treib</i>	
Chapter 8 Do Policies Determine Politics?.....	109
<i>Hubert Heinelt</i>	

Part III **Policy Politics, Advocacy, and Expertise**

Chapter 9 A Guide to the Advocacy Coalition Framework	123
<i>Christopher M. Weible and Paul A. Sabatier</i>	
Chapter 10 Policy Communities	137
<i>Hugh T. Miller and Tansu Demir</i>	
Chapter 11 Public Policy Analysis and Think Tanks	149
<i>Diane Stone</i>	

Part IV**Policy Decision Making: Rationality, Networks, and Learning**

Chapter 12 Rationality in Policy Decision Making	161
<i>Clinton J. Andrews</i>	
Chapter 13 Rational Choice in Public Policy: The Theory in Critical Perspective	173
<i>Steven Griggs</i>	
Chapter 14 Taking Stock of Policy Networks: Do They Matter?	187
<i>Jörg Raab and Patrick Kenis</i>	
Chapter 15 Theories of Policy Learning: Agency, Structure, and Change	201
<i>John Grin and Anne Loeber</i>	

Part V**Deliberative Policy Analysis: Argumentation, Rhetoric, and Narratives**

Chapter 16 Deliberative Policy Analysis as Practical Reason: Integrating Empirical and Normative Arguments	223
<i>Frank Fischer</i>	
Chapter 17 Rhetoric in Policy Making: Between Logos, Ethos, and Pathos	237
<i>Herbert Gottweis</i>	
Chapter 18 Narrative Policy Analysis	251
<i>Michel M.J. van Eeten</i>	

Part VI**Comparative, Cultural, and Ethical Perspectives**

Chapter 19 Comparative Public Policy	273
<i>Martin Lodge</i>	
Chapter 20 Applied Cultural Theory: Tool for Policy Analysis.....	289
<i>Robert Hoppe</i>	
Chapter 21 Ethical Issues and Public Policy	309
<i>Eileen Sullivan and Mary Segers</i>	
Chapter 22 Public Policy and Democratic Citizenship: What Kinds of Citizenship Does Policy Promote?	329
<i>Anne Larason Schneider and Helen Ingram</i>	

Part VII**Quantitatively Oriented Policy Methods**

Chapter 23 Quantitative Methods for Policy Analysis.....	349
<i>Kaifeng Yang</i>	

Chapter 24	The Use (and Misuse) of Surveys Research in Policy Analysis.....	369
	<i>Jerry Mitchell</i>	
Chapter 25	Social Experiments and Public Policy.....	381
	<i>Caroline Danielson</i>	
Chapter 26	Policy Evaluation and Evaluation Research.....	393
	<i>Hellmut Wollmann</i>	
Part VIII		
Qualitative Policy Analysis: Interpretation, Meaning, and Content		
Chapter 27	Qualitative-Interpretive Methods in Policy Research.....	405
	<i>Dvora Yanow</i>	
Chapter 28	Qualitative Research and Public Policy.....	417
	<i>Alan R. Sadovnik</i>	
Chapter 29	Interpretation and Intention in Policy Analysis.....	429
	<i>Henk Wagenaar</i>	
Chapter 30	Context-Sensitive Policy Methods	443
	<i>Susan E. Clarke</i>	
Part IX		
Policy Decisions Techniques		
Chapter 31	Cost-Benefit Analysis.....	465
	<i>Gerald J. Miller and Donijo Robbins</i>	
Chapter 32	Environmental Impact Assessment: Between Bureaucratic Process and Social Learning.....	481
	<i>Yaakov Garb, Miriam Manon, and Deike Peters</i>	
Chapter 33	Technology Assessment as Policy Analysis: From Expert Advice	493
	to Participatory Approaches <i>Bernard Reber</i>	
Chapter 34	Public Policy Mediation: From Argument to Collaboration	513
	<i>David Laws and John Forester</i>	
Part X		
Country Perspectives		
Chapter 35	Policy Analysis in Britain.....	537
	<i>Wayne Parsons</i>	
Chapter 36	The Evolution of Policy Analysis in the Netherlands	553
	<i>Igor Mayer</i>	

Chapter 37	Policy Analysis and Evaluation in Sweden: Discovering the Limits of the Rationalistic Paradigm	571
	<i>Jan-Eric Furubo</i>	
Chapter 38	The Policy Turn in German Political Science	587
	<i>Thomas Saretzki</i>	
Chapter 39	Policy Analysis in India: Research Bases and Discursive Practices	603
	<i>Navdeep Mathur and Kuldeep Mathur</i>	
Chapter 40	Korean Policy Analysis: From Economic Efficiency to Public Participation	617
	<i>Changhwan Mo</i>	
	Index	625

27 Qualitative-Interpretive Methods in Policy Research

Dvora Yanow

The use of qualitative methods in policy research is not new. Academic scholars and policy analysts have for some years been venturing out into the “field” as ethnographers or participant-observers to study first-hand the experiences of legislators, implementors, agency clients, community members, and other policy-relevant stakeholders. Others have based qualitative studies on in-depth interviews with various policy actors; and still other studies draw on legislative, agency, and other documents.

What is new, however, in methodological circles is a greater attention to making the steps of such analyses more transparent. On the one hand, this makes it easier for students and others to learn how such studies are carried out. At the same time, such transparency enables critics and skeptics of the scientific standing of such research to see that they are not impressionistic, that they have regularized procedures, and that they can yield trustworthy analyses, although these procedures and standards may be—indeed, are—different from those used in other forms of research. Part of this transparency involves making clear that qualitative methods have a longstanding history of philosophical exploration and argumentation that supports their procedures and evidentiary claims at a conceptual level. It has become increasingly important to be explicit about what these philosophical groundings are, and so this chapter includes a brief summary of several of the central presuppositions and their ideational sources. Another part of this transparency involves attending quite carefully to the language used in talking about methodological concerns and methods procedures. This has led to a shift in many circles from talking about “qualitative” methods to a discourse of “interpretive” methods. This shift has taken place because of the so-called “interpretive turn” in the social sciences quite broadly (see, e.g., Rabinow and Sullivan 1979, 1985), but also because of the greater awareness of the philosophical presuppositions undergirding *all* research methods and an increased desire to ground methods discussions in their attendant methodologies.

The approach I sketch out here rests, then, on “taking language seriously” (to draw on Jay White’s article and book titles; White 1992, 1999) and also on the very philosophical presuppositions that undergird these methods and methodologies. I begin with an explanation and defense of the interpretive turn, not only in conceptual terms but in methodological ones as well, as a more fitting name for this form of research. As this rests on philosophical argumentation, in the second section I summarize some of the main points from interpretive philosophies that inform interpretive methods. These suggest some of the central characteristics and themes of interpretive methods, including some of the central issues raised today in methodological discussions. Entire chapters and volumes have been written about these several interpretive methods. Here, I will sketch out the entailments of interpretive methods for accessing or generating data. The chapter concludes with very brief notes on some of the interpretive methods used in analyzing such data in the context of policy research. There are many more than I have space for here, and the reader is encouraged to use the references to pursue these.

WHAT'S IN A NAME? INTERPRETIVE METHODS

Researchers in many fields who use those methods traditionally called “qualitative”—field research methods such as participant-observation and analytic methods such as frame analysis or ethno-methodology—are increasingly using a different umbrella term to refer to them: “interpretive.” The reasons are both historical and contemporary, having to do with the origins of the term qualitative and current issues in the philosophy of science, including social science.

The language of qualitative methods came into being to distinguish field research methods, such as those developed prominently in Chicago School sociology and anthropology from the 1930s to 1960s, from the survey research design and statistical methods being developed at the same time, notably at Columbia University and later at the University of Michigan’s Institute for Social Research. As the latter were designated “quantitative” methods, the former must, by the logic of language and category construction, be “qualitative.” Qualitative research, then, was that research that drew on one or more of three methods for gathering, accessing or generating data: observing, with whatever degree of participating; interviewing in a conversational mode; and the close reading of topic-relevant documents.¹

One difficulty with the qualitative-quantitative nomenclature is that the category structure sets up an opposition that does not hold. “Qualitative” researchers count things (although what they do with numbers, how they treat them analytically, is characteristically quite different from the ways that quantitative researchers treat them; see, e.g., Gusfield 1976, 1981); “quantitative” researchers interpret their data. And so the distinction is both erroneous and misleading.

Two other differences further complicate the two-part category structure. First, its focus on numeracy diverts attention from underlying ontological and epistemological differences that are far more significant. Different methods presume different “reality statuses” for the topic of research. A simplistic example would be that tables, chairs, and other office furniture, which one can physically touch, have a different ontological standing than, say, the organization whose offices they furnish—something that might matter, for instance, in analyses from different perspectives of space planning for that organization (which, as a concept, denotes more than its material reality). Different reality statuses in turn presume different ways of knowing and different rules of evidence (that supports the “truth claims” of the analysis) or criteria for assessing its trustworthiness. An analysis of the allocation of office space and furnishings to members at various levels of the organization requires a different kind of “know-ability” than an assessment of the meanings of those allocations to those members and their interpretations of the differences. The qualitative-quantitative terminology has become a shorthand proxy for referring to philosophical differences between methods informed by interpretive philosophies and those informed by logical positivism and its emendations. This masking, through the qual/quant language of the category structure, of ontological and epistemological presuppositions undergirding methodological debates and methods procedures exacerbates the lack of attention to philosophical presuppositions common in the way methods courses are typically taught—that is, as a set of tools divorced from any underlying assumptions.²

Second, under pressure to meet the evaluative standards of quantitative methods—the validity and reliability criteria that are grounded in the presuppositions of logical positivism—some qualitative researchers are increasingly doing work designed to resemble more closely the characteristics

1. Examples of such qualitative studies include many that focused on bureaucracies, such as Blau 1953, Gouldner 1954; Kaufman 1960, Selznick 1949, or on workers and work practices, such as Becker et al. 1961; Dalton 1959.
2. Note that “pre”suppositions are not prior in time but in logic. Most researchers do not first decide what their ideas about reality and knowledge are. It is far more common to simply begin with a research puzzle and proceed to a research design. What is “prior” precedes in the sense of logic: research designs presume certain ideas about or attitudes toward ontological status and epistemological possibilities. These are embedded in research methods.

of large “n” research and to conform more to the research processes associated with quantitative methods. “Qualitative” research looks less and less like the traditional field research methods associated with that term. Such efforts include, for example, the adoption of computer programs (such as NU’DIST or Atlas-Ti) to “process” words and phrases from interview and field notes or focus groups, as well as highly structured interviews, Q-sort and other techniques, rather than the ethnographic, participant-observer, ethnomethodological, semiotic, narrative, and other approaches that are the hallmarks of qualitative methods.³ The social sciences, including policy studies, are increasingly characterized by a tripartite methods categorization: quantitative, qualitative-positivist, and qualitative-interpretive. The distinction is made clearer when one considers the presuppositional grounding that informs the methods used in this latter category.

INTERPRETIVE METHODOLOGICAL PRESUPPOSITIONS

The Continental philosophies of phenomenology, hermeneutics, and critical theory developed in Europe during the first half of the twentieth century engaged some of the same questions that nineteenth- and early twentieth-century positivist philosophies did: what is the character of human social reality, as compared with the ontological status of the physical or natural world? And, in light of that reality status, how can aspects of the human social world be known in a “scientific” fashion—again, as compared with the ability to know something, with any degree of certainty, about the physical or natural world? Early nineteenth-century positivist philosophers advanced the argument that the social world should be know-able in the same way that planetary motion and physical mass, for example, could be known: through systematic application of human reason, restricted by the later logical positivist philosophers to sense-based observation alone. Such study should yield principles or “laws” of human behavior that were not only discoverable, but universal. Observation from a vantage point external to the subject of study—an Archimedean point or “God’s-eye view” (see, e.g., Harding 1988)—was not only desirable; it was deemed possible.⁴

From the perspective of the interpretive philosophers, however—those Continental philosophers and their American counterparts in symbolic interactionism, pragmatism, and the later ethnomethodology—the human social world is different in significant ways from the world of nature and physical objects and forces. One difference is the centrality of meaning-making to human life. A second is that that meaning-making of lived experience—the interpretive processes through which one generates meaning and is able to understand another’s meaning—is highly context-specific. From this perspective, the researcher cannot stand outside the subject of study: more than just the five senses is involved in interpreting people’s acts, the language they employ, and the objects they create and use; objectivity is not possible—from this perspective, general laws look more like a “view from nowhere” (Nagel 1986; see also Haraway 1988, Harding 1993), as situational sense-making draws on prior knowledge and builds on intersubjective understanding.

Interpretive researchers, then, do not feel the need to transform words into numbers for analysis. This is the most immediately visible characteristic of interpretive methods: they are word-based, from data “collection” instruments to data analysis tools to research report formats and contents. Interpretive researchers stick close to the character of the data they are encountering: as policy-relevant actors deliberate through words, whether written or oral (or, for that matter, nonverbal), researchers use those words as their data in seeing meanings and sources of meanings. When those actors use numbers, as in counting the numbers of drivers arrested for driving drunk (Gusfield 1981), researchers read those numbers as sources of meaning (for instance, to explore category-construction). This

3. For further discussion of these points and for illustrations of these and other interpretive methods beyond what is discussed in this chapter, see, e.g., Prasad 2005 and Yanow and Schwartz-Shea 2006.

4. This has come to be one understanding of “objectivity.” For a critique of that understanding, see, e.g., Bernstein 1983, Hawkesworth 2006, Yanow 2006a.

makes interpretive methods particularly suitable for argumentative, deliberative, and other such approaches to policy research (e.g., Fischer and Forester 1993, Hajer and Wagenaar 2003).

Because they are ontologically constructivist (rather than realist) and epistemologically interpretivist (rather than objectivist), interpretive researchers are attuned to the ways in which their own presence might, in many ways, potentially affect what they are learning in their research. Unlike survey researchers, however, who exert efforts in questionnaire design and administration to minimize these so-called “interviewer effects,” interpretive researchers increasingly deny the possibility that interviewers or participants or, in fact, readers can be nonimpacting in this way. Instead—and here is a second hallmark of interpretive research—interpretive methodologists call for heightened degrees of reflexivity on the part of the researcher: explicit attention to the ways in which family background, personality, education, training, and other experience might well shape who and what the researcher is able to access, as well as the ways in which he makes sense of the generated data. This is the enactment of the phenomenological argument that selves are shaped by prior experiences, which in turn shape perception and understanding. It is an argument that has also been advanced in feminist theories and race-ethnic studies concerning “standpoint” perspectives (see Hartsock 1987). Contemporary research reports are increasingly expected to include reflexive accounts of these “standpoints” and their role in shaping interpretations.

A related implication of taking a context-specific view “from somewhere” that denies the possibility of “discovering” generalizable, universal laws in policy research is the potential for multiplicity of meaning, depending on context and phenomenological experience. A hermeneutic argument, this goes beyond the interpretation of biblical texts—its historical antecedent—to the interpretation of other sorts of texts (e.g., policy documents) and other sorts of physical artifacts (e.g., agency buildings), as well as to human acts (e.g., legislating or implementing)—what Taylor (1971) called “text analogues” (see also Ricoeur 1971), to which we might also add nonverbal behaviors. It posits a representational—a symbolic—relationship between human artifactual creations and the values, beliefs, and sentiments that comprise their underlying meanings. Central to this position is an appreciation for the ambiguities that may, and often do, especially in policy arenas, arise from multiple interpretations of the same artifacts—especially as the reasons for such interpretational differences are rarely made explicit in everyday policy discourse. This is, or can be, the researcher’s task.⁵

For this reason, among others, interpretive researchers insist on grounding analytic inferences in the clear and detailed enumeration of acts, of interview language, and of objects necessary for supporting inferences. Such grounding is one of the ways in which interpretive researchers argue for the evidentiary bases for their truth claims. It is why narrative reports often read like novels—a third hallmark: without such detailed grounding, reports could read like imaginative flights of fancy. This is also why interpretive research data often cannot be condensed in tables, leading to reports that are typically longer than those based on quantitative data that can be summarily presented in such a fashion. (This acceptance of the social realities of multiple meanings is also the reason that interpretive policy analysts include the study of underlying values in their research, negating the

5. I develop the argument about symbolic relationships further in Yanow (2000, ch. 1). I disagree with those who claim that a hermeneutic approach requires, per se, a realist approach to texts and text analogues, a point discussed in Hendriks (2005b: 25). For those of us who follow a “reader-response” approach to textual meaning, meaning does not necessarily reside in the text itself, nor does it reside necessarily in the author’s intended meaning—analogous in the policy world to legislators’ intent. A phenomenological hermeneutics—the point I have sought to articulate in my work—sees meaning also in readers’ responses to texts, and it can be seen as well as emerging out of an interaction among these three (text, author, reader; see, e.g., Iser 1989). This position is well suited for the analysis of policies because of its appreciation for the ambiguities of lived experience and its interpretation.

fact-value dichotomy that has held sway in some other areas of policy analysis.⁶)

These characteristics—word-based methods and writing, researcher reflexivity, and the exploration of multiple meanings and their ambiguities, especially in policy contexts in which contention over the policy issue under study is common—are three of the central hallmarks of interpretive research, informed by a constructivist ontology, an interpretivist epistemology, and other attendant philosophical presuppositions. These presuppositions are enacted in methods of generating and analyzing data.

METHODS OF GENERATING DATA

Terminology comes into play again in talking about what in methods texts has customarily been termed “collecting” or “gathering” data. This language suggests that the data are just lying around waiting to be found and assembled and brought back for analysis, much like a botanist might collect or gather specimens to mount in the lab. Indeed, even the words “datum/data” in their literal meanings denote things that are given, underscoring the positivist notion that the researcher can stand outside the research setting and its details and discover (or uncover) their characteristics objectively.

From an interpretive perspective, by contrast, the evidentiary material that the researcher analyzes is constructed by participants in the event or setting being studied. To the extent that the researcher herself is seen as a participant, one might even speak of the co-construction or co-generation of evidence. This language draws on the social constructionist argument that is central to phenomenology (see, e.g., Schütz 1962; Berger and Luckmann 1966). Methods of generating data are threefold: observing, interviewing, reading. Interpretive research typically draws on one or more of these three.

1. OBSERVING

Observing, with whatever degree of participation in the setting, acts, and events being observed, is the heart of participant-observer and ethnographic research. These methods entail more than just a set of tools; they rest on what might be called, in both cases, an “ethnographic sensibility” (Pader 2006). This means an intention to understand acts and actors as much as possible from within their own frame of reference, their own sense-making of the situation. In ways similar to those articulated by Erving Goffman (1959) concerning symbolic interactionism and Harold Garfinkel (1977) concerning ethnomethodology, the researcher seeks to understand the everyday, common sense, largely unarticulated, yet tacitly known “rules” that members of the situation have mastered and which enable them to navigate the interactions and settings that comprise their daily lives.

In the context of housing policy, for example, and specifically of occupancy rates, Ellen Pader’s experience as a guest in the home of a Mexican family opened her eyes to the fact that the lived experience of “crowding”—the number of bodies occupying a given square footage of domestic space—is not universal. Yet United States housing policy sets occupancy rates that disallow the person:space ratios common in other parts of the world, even when immigrants to the United States from those places would themselves be more comfortable at the higher ratios familiar from their countries of origin. Enforcement of lower ratios mandated by law can, in her view, be discriminatory. It was her first-hand observation of different ways of constructing space and its meanings that led her to her analyses of these policies (see, e.g, Pader 1994, 1998, 2002, 2006).

6. For a critique of the fact-value dichotomy, see Rein (1976). For a critique of other ways of treating that dichotomy, see Hawkesworth (1988).

Herbert Gans (1976) makes the important point that participant-observation can entail varying degrees of participation. Ranging these along a continuum, we have at one end what most would probably consider the typical participant-observer role: much like Pader participating in the Mexican household, sleeping in the same bed with the daughters, the researcher assumes a situation-specific role and acts out of the requirements of that role. One might take on the role, for instance, of community organizer or agency department head (Yanow 1996) to study policy implementation at the local level. Gans notes, however, that it is also possible to be a participant-observer in the explicit or public role of researcher, rather than in an “insider” role. Here, the emphasis is more on “observer” than on “participant,” although the researcher is present on site, accompanying policy-relevant actors as they attend to daily tasks and so on, according to the needs of the study. When called upon to act, the researcher does so in keeping with her research role, rather than her member role. Ingersoll and Adams’ (1992) study of the Washington State Ferry system is an example of extended observation where the researchers mingled their observational roles as researchers with participation as system riders. Lin’s (2000) comparative analysis of state prisons and criminal justice policy is another example of a study that drew on on-site observation, in which she was clearly in a researcher’s role rather than that of either guard or prisoner.

All along this continuum, the researcher is ever-mindful of his researcher role, even in a situational role, as Gans stresses, even when constrained from acting as a researcher by the demands of his member role. This casts the researcher in an “undercover” role, which raises the classic questions of ethical research practice connected to disguised identity (that is, is it ethical for the researcher to disguise the fact that she is conducting research?). Different researchers take different positions on this question.⁷

2. INTERVIEWING

Interpretive interviewing bears a family resemblance to common conversation, although the interviewer typically takes a more active role in directing the trajectory of the conversation than, say, a friend or family member might. As with participant-observation or ethnographic research, the interpretive interviewer is interested in understanding how those he is talking to make sense of their lived experiences. This enacts a phenomenological position. Unlike the survey researcher, whose training stipulates that she not depart from the text of the written questions—neither in tone of voice nor delivery nor in wording or question order—the interpretive researcher typically seeks to draw the speaker out, much as one would a conversational partner, in order to gain further understanding of the terms being used or the perspective being articulated. Frederic Schaffer’s “ordinary language interviewing” (2006) is an example. He sought to understand how those he spoke with in Senegal made sense of the concept of “democracy” (Schaffer 1998): was it, in their eyes and in their experiences, the same thing that Americans call democracy, or did it have a particular, local coloration? He shapes his follow-up questions to respond to what he has just been told or, at times, to clarify a point made earlier in the conversation (see Schaffer 2006).

Policy-related research often draws on interviews, especially of legislators or agency executives. Yet interviewing need not be restricted to “elites” (see, e.g., Soss 2006, Walsh 2004). From an interpretive research perspective, especially one informed by critical theory, non-elite actors are also seen as playing a role in shaping policies, especially in rejecting top-down acts such as in policy implementation; and the researcher would want to understand their perspectives as well. Jeanette Hoffman (1995), for instance, found that technology policy was determined not only by

7. In institution-based research in the United States where the investigator is required to comply with institutional review boards’ (IRB) interpretations of protection of human subjects regulations, this question might also arise in the context of whether lack of such disclosure might potentially harm research “subjects.” There are many more questions about ethical practices and about IRB procedures than I can address in this chapter. See, e.g., Katz (2004).

policy-makers, but also in a complex interaction that included members of technology firms and university researchers.

Interviewing can be the sole source of data for an interpretive study. It can also be the “talk” part of a participant-observer or ethnographic study. However, if the researcher observes, say, office activities before, during, and after conducting interviews, that would not commonly be considered generating ethnographic observational data. The latter requires more systematicity to provide trustworthy evidence: “being there” through prolonged observation over time and space, in various circumstances (e.g., times of day, days of the week, time of year, level or part of the organization), depending on how these bear on the research question.

3. READING DOCUMENTS

The third source of interpretive data is documents of various kinds, depending on the research topic. These can be legislative records, bills and their marked-up drafts, notes on meetings, personal diaries, daily calendars, agency memos, annual reports, correspondence, and so on. For historical data, the researcher might also read back issues of newspapers; depending on the research question, editorial columns might constitute data alongside reportage. Rather than reading these as event evidence, they might be read for a sense of the times—of how people responded at that time to particular events or ideas. The focus is on meaning-making. One is, in a way, interrogating the written record when one was not or could not be present oneself. Phyllis Chock’s (1995) study of Congressional “talk” during debates on immigration policy is an example of such usage of legislative records. By examining the written record of spoken language, she was able to analyze the ways in which legislators’ and expert witnesses’ embedded ideas about immigrants reflected and shaped immigration reform and policy contentions.

Document reading can also be part of an observational study or an interview-based project. Documents can provide background information prior to designing the research project, for example, or prior to conducting interviews. They may corroborate observational and interview data—or they may refute them, in which case the researcher is “armed” with evidence that can be used to clarify or, perhaps, to challenge what he is being told, a role that observational data may also play.

METHODS OF ANALYZING DATA

Once one has data in hand, so to speak, how might one analyze them interpretively? Analysis and data generation are not so clearly separable—analysis begins, in fact, with the very design of the research project, and fieldwork, deskwork, and textwork (the “writing up”) are intertwined; but in a short chapter, it is easier to treat them as if they were temporally distinct.

There is a vast array of interpretive methods of analysis, among them action research (or participatory action research), case study analysis (either single or explicitly comparative), category analysis, content analysis (word-based, not incidence rate counts), conversational analysis, discourse analysis, dramaturgical analysis, ethnomethodology, frame (-reflective) analysis, genealogy, grounded theory, life histories, metaphor analysis, myth analysis, narrative analysis (of various sorts), poststructural analysis, science studies, semiotics, space analysis, story-telling analysis, and value-critical analysis. Some of these have been drawn on in policy research more than others, perhaps for reasons of familiarity rather than anything else (although one might argue that the subjects of policy studies are marked by a degree of contention that lends themselves to some methods, such as frame or value-critical analysis, more than others). Here, I will touch on a few of these as exemplars.

1. FRAME OR VALUE-CRITICAL ANALYSIS

Interviewing, sometimes together with observing (e.g., meetings, public hearings) and document analysis, lends itself to frame analysis or value-critical analysis (see, e.g., Linder 1995; Schmidt 2000, 2006; Schon and Rein 1994; Swaffield 1998; see also Luker 1984). Here, the researcher identifies two or more interpretive communities (also called communities of meaning, communities of practice, speech or discourse communities, etc.) and the language each uses to “frame” the policy issue, typically in conflicting ways. Analysis consists of identifying the values underlying the respective frames. Undertaken in an action research mode, this analysis might also suggest interventions to enable each interpretive community to understand why the other reasons in the way that it does and possibly to broker a mediated resolution to the conflict. Graham Allison’s (1971) multiple-lens study of the Cuban missile crisis was an earlier version of this kind of research. It is an approach that has been taken up in organizational studies at a theoretical level (see, e.g., Morgan 1986 or Bolman and Deal 1991). I have extended the interventionist implications of this approach also to implementation analysis (Yanow 1987).

2. STORY-TELLING ANALYSIS

Drawing on an interesting combination of interviewing with directed diary writing, Steven Maynard-Moody and Michael Musheno (2003) and their colleagues have developed a method of accessing stories told by front-line workers concerning their actions in implementing public policies. Michael Lipsky’s (1980), Jeffrey Prottas’ (1979), and Richard Weatherly’s (1979) first-generation studies of workers at the front lines themselves rested on intimate familiarity with what teachers, social workers, police officers, and others actually do in the field—how they interact with clients, students, and so on—generated through some combination of observing people in action and talking with workers and others.

3. NARRATIVE ANALYSIS

Other researchers see narrative analysis as distinct from story analysis. Carolyn Hendriks (2005a), for example, treats narratives as the overall development of a line of argument, rather than as stories in the way used by Maynard-Moody and Musheno—narratives with plot lines that have beginnings, middles, and ends. Emery Roe’s (1993) theory of narrative policy analysis draws on a stream of literary theory that uses “counter-narratives” as ways of making the line of argument clearer, through juxtaposing the narrative argument with a contrasting hypothetical. Tineke Abma (1999) has treated narrative analysis in a number of ways in the context of program evaluations. What all of these have in common is a focus on the importance of attending to policy-relevant actors’ language in discerning the character of disputes and the potentials for interpretation.

4. DRAMATURGICAL ANALYSIS

Maarten Hajer (2005) draws on the approach developed by the literary theorist Kenneth Burke for analyzing dramas. His analytic pentad situates dramatic action in the context of its setting, looking also at the actors in question, their acts, and their agency and purpose (Burke 1945). This provides a systematic framework for the analysis of policy “acts,” which Hajer has extended most recently to the analysis of events surrounding the murder of the Dutch public figure Theo van Gogh. Burke’s

theory also suggests a systematic approach to the analysis of policy and organizational settings and their spatial meanings (Yanow 2000, 2006b).

5. CATEGORY ANALYSIS

One of the analytic steps that characterizes the work of interpretive researchers is the impulse to, in the words of some, “destabilize” received or commonplace meanings. Others talk about this using the language of “deconstruction”: accepted policy meanings are deconstructed in the sense that the typically unspoken, commonsense assumptions built in to them are named and subjected to inquiry. One of the most common sets of assumptions are those embedded in policy issue categories, such as classifications of welfare recipients or prisoners, or of school children and their learning levels. Analyzing the language and structure of these categories along with practices of category-making is another area of interpretive method. As creating categories for administrative purposes through policy-making is a common state activity, category analysis is especially useful in policy research. I have developed one approach to category analysis and used it in the context of race-ethnic policy and administrative practices, such as those used in hospitals, census-taking, and employment (Yanow 2003).

There are many more forms of interpretive (qualitative) approaches to policy research than there is space to discuss here. The references point to some of these, as well as to primary and secondary sources for their theoretical and philosophical background. Additional forms will continue to be developed as more and more policy researchers discover the utility of analyses grounded in the actual lived experiences of policy-relevant actors and in the meanings they make of the policies that engage and affect their lives.

REFERENCES

- Abma, Tineke, ed. 1999. *Telling Tales: On Narrative and Evaluation*. Advances in Program Evaluation, v. 6. Stamford, CT: JAI Press.
- Allison, Graham. 1971. *Essence of Decision*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Becker, Howard S., Geer, Blanche, Hughes, Everett C., and Strauss, Anselm L. 1961. *Boys in White*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Berger, Peter L. and Luckmann, Thomas. 1966. *The Social Construction of Reality*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Bernstein, Richard J. 1983. *Beyond Objectivism and Relativism*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Blau, Peter. 1963 [1953]. *The Dynamics of Bureaucracy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bolman, Lee G. and Deal, Terrence E. 1991. *Reframing Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Burke, Kenneth. 1945. *A Grammar of Motives*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Chock, Phyllis Pease. 1995. “Ambiguity in Policy Discourse: Congressional Talk About Immigration.” *Policy Sciences* 28: 165–84.
- Dalton, Melville. 1959. *Men Who Manage*. New York: Wiley.
- Fischer, Frank and Forester, John, eds. 1993. *The Argumentative Turn in Policy Analysis and Planning*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Gans, Herbert. 1976. “Personal Journal: B. On the Methods Used in This Study.” In *The Research Experience*, ed. M. Patricia Golden, 49–59. Itasca, IL: F.E. Peacock.
- Garfinkel, Harold. 1977. “What is Ethnomethodology?” In *Understanding and Social Inquiry*, ed. Fred R. Dallmayr and Thomas A. McCarthy, 240–61. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Goffman, Erving. 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Doubleday.
- Gouldner, Alvin Ward. 1954. *Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

- Gusfield, Joseph R. 1976. "The Literary Rhetoric of Science." *American Sociological Review* 41: 16–34.
- Gusfield, Joseph R. 1981. *The Culture of Public Problems: Drinking-driving and the Symbolic Order*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hajer, Maarten. 2005. "Setting the Stage: A Dramaturgy of Policy Deliberation." *Administration and Society* 36: 624–647.
- Hajer, Maarten A. and Wagenaar, Hendrik, eds. 2003. *Deliberative Policy Analysis*. NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Haraway, Donna. 1988. "Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of the Partial Perspective." *Feminist Studies* 14: 575–99.
- Harding, Sandra. 1993. "Rethinking Standpoint Epistemology: What is 'Strong Objectivity'?" In *Feminist Epistemologies*, ed. Linda Alcoff and Elizabeth Potter, 49–82. New York: Routledge.
- Hartsock, Nancy C. M. 1987. "The Feminist Standpoint." In *Feminism & Methodology*, ed. Sandra Harding, 157–80. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Hawkesworth, M. E. 1988. *Theoretical Issues in Policy Analysis*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Hawkesworth, Mary. 2006. *Feminist Inquiry: From Political Conviction to Methodological Innovation*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Hendriks, Carolyn M. 2005a. "Participatory Storylines and Their Influence on Deliberative Forums." *Policy Sciences* 38: 1–20.
- Hendriks, Carolyn M. 2005b. "Stories from Policy Praxis: The Case of Deliberative Governance." Presented at the European Consortium for Political Research Conference, Budapest (September).
- Hofmann, Jeanette. 1995. "Implicit Theories in Policy Discourse: An Inquiry into the Interpretations of Reality in German Technology Policy." *Policy Sciences* 28: 127–48.
- Ingersoll, Virginia Hill and Adams, Guy. 1992. *The Tacit Organization*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Iser, Wolfgang. 1989. *Prospecting: From Reader Response To Literary Anthropology*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Katz, Jack. 2004. "Subterranean Fieldworkers' Blues: Scratching Toward a Common Law of Social Research Ethics." Presented to the Center for the Study of Law and Society, Boalt Hall School of Law, University of California, Berkeley (February 17).
- Kaufman, Roger. 1960. *The Forest Ranger*. Baltimore, MD: Published for Resources for the Future by Johns Hopkins Press.
- Lin, Ann Chih. 2000. *Reform in the Making*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Linder, Steven. 1995. "Contending Discourses in the Electric and Magnetic Fields Controversy." *Policy Sciences* 28: 209–30.
- Lipsky, Michael. 1980. *Street-Level Bureaucracy*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Luker, Kristin. 1984. *Abortion and the Politics of Motherhood*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Maynard-Moody, Steven and Musheno, Michael. 2003. *Cops, Teachers, Counselors: Stories from the Front Lines of Public Service*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Maynard-Moody, Steven and Musheno, Michael. 2006. "Stories for Research." In *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*, ed. Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, ch. 18. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Morgan, Gareth. 1986. *Images of Organization*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Nagel, Thomas. 1986. *The View from Nowhere*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Pader, Ellen J. 1994. "Spatial Relations and Housing Policy: Regulations that Discriminate Against Mexican-Origin Households." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 13: 119–35.
- Pader, Ellen-J. 1998. "Housing Occupancy Codes." In *The Encyclopedia of Housing*, ed. Willem van Vliet, 288–90. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pader, Ellen J. 2002. "Housing Occupancy Standards: Inscribing Ethnicity and Family Relations on the Land." *Journal of Architecture and Planning Research* 19: 300–18.
- Pader, Ellen. 2006. "Seeing with an Ethnographic Sensibility: Explorations Beneath the Surface of Public Policies." In *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*, ed. Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, ch. 8. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Prasad, Pushkala. 2005. *Crafting Qualitative Research: Working in the Postpositivist Traditions*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

- Protas, Jeffrey Manditch. 1979. *People Processing: The Street-Level Bureaucrat in Public Service Bureaucracies*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Rabinow, Paul and Sullivan, William M., eds. 1979. *Interpretive Social Science*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Rabinow, Paul and Sullivan, William M., eds. 1985. *Interpretive Social Science*, 2nd ed. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Rein, Martin. 1976. *Social Science and Public Policy*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Ricoeur, Paul. 1971. "The Model of the Text." *Social Research* 38: 529–62.
- Roe, Emery. 1994. *Narrative Policy Analysis: Theory and Practice*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Schaffer, Frederic Charles. 1998. *Democracy in Translation: Understanding Politics in an Unfamiliar Culture*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Schaffer, Frederic Charles. 2006. "Ordinary Language Interviewing." In *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*, ed. Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, ch. 7. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Schmidt, Ronald, Sr. 2000. *Language Policy and Identity Politics in the United States*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Schmidt, Ronald, Sr. 2006. "Value-Critical Policy Analysis: The Case of Language Policy in the United States." In *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*, ed. Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, ch. 17. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Schon, Donald A. and Rein, Martin. 1994. *Frame Reflection: Toward the Resolution of Intractable Policy Controversies*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schütz, Alfred. 1962. "On Multiple Realities." *Collected Papers*, ed. Maurice Natanson, 3 vols., 207–59. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Selznick, Philip. 1949. *TVA and the Grass Roots: A Study in the Sociology of Formal Organization*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Soss, Joe. 2006. "Talking Our Way to Meaningful Explanations: A Practice-Centered View of Interviewing for Interpretive Research." In *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*, ed. Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, ch. 6. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Swaffield, Simon. 1998. "Contextual Meanings in Policy Discourse: A Case Study of Language Use Concerning Resource Policy in the New Zealand High Country." *Policy Sciences* 31: 199–224.
- Taylor, Charles. 1971. "Interpretation and the Sciences of Man." *Review of Metaphysics* 25: 3–51.
- Walsh, Katherine Cramer. 2004. *Talking About Politics: Informal Groups and Social Identity in American Life*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Weatherley, Richard A. 1979. *Reforming Special Education: Policy Implementation from State Level to Street Level*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- White, Jay D. 1992. "Taking Language Seriously: Toward a Narrative Theory of Knowledge for Administrative Research." *American Review of Public Administration* 22: 75–88.
- White, Jay D. 1999. *Taking Language Seriously: The Narrative Foundations of Public Administration Research*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Yanow, Dvora. 1987. "Toward a Policy Culture Approach to Implementation Analysis." *Policy Studies Review* 7, 103–115.
- Yanow, Dvora. 1996. *How Does a Policy Mean? Interpreting Policy and Organizational Actions*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Yanow, Dvora. 2000. *Conducting Interpretive Policy Analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Yanow, Dvora. 2003. *Constructing American "Race" and "Ethnicity": Category-making in Public Policy and Administration*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Yanow, Dvora. 2006a. "Neither Rigorous Nor Objective? Interrogating Criteria for Knowledge Claims in Interpretive Science." In *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*, ed. Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, ch. 4. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Yanow, Dvora. 2006b. "How Built Spaces Mean: A Semiotics of Space" In *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*, ed. Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, ch. 20. Armonk, NY: M E Sharpe.
- Yanow, Dvora and Schwartz-Shea, Peregrine. 2006. *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*. Armonk, NY: M E Sharpe.



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

28 Qualitative Research and Public Policy

Alan R. Sadovnik

Over the past two decades, the use of qualitative research in the social sciences has increased significantly (Riehl 2001). Although quantitative methodologies remain the dominant paradigm in policy research and recent federal policy initiatives privileging experimental designs and randomized field trials as the gold standard for evaluation research have bolstered its position, qualitative methods remain an important tool for policy researchers (Maxwell 2004; Chatterji 2005). The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the evolution of qualitative research, its strengths and weaknesses, how it differs from quantitative research, and its important contributions to public policy research, especially in educational research. Based upon this discussion, I will argue that qualitative research should be part of any mixed-method approach to policy research.

WHAT IS QUALITATIVE RESEARCH?

Qualitative research involves research that uses observational, communicative, and documentary methods in natural settings (Riehl 2001, 116) in an effort to understand the social world. According to Denzin and Lincoln, it is

multi-method in focus, involving an interpretive, naturalistic approach to its subject matter. This means that qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them. Qualitative research involves the studied use and collection of a variety of empirical methods—case study, personal experience, introspective, life story, interview, observational, historical, interactional, and visual texts—that describe routine and problematic moments in individuals' lives. (1994, 2)

Some qualitative researchers have remained squarely in the scientific tradition of post-positivism: insisting on objectivity, rigorous research design, and examining causality (Maxwell 2004). Others are more rooted within interpretive traditions, including symbolic interactionism, ethnomethodology, hermeneutics, postmodernism, feminism, critical theory, and cultural studies (Riehl 2001, 116) and in varying degrees reject post-positivist notions of scientific rigor.

HISTORY OF QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

Logical positivism has been the foundation for social science methods since the nineteenth century. From Comte's introduction of a positive science of society, later to be termed positivism, to Durkheim's codification of positivist empiricism in his classic *The Rules of Sociological Method*, quantitative methods dominated social science, especially in the United States (Denzin and Lincoln

1994, 1–17). However, there has been a rich, concurrent qualitative tradition, beginning with cultural anthropology and institutionalized in sociology by the Chicago School in the 1920s–1940s (Vidich and Lyman 1994, 23–59).

The Chicago School sociologists, such as Robert Park, Ernest W. Burgess, W.I. Thomas and Louis Wirth produced a series of ethnographic studies on Chicago neighborhoods that was part of the larger project of producing an ecological theory of urban life. These sociologists moved away from the “missionary” perspective of earlier sociologists such as Albion Small and early cultural anthropologists seeking to bring a Christian attitude to the study of “primitive” cultures. The Chicago School made ethnographic studies an important feature of American sociology (Vidich and Lyman 1994, 32–35).

Working within this tradition, William Foote Whyte’s *Street Corner Society* (1943, 1955, 1981) about Italian Americans living in the North End of Boston introduced participant observation as an important part of ethnography. Whyte lived in the neighborhood, interacted daily with his “Cornerville” boys and became a subject of his own study. Like his mentors in Chicago’s Sociology Department, Whyte’s work was “initially motivated by a sense of moral responsibility to up-lift the slum-dwelling masses,” but became the model for future ethnographic research in which the researcher became part of the group he was studying. Such immersion required ethnographers to move back and forth between their roles as “objective” observers and their roles as “subjective” participants (Vidich and Lyman 1994, 34).

Some Chicago School researchers, like Park, worked from an assimilationist model, with their works exploring how to assimilate new immigrants into the urban Protestant middle class culture. Others like Hollingshead (1949/1961) celebrated nineteenth-century small town values and relied on Durkheim’s distinction between mechanical and organic societies and Tonnie’s distinction between *gemeinschaft* and *gesellschaft*. Neither model, however, could account for the racism within American society and the opposition to the assimilation of African Americans into mainstream culture. Another Chicago trained sociologist, African-American E. Franklin Frazier produced a series of works (1937a, 1937b, 1957) that “stands apart, not only because it points to the exclusion of blacks from the American ideal of brotherhood and the then-emerging civic otherhood, but also because its research orientation drew on the life histories of his subjects and his own experience (Vidich and Lyman 1994, 34).

From World War II to the present, American sociology moved away from the assimilationist model to a more pluralist one, with ethnographies rejecting a linear pattern of the integration of immigrants and African Americans into white, middle-class culture. Recent works such as Portes and Rumbaut’s *Legacies: The Story of the Immigrant Second Generation* (2001) provides much more nuanced ethnographic accounts of the tensions between assimilation and separation and introduces the term “segmented assimilation” to reject a linear model of cultural integration. What *Legacies* has in common with earlier ethnographic accounts is its rich descriptions of immigrant life and an understanding of the subjective perspectives of individuals and groups, the hallmark of qualitative research.

From the early twentieth century, qualitative research has been influenced by interpretive and phenomenological paradigms in the social sciences (Giddens 1975). From the symbolic interactionism of G.H. Mead and Herbert Blumer with its emphasis on the social construction of reality, to the sociological analysis of everyday life by Erving Goffman (1961a, 1961b, 1963a, 1963b, 1967) and ethnomethodologist Harold Garfinkel (1967), qualitative researchers sought to uncover the contextual use of symbols, such as language and dress and the problematic nature of meanings (Collins 1975; Sadovnik 1994). These micro-sociologies of everyday discourse and interactions laid bare the ways in which social actors constructed meaning in the context of social interactions and how everyday life is often confused, problematic and uncertain. When combined with more macro-structural approaches, these sociologies of everyday life became powerful analyses of social order and change (Collins 1975, 2005).

From the 1980s to the present, qualitative research has been heavily influenced by postmodernism. Postmodernism developed out of a profound dissatisfaction with the modernist project of enlightenment and reason. Beginning with the poststructural writings of Jacques Derrida (1973, 1981, 1982) and Jean Baudrillard (1981, 1984), social theorists, particularly in France, questioned the appropriateness of modernist categories for understanding what they saw as a postmodern world, a world that transcended the economic and social relations of the industrial world that modernist thought had sought to understand. In particular, the work of Jean Francois Lyotard (1982, 1984) rejected the Marxist perspective and the Enlightenment and modernist assumptions underlying Marxist theory and sought to create a different theory for the late twentieth century.

There is a vast body of literature on the definition of postmodernist theory (Aronowitz and Giroux 1991; Giroux 1991; Harvey 1989; Jameson 1982, 1992; Jencks 1987; Lyotard 1984), as well as a growing body of literature on postmodern approaches to education (Aronowitz and Giroux 1991; Cherryholmes 1988; Doll 1989; Ellsworth 1989; Giroux 1988, 1991; Lather 1989; McLaren 1986, 1991; McLaren and Hammer 1989; Wexler 1987).

It is important to begin by defining modernist social theory. In both sociology and philosophy, modernist theory traces its intellectual heritage to the Enlightenment. From the classical sociological theory of Marx (1971), Marx and Engels (1947), Weber (1978), and Durkheim (1938/1977, 1947), to the pragmatist philosophy of Dewey (1916, 1927/1984), and to the social theory of Jürgen Habermas (1979, 1981, 1982, 1983, 1987), what is usually referred to as modernist theories had a number of things in common. First, they believed in progress through science and technology, even if they were skeptical of positivist social science. Second, they emphasized the Enlightenment belief in reason. And third, they stressed Enlightenment principles such as equality, liberty, and justice.

Postmodernist thought consists of many interrelated themes. First, postmodernism insists on what Lyotard (1984) has labeled the rejection of all metanarratives. By this, Lyotard meant that modernist preoccupation with grand, total, or all-encompassing explanations of the world need to be replaced by localized and particular theories. Second, postmodernism stresses the necessary connection between theory and practice as a corrective to the separation of them in much modernist thought. Third, postmodernism stresses the democratic response to authoritarianism and totalitarianism. In particular, Stanley Aronowitz and Henry Giroux (1991), Giroux (1991), and Peter McLaren and R. Hammer (1989) call for a democratic, emancipatory, and antitotalitarian theory and practice, with schools seen as sites for democratic transformation. Fourth, postmodernism sees modernist thought as Eurocentric and patriarchal. Giroux (1991), Patricia Lather (1991), Elizabeth Ellsworth (1989), and others provide an important critique of the racism and sexism in some modernist writings and of the failure of modernism to address the interests of women and people of color. Fifth, postmodernist theorists believe that all social and political discourses are related to structures of power and domination. Sixth, postmodernism stresses what N. Burbules and S. Rice (1991) term "dialogue across differences." Recognizing the particular and local nature of knowledge, postmodern theorists call for the attempt to work through differences rather than to see them as hopelessly irreconcilable. Thus, postmodern theories of education call for teachers and students to explore the differences between what may seem like inherently contradictory positions in an effort to achieve understanding, respect, and change.

In qualitative research the works of Norman Denzin and Yvonne Lincoln (1994, 2000, 2005) have influenced what has been termed the postmodern turn. Rejecting the modernist approaches of earlier qualitative researchers such as Howard Becker, whose *Boys in White* (Becker 1961/1976), applied rigorous scientific methods of quantitative research to qualitative analysis, postmodernists rejected the principles of logical positivism and crossed theoretical and methodological boundaries. These researchers produced small case studies, celebrated stories and narratives, and questioned the possibility of objectivity. These researchers often blurred the lines between social science and literature, with traditional methodological concerns with objectivity, sample size, and reliability and validity rejected as Eurocentric and oppressive (Kincheloe and Steinberg 1998; Lather 1989,

1991). Sadovnik (1995) provides a critique of postmodern research in education, arguing that they often lack empirical evidence to support their claims. Nonetheless, in the last decade they have increasingly become an important school of qualitative research.

Insufficient empirical evidence is certainly a problem for policy research, where policy makers rely on sound empirical findings to influence policy. Despite the problems with much postmodern research, there remains a significant body of qualitative research that is methodologically sound and is important for policy research. Riehl (2001, 117) argues that there have been numerous important qualitative studies in the sociology of education that have influenced policy in a number of areas, including studies of inequality and the differential effects of schooling on student achievement, schooling and socialization, schools as social organizations, and policy issues in education.

THE NATURE OF QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

Qualitative research is based on what sociologists term social constructionism and interpretivism. Unlike quantitative research, which is usually deductive (theory testing), qualitative research is usually inductive (theory construction). Social scientists do not simply discover or find knowledge; they are not detached from the world they are researching. Rather, they actively construct knowledge by inventing tools and instruments to collect and produce data. These tools and instruments are constantly renewed and revised. Social scientists formulate concepts to make interpretations of the data. The language coined to interpret data is distinguished from everyday talk, but also enters everyday talk. As concepts enter everyday talk they shape everyday practices and activities. There are a number of different forms of constructionism:

- **Weak Constructionism:** “Scientific knowledge is in part the product of processes of social negotiation without claiming that such knowledge is *only* a matter of social negotiation.” This position avoids the relativist view that any interpretation is as good as another (Schwandt 2000, 199).
- **Strong Constructionism:** “Radical social constructionists ... argue that knowledge is the product of social processes and that all statements of the true, the rational, and the good are the products of various particular communities of interpreters and thus to be regarded with suspicion” (ibid., 199).

Interpretivism views human action as inherently meaningful and therefore qualitative researchers interpret the subjective meaning of action (grasping the actor’s beliefs, desires, etc.) from an objective manner. Within this context, understanding is an intellectual process whereby the researcher (the inquirer as subject) gains knowledge about an object (the meaning of human action). Researchers refer to the hermeneutic circle of understanding which is “object oriented”: it directs the researcher to the texts, institutions, practices or norms of life that are the object of inquiry. No reference is made to the researcher (Schwandt 2000).

A more radical branch of interpretivism is derived from philosophical hermeneutics, which is radical departure from other interpretivist methods. This perspective challenges the Cartesian binary or dichotomy between the inquirer (subject) and the object of inquiry (research object) and argues that:

- research knowledge cannot simply reproduce the meanings or understandings of the empirical world without taking into account the researchers’ biases;
- understanding is something that is *produced* in the dialogue of research;

- a naive realism or objectivism is opposed with respect to meaning and endorses the position that there is never a finally correct interpretation;
- meaning is negotiated. (Schwandt 2000, as cited in Singh 2005)

Based upon the view that reality is socially constructed and negotiated, qualitative researchers attempt to uncover this situated, contextual, and changing nature of reality. In order to do this, qualitative researchers use a variety of methodological approaches and sampling techniques.

ETHNOGRAPHY

Ethnography refers to an in-depth study of a group of people or individuals in their or his context. It is both descriptive and interpretive, providing an insider view of the subjects. This includes what is called an emic view, the view of the insiders of themselves, and an etic view, the view of the outsiders of the culture. The ethnographic method includes the following:

- Selection of the group/site
- Gaining entrance
- Identification of area of interest
- Immersion in the context
- Gaining informants
- Data gathering (observations, interviews, artifacts)
- Data analysis and theory development—intermittent with collection—“thick description”
- Avoidance of theoretical preconceptions. (Singh 2005)

ACTION RESEARCH

This type of qualitative method is aimed at improving a certain practice, organizational context or a way of life. Action research is characterized by the following:

- It understands practice as a social phenomenon;
- It involves the people within the practice in the research process—it is participatory;
- It involves people working collaboratively with each other and with people from the outside;
- It is critical—asks why, why not, whose voice is being heard, and whose interests are being served;
- Aims at empowering people inside the practice. (Singh 2005)

Researchers who want to directly influence the practice within organizations most often use action research. For example, educational researchers often conduct action research with teachers and principals in schools in order to discover what works and what does not work and to collaboratively implement organizational change. From a positivist standpoint, such a priori political goals violate the objective norms of science and make the researcher part of the processes under investigation. Action researchers reject this stance of objectivity and argue that the purpose of research is to help improve the organizations under investigation. Although action research has become an important tool for policy research, it remains controversial.

CASE STUDY

A case study is a holistic, in-depth investigation that uses multiple sources of data that can be either quantitative or qualitative. There are three types of case studies: *Exploratory*, *Explanatory*, and *Descriptive*. The researcher selects cases for either intrinsic or instrumental reasons; it can be different from ethnography because it does not necessarily aim to see the emic view and different from action research because it does not necessarily aim to change a practice or involve the people from the inside (Singh 2005).

GROUNDED RESEARCH

Based on the grounded theory of Strauss and Glaser (1967) and Strauss and Corbin (1990), the general goal of grounded theory research is to construct theories in order to understand phenomena. Its main contribution is in generating theory from data in a systematic way—theory grounded in the data. Using the process of analytic induction, grounded theory research examines cases in detail and continues to build theory from the bottom up—based on observations of particular data. In the process of examining these cases over time, the researcher continually refines and develops new theories to explain the observed phenomena.

These types of qualitative approaches involve a number of different methods, some or all of which can be used in a given study. These include interviews, focus group interviews, observation (participant and non-participant), archival and content analysis.

Interviews may be conducted face-to-face, by e-mail, or telephone and may be informal, semi-structured, or formal, structured interviews. They are sometimes audiotaped and then carefully transcribed. These transcripts can be analyzed using a number of different qualitative software packages, which organize the data according to a number of themes.

A selected group of individuals may be interviewed on a common topic; the group dynamics provide valuable information. These focus groups are often organized around a topic, scenario, or dilemma. Although focus groups can provide the interviewer with important insights, they can also be manipulated by the presence of a strong personality in the group. Skilled focus group interviewers have to manage the group dynamics carefully.

Observation may be participant observation or non-participant observation. In participant observation, the researcher becomes a part of the context he/she is studying. For example, in *Street Corner Society*, William Foote Whyte lived in the North End of Boston and became a member of the group he was studying. In *Home Advantage*, Annette Lareau served as a teaching assistant in the schools she was studying. The purpose of such immersion is to allow the researcher to become part of the culture and to understand the subjective perception of members. The danger is that participant observers can lose their objectivity or begin to see the world as members rather than researchers.

Non-participant observation involves observing individuals or groups from the outside, often without any direct interaction. The work of Erving Goffman (1971) is the best example of such an approach. Goffman observed people in their natural settings, including theaters, cafeterias, train stations, public restrooms and built a dramaturgical theory of human interaction. This approach saw social actors as in a continual state of performance and interpretation. Adler and Adler (1994) note that the major problem with this form of research concerns its validity, as without interacting with people, the researcher is always interpreting their behavior from his perspective, without benefit of learning the subjective perspective of the individuals involved.

Qualitative researchers sometimes study situations and organizations of which they are a part. This type of research, observer as participant is a potentially fruitful but difficult form of qualitative research. Sadovnik (1994) and Semel (1994) provide accounts of the difficulties of conducting

research in schools in which they were teaching and of the need to bracket out their insider perspective as a member of the group from their outside perspective as researcher.

One of the most controversial issues in observational research is the question of consent. Although IRB (Institutional Review Board) regulations require that researchers inform their subjects that they will be studying them, some researchers argue that deception may be necessary to uncover the workings of some organizations. Journalists, for example, sometime pose as members without consent in order to do an expose. For example, Emily Sachar taught as a New York City public school teacher for a year and then wrote a series of articles in *Newsday*, later published as *Shut Up and Let the Lady Teach* (1991). The principal, teachers, and students in the school did not know she was a journalist until the series was published. Punch (1994) argues that although deception is generally a violation of social science research codes, there may be times when the public good outweighs this restriction, so long as the ethical dictum, “do no harm” is followed.

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING QUALITATIVE RESEARCH DESIGNS

Qualitative policy research must be conducted in a systematic manner if policy makers are going to take its recommendations seriously. Therefore, we must be able to evaluate the research designs of qualitative studies. The criteria for such evaluation include:

- Identification of comments about participant/site selection-sampling procedures, ethical clearance procedures, design of data collection protocols, and data analysis instruments;
- Rationale for sampling procedures—choice of sites, participants, and size of cohort;
- Deployment of different data collection instruments—interviews, observation, documents, and audio/video recordings;
- Systematic procedure for recording data—protocols, and transcription conventions;
- Systematic procedure for analyzing data;
- Reliability of sample size: Although qualitative research does not require the type of reliability and generalizability of quantitative research, the question of sample size remains an important one. Whether educational policy makers can or should make policy based on one classroom or school is an important question. The evaluation of sample size usually revolves around whether or not the case or cases can be seen in some way as representative of a larger population of which it or they are a part. (Creswell 2005, in cited in Singh, 2005)

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004, 20) provide a useful discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of qualitative research:

Strengths

- The data are based on the participants’ own categories of meaning.
- It is useful for studying a limited number of cases in depth.
- It is useful for describing complex phenomena.
- Provides individual case information.
- Can conduct cross-case comparisons and analysis.
- Provides understanding and description of people’s personal experiences of phenomena (i.e., the “emic” or insider’s viewpoint).

- Can describe, in rich detail, phenomena as they are situated and embedded in local contexts.
- The researcher identifies contextual and setting factors as they relate to the phenomenon of interest.
- The researcher can study dynamic processes (i.e., documenting sequential patterns and change).
- The researcher can use the primarily qualitative method of “grounded theory” to generate inductively a tentative but explanatory theory about a phenomenon.
- Can determine how participants interpret “constructs” (e.g., self-esteem, IQ).
- Data are usually collected in naturalistic settings in qualitative research.
- Qualitative approaches are responsive to local situations, conditions, and stakeholders’ needs.
- Qualitative researchers are responsive to changes that occur during the conduct of a study (especially during extended fieldwork) and may shift the focus of their studies as a result.
- Qualitative data in the words and categories of participants lend themselves to exploring how and why phenomena occur.
- One can use an important case to demonstrate vividly a phenomenon to the readers of a report.
- Determine *idiographic* causation (i.e., determination of causes of a particular event).

Weaknesses

- Knowledge produced may not generalize to other people or other settings (i.e., findings may be unique to the relatively few people included in the research study).
- It is difficult to make quantitative predictions.
- It is more difficult to test hypotheses and theories.
- It may have lower credibility with some administrators and commissioners of programs.
- It generally takes more time to collect the data when compared to quantitative research.
- Data analysis is often time consuming.
- The results are more easily influenced by the researcher’s personal biases and idiosyncrasies.

Based upon these strengths and weaknesses, it is clear that qualitative research should be an important part of public policy research. Riehl (2004) argues that qualitative research in the sociology of education has made valuable contributions to our understanding of educational problems and has offered policy makers useful data for school improvement. In an age where educational research is dominated by the Institute of Education Sciences at the U.S. Department of Education labeling experimental research design and randomized field trials modeled after the pharmaceutical and medical research communities as the “gold standard” for evaluating what works and recommending policy and programmatic interventions, it is imperative that qualitative research is recognized as an important tool for policy makers. Whether studies are totally qualitative or part of a mixed-method approach that uses both quantitative and qualitative methods, qualitative research provides important data for public policy. Chatterji (2005) argues convincingly that a mixed-method approach rich in qualitative methods must be part of extended-term mixed-method (ETMM) evaluation designs to ensure researchers provide policy makers with the best evidence of what works in education. This is certainly true in other areas such as public administration, health care, transportation, criminal justice, and other public policy realms.

A number of examples of how qualitative research informs public policy are in order. Annette Lareau’s *Home Advantage* (1989) and *Unequal Childhood: Class, Race and Family Life* (2004) provide in-depth ethnographic accounts of the relationship between family and schools. These books

provide policy makers with an understanding of how families and schools can work together to improve student achievement. Pierrette Hondagneu-Sotelo's *Domestica* provides a qualitative investigation of the world on Latina immigrant domestic workers in Los Angeles and offers important findings to improve the working and living conditions of immigrants. Lois Weis's *Class Reunion* examines how a group of working class adults in a northeastern de-industrialized city have adapted to the new service economy. A follow-up to her *Working Class without Work* (1990), Weis re-interviewed the graduates of the high school she studied in 1985. Using what she terms qualitative longitudinality (2005), Weis provides two ethnographic snapshots of the same individuals over two decades and how they responded to changing economic and social conditions. Weis's work provides important data for policy makers concerned with improving the lives of workers in a rapidly changing global economy. Roger Sanjek, *The Future of Us All* is a detailed qualitative ethnography of the Elmhurst-Corona section of Queens in New York City. Based on fifteen years of ethnographic research, Sanjek chronicles how the new waves of immigrant groups turned the area into one of the most racially and ethnically diverse neighborhoods in the United States. Through an analysis of how these immigrant groups interacted with neighbors who had been their longer and with the New York City political and economic elites, Sanjek provides valuable data for urban planners and policy makers. These are just a few of the important qualitative studies that have made significant contributions to public policy debates. They are all methodologically rigorous, scrupulously researched, and illustrate the importance of qualitative research for public policy research.

REFERENCES

- Adler, P. A., and Adler, P. (1994). Observational Techniques. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 377–392). London: Sage.
- Aronowitz, S., and Giroux, H. (1991). *Postmodern education: Politics, culture and social criticism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Baudrillard, J. (1981). *For a critique of the political economy of the sign* (Charles Leaven, Trans.). St. Louis: Telos Press.
- Baudrillard, J. (1984). The precession of simulacra. In B. Wallis, (Ed.), *Art after modernism: Rethinking representation* (pp. 213–281). Boston: David Godine.
- Becker, H. (1961/1976). *Boys in white*. Somerset, NJ: Transaction Books. (Originally published in 1961)
- Burbules, N., and Rice, S. (1991). Dialogue across differences: Continuing the conversation. *Harvard Educational Review*, 61(4), 393–416.
- Burbules, N., and Rice, S. (1992). Can we be heard? A reply to Leach. *Harvard Educational Review*, 62(2), 264–271.
- Chatterji, M. (2005). Evidence on “What Works”: An argument for extended-term mixed-method (ETMM) evaluation designs. *Educational Researcher*, 34(5):14–24
- Cherryholmes, C. (1988). *Power and criticism: Poststructural investigations in education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Collins, R. (1975). *Conflict sociology*. New York: Academic Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2005). *Educational research, planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (2nd edition). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education
- Denzin, N. K., and Lincoln, Y.S. (Eds.) (1994). *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Denzin, N. K., and Lincoln, Y.S. (Eds.) (2000). *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Denzin, N. K., and Lincoln, Y.S. (Eds.) (2005). *Handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Derrida, J. (1973). *Speech and phenomenon*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Derrida, J. (1981). *Positions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Derrida, J. (1982). *Of grammatology*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York: Free Press.
- Dewey, J. (1984). The public and its problems. In John Dewey: *The later works*, Vol. 2: 1925–1927. Carbondale & Edwardsville, IL: Southern Illinois University Press. (Original work published 1927)
- Durkheim, E. (1947). *The division of labor in society*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press. (Original work published 1893)
- Durkheim, E. (1952). *The rules of sociological method*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Durkheim, E. (1977). The evolution of educational thought (P. Collins, Trans.). London: Routledge (Kegan Paul. (Original published in 1938)
- Ellsworth, E. (1989). Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review*, 59(3), 297–324.
- Frazier, E. F. (1937a). The impact of urban civilization on Negro family life. *American Sociological Review*, 2: 609–618.
- Frazier, E. F. (1937b). Negro Harlem: An ecological study. *American Journal of Sociology*, 43: 72–88.
- Frazier, E. F. (1957). *Black bourgeoisie: The rise of a new middle class in the United States*. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.
- Giddens, A. (1975). *The new rules of sociological method*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Giroux, H. (1981). *Ideology, culture and the process of schooling*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Giroux, H. (1983). *Theory and resistance in education*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey.
- Giroux, H. (1988). *Teachers as intellectuals*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey.
- Giroux, H. (1991). *Postmodernism, feminism, and cultural politics: Redrawing educational boundaries*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Goffman, E. (1961a). *Asylums*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Goffman, E. (1961b). *Encounters*. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Goffman, E. (1963a). *Stigma*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Goffman, E. (1963b). *Behavior in public places*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Habermas, J. (1979). *Communication and the evolution of society*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Habermas, J. (1981). Modernity versus postmodernity. *New German Critique*, 8(1), 3–18.
- Habermas, J. (1982). The entwinement of myth and enlightenment. *New German Critique*, 9(3), 13–30.
- Habermas, J. (1983). Modernity: An incomplete project. In H. Foster (Ed.), *The anti-aesthetic: Essays on postmodern culture* (pp. 3–16). Seattle, WA: Bay Press.
- Habermas, J. (1987). *The philosophical discourse of modernity* (F. Lawrence, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Harvey, D. (1989). *The condition of postmodernity: An inquiry into the origins of cultural change*. Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell.
- Hemmings, A. (2006). Great ethical divides: Bridging the gap between institutional review boards and researcher. *Educational Researcher*, 35(4), 12–17.
- Hondagneu-Sotelo, P. (2004) *Domestica*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Jameson, F. (1982). Postmodernism and consumer society. In H. Foster (Ed.), *The anti-aesthetic: Essays on postmodern culture* (pp. 11–125). Seattle: Bay Press.
- Jencks, C. (1987). *What is post-modernism?* New York: St. Martin's.
- Johnson, R. and Onwuegbuzie, A. (2004). Mixed methods: a research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Researcher*, 33(7):14–26.
- Kincheloe, J. L., and Steinberg, S. R. (Eds.). (1998). *Unauthorized methods: Strategies for critical teaching*. New York: Routledge.
- Lareau, A. (1989). *Home advantage*. New York: Routledge.
- Lareau, A. (2004). *Unequal childhood: Class, race and family life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lather, P. (1989). Critical theory, curriculum transformation, and feminist mainstreaming. *Journal of Education*, 1966 (March), 49–62.
- Lather, P. (1989). Postmodernism and the politics of enlightenment. *Educational Foundations*, 3 (3), 8–9.
- Lather, P. (1991). *Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy within the postmodern*. New York: Routledge.
- Lyotard, J. F. (1984). *The postmodern condition* (G. Bennington & B. Massumi, Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

- Maxwell, J. Causal explanation, qualitative research and scientific inquiry in education. *Educational Researcher*, 33(2): 3–11.
- Marx, K. (1971). *The poverty of philosophy*. New York: International Publishers.
- Marx, K., and Engles, F. (1947). *The German ideology*. New York: International Publishers. (Original work published 1846)
- McLaren, P. (1991). Schooling and the postmodern body: Critical pedagogy and the politics of enmeshment, In H. Giroux, *Postmodernism, feminism, and cultural politics: Redrawing educational boundaries* (pp., 144–173). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- McLaren, P., and Hammer, R. (1989). Critical pedagogy and the postmodern challenge: Toward a critical postmodernist pedagogy of liberation. *Educational Foundations*, 3(3), 29–62.
- Portes, A., and Rumbaut, R. (2001). *Legacies: The story of the immigrant second generation*.
- Punch, M. (1994). Politics and ethics in qualitative research. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 83–97). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Riehl, C. (2001). Bridging to the future: The contributions of qualitative research to the sociology of education. *Sociology of Education*, 74 (Extra Issue): 115–134.
- Sacher, E. (1991). *Shut up and let the lady teach*. New York: Poseidon Press.
- Sadovnik, A. R. (1994). *Excellence and equity in higher education*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Sadovnik, A. R. (1995). Postmodernism and the sociology of education: Closing the rift among scholarship, research, and practice. In George Noblit & William Pink (Eds.), *Continuity and contradiction: The futures of the sociology of education*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Sanjek, R. (2000). *The future of us all*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Schwandt, T. A. (2000). Three Epistemological Stances for Qualitative Inquiry: Interpretivism, Hermeneutics and Social Constructionism. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 189–213). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Semel, S. F. (1994a). Writing School History as a Former Participant: Problems in Writing the History of an Elite School. In G. Walford (ed.) *Researching the powerful in education* (pp. 204–220), University College London Press.
- Singh, P. (2005). Data collection in qualitative research. Brisbane, Queensland, Australia: Queensland University of Technology, CD ROM of course EDN611, possession of author; also at <http://olt.qut.edu.au/edu/EDN611/sec/index.cfm?>
- Strauss, A. and Glaser, B.G. (1967) *Discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Somerset, NJ: Aldine Transaction.
- Vidich, A. J. and Lyman, S. M. (1994). Qualitative Methods: Their History in Sociology and Anthropology. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 23–59). London: Sage.
- Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and society* (Vols. 1 & 2). (G. Roth & C. Wittich, Eds.) Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Wexler, P. (1987). *Social analysis: After the new sociology*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Whyte, W.F. (1981). *Street corner society: The social structure of an Italian slum* (3rd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1943)
- Weis, L. (2004). *Class Reunion*. New York: Routledge.



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

29 Interpretation and Intention in Policy Analysis

Hendrik Wagenaar

1 INTERPRETATION IN POLICY ANALYSIS: CAUSAL VERSUS INTENTIONAL EXPLANATION

The interpretative approach to policy analysis is not one singular method, but rather a family of approaches. Different approaches to interpretive theory have varying takes on the object of interpretation (intentions, reasons, traditions, stories, discourses, systems of signs), follow different methods, and operate on different philosophical preconceptions, but their shared assumption is that policy formation and implementation, or broader, the activities and interactions of government agencies, public officials and their publics in civil society, cannot be properly understood unless we grasp their relevant meanings (Bevir and Rhodes 2003). For example, as Yanow puts it in characterizing interpretive policy analysis: “An interpretive approach to policy analysis (...) is one that focuses on the meanings of policy, on the values, feelings, or beliefs they express, and on the processes by which those meanings are communicated to and ‘read’ by various audiences.” (Yanow 2000) This is the standard definition of interpretive policy analysis, and obviously it makes sense as it couples a particular mode of inquiry and explanation to a particular image of the social-political world. That world, which is both the object and context of policy analysis, is characterized by “values, feelings and beliefs” (Weiss and Rein 1970) and the way these are expressed and communicated among various groups. It is also—something that is undercharacterized in Yanow’s definition—about acting in a world of uncertainty that originates in complexity (Bohman 1996; Dryzek 1990), irrepressible ambiguity and contingency (Schwandt 1997), and the inevitable conflict and incompatibility that spring forth from pluralistic practices and institutional positions (Kekes 1993; Wagenaar 2002).

To understand such a world, explanations in terms of causal connections between an entity x and an entity y don’t make much sense. For example, to say that, when one declines to vote for candidate A because one disagrees with his position on abortion, that his or her nonvoting behavior is “caused” by a position on abortion would be seriously misleading. After all, despite his or her stand on abortion, one could still have decided to vote for him because one believes he is a better leader in times of crisis, or because he is the lesser of two evils, or because one feels affinity with his personality, or because one has always been voting Republican/Democrat and to do otherwise now just doesn’t feel right, or because one’s father-in-law votes for him, and so forth. Not only does the terminology of causation suggest an airtight level of determination that simply isn’t warranted in the world of human action, but more importantly, it is beside the point. The very concepts that figure in the explanation—voting, position, abortion, strong leader—are not mere behaviors but *action* concepts, that is activities that are defined and constituted by an intrinsic *intention* (Fay 1975; Taylor 1977). Differently put, we, as voters and citizens of Western liberal states, grasp these concepts, and the associated behaviors, in terms of what they *mean* to us.

Meanings are not causally connected, but intentionally. An action is explained intentionally when we are able to specify the future state of affairs that required the specific action. (Elster 1983; von Wright 1971).¹ The difference with causal explanation is in the different *explananda*. An example

suggested by von Wright will make this clear. When an experimental psychologist stimulates the cortex of a monkey to elicit certain movements of the monkey's left arm, the language of intentions plays no role in the explanatory scheme. We could perhaps be tempted to say that the electrical stimulation made the monkey wave his hand, but that would be irrelevant to the causal explanation of the arm movement as an effect of the stimulation. By saying that the electrical current to the cortex, triggered certain neurological activities in certain nerve strata, which in turn made the muscles of the left arm contract so that the monkey lifted his arm, is to exhaustively explain the monkey's arm movement. To add that the stimulation of the cortex made the monkey wave at us would be to ascribe something to the monkey that greatly and unwarrantedly, transcends the explanatory scheme. What is explained is how parts of the monkey's body move under the causal influence of electrical stimulation of the cortex.

Now consider the following situation. At the time of this writing, a small controversy erupted in the Dutch media over a Moroccan Imam who, upon being presented to the Minister of Immigration in a meeting—who, a fact that is essential to this small drama, is a woman—refused to shake hands with her. The scene, including the minister's defiant reaction, was broadcast on television, and instantly a wave of indignation at the Imam's rude behavior engulfed the media. Now, to explain the Imam's behavior in causal terms would be wholly incommensurate to the situation at hand. In fact, in the days following the incident, various actors in the media, including the Imam himself, stepped in to explain the refusal to shake hands. The Imam referred to the words of the Prophet that prohibit men and women from shaking hands because of the close association of touching and sexual intercourse. The refusal to shake hands was, in fact, meant as a sign of respect to the female minister. Other Muslims, however, saw this as a particularly strict interpretation of the Koran that was inappropriate for Muslims in a modern, urban society. Others thought the minister's behavior rude and lacking in respect and pointed out that in many religious communities relations between men and women are strictly regulated. Among orthodox Jews, for example, men and women are also not allowed to shake hands.

To summarize the situation around the Minister and the Imam, the *explanandum* in this case, is not a particular muscular movement, but an *action*, a particular behavior that is constituted by an intention. Or, as von Wright puts it, an *inner* aspect that is behind the action, and the results that the action is supposed to bring about or the *outer* aspect of the action (von Wright 1971, 86). In human affairs the inner and the outer aspect of action always go together, for most of the time we act because we intend to bring about some result. In fact, by taking the intention (not to violate the commands of the Koran) out of the explanatory scheme of the Imam refusing to shake hands with the minister, we wouldn't be able to make sense of the situation. The physical movements alone are not even a necessary condition of the action "avoid shaking hands," because there are other ways of doing that like walking out of the room, turning one's back, or ignoring the minister altogether. In this particular case, intentions literally *constitute* the situation, from the expectation of shaking hands in situations like this to refusing to acknowledge the minister's extended hand. The whole storm erupted because a social code exists that defines extending and accepting (or refusing) hands as the patterned activity we recognize as greeting (Geertz 1973).

2 HOW NOT TO THINK ABOUT INTENTION

This is what we mean when we speak of actions having *meaning*. This is also the bare-bone formulation of how we explain meaningful action; how we acquire valid knowledge of it, through intentional explanation. But having said this, it leaves many questions open, some of which will be discussed in this section. First, the immediate conclusion after stating the necessity of intention in understanding human situations is that to be appropriate to their subject, the social sciences require a different kind of inquiry than the natural sciences, namely interpretive inquiry. In general terms

this seems to be the proper conclusion, but in the actual practice of doing interpretive inquiry, there are so many complexities and confusions that this becomes an almost meaningless, and in some cases even misleading, statement. But let's first state the case of an interpretive approach to the social sciences, and for the purpose of this chapter, policy sciences.

The central fact that necessitates interpretive explanation in the social sciences is that the unit of analysis, the "brute" data of the social and policy sciences, are not hardwired into social reality, but require interpretation to make them "visible" at all. Terms such as "voting," "marrying," or "negotiating" can only be inferred from the physical movements that carry them by assuming a particular purpose or intention that makes this particular movement or verbal utterance a recognizable case of marrying or negotiating. In the social sciences observation requires interpretation.

Some analysts infer from this that interpretive inquiry is, by inference, a subjective enterprise. There are two reasons why the evocation of the term subjective without any further qualification is misleading. First, the acceptability of interpretive statements is as constrained by the empirical world as is the acceptability of causal statements (Thomas 1979), but, it should be added, constrained in a different way. Second, the term "subjective" suggests that interpretation is something that takes place within the mind, or is about objects that can only be grasped by mental processes. Both objections to the term "subjective" hang together.

Let's clarify the misunderstandings about the alleged subjective character of the word "intention" by looking at an example. What does it mean when in a police report, it is stated: "The suspect was arrested because he intended to rape the victim." This statement does certainly not refer to some mental state that preceded the act of rape, that is only accessible by the person himself and that only he can avow or deny. Intention has "no experiential essence," as Jeffrey Coulter puts it. The word "intend" in the above phrase does not denote some subjective state of the suspect's mind that can only be reflected upon by the subject himself, or inferred, through empathic identification of an observer with a subject. The seemingly mentalistic word "intend" here refers as much to an observable action as the seemingly objective word "rape" later in the sentence. As Coulter states:

To learn the expression "I intend" is not to learn, miraculously, to assign a label to some introspected experience—for how could one be trained to make the correct identification of his introspected percept?—but consists, rather in learning how to perform what Austin termed a "commissive."²² To declare one's [or disavow, as in this example—HW] intention is to perform a specific sort of illocutionary act, which, like all such acts, require appropriate "felicity" conditions. Thus there is a clear and crucial connection between particular sorts of intentions and particular sorts of circumstances. . . . Thus: A description of an intention is a description of an action (an envisaged action), not of an experience. Avowals and ascriptions of intentions, then, are organized by, and gain their intelligibility from, not some mental divininations but from the particulars of public states of affairs. (Coulter 1979)

This whole process of grasping intentions takes place in, what one could call, a semiotic public space; or, more precisely, is made possible at all by being suspended in this shared linguistic realm. If a detective weighs the evidence that will or will not lead to the conclusion that the suspect had the intention to rape the victim, this whole process hinges on the public availability, and the possibility for public inspection of, such categories as "victim," "rape," and "consent." All actors in this drama—victim, suspect, detective, and later, district attorney, lawyer, judge—are bound by these pre-given cultural categories, and are unable to overstep the boundaries of these concepts-in-use (to use a famous phrase by Donald Schön) on peril of being misunderstood in the best case and ostracized in the worst. A different way to put this is that "data," judgments and conclusions (and the warrants for the conclusions), in this social event are all situated. They make sense only within a particular context. The rape claim is predicated on a complex set of (mostly tacit) background

knowledge about value systems surrounding gender, about the relation between men and women, about the set of conventions that guide the initiation of sexual contact, and so forth. Data, conclusions, as well as the grounds for those conclusions are constituted by the shared expectations, beliefs, values, routines, and practices of the members of a culture; “constitutive” indicating that the shared background knowledge “creates the very possibility of certain activities,” and, I would add, certain categories (Searle 1995, see also Fay 1975, 76; Taylor 1977). This is the meaning of those oft-used words “public” and “transparent” here. Terms such as “rape,” “sexual,” “intending,” (or “voting,” “promising,” “shaking hands”) are publicly available for everyone to see. They are transparent in that:

The public criteria for . . . “intending” are circumstantially bound and not restricted to some codified set of associated behaviors or experiences, as if these could be listed as a fixed set of “conditions”; members of a culture must exercise situated judgments, must analyze contexts for what could account as criteria for proper ascription or for the ratification of an avowal in those specific cases. (Coulter 1979, 44)

One way to try to end these convolutions about subjective and objective meaning is to follow Geertz and simply say that the whole dichotomy is misconceived. If we insert “meaning” where he uses “culture,” we would conclude then that meaning “though ideational, (...) does not exist in someone’s head, though unphysical, (...) is not an occult entity” (1973, 10). Geertz is perfectly right here, of course. It doesn’t make sense to try to locate meaning, ontologically, in the mind or in some reified cultural or institutional pattern. Actions are meaningful in that they signify something, and the question is then: What does this particular action (a disavowal of rape; the refusal to shake hands) signify? Something larger than the particularity of that singular action is being said, and this expressive force hinges on these actions being embedded in something larger in the first place, something that exists before, and independently of, the individual acting. But that something is not some reified “deep structure” or some axiomatic set of rules, but more a shared set of understandings that are linguistically inscribed in the world, and that are invoked, and, in an ongoing dialectical movement sustained, whenever we “read” the symbolic meaning of a particular behavior. So perhaps this is the place to insert what is perhaps Geertz’s most often quoted statement on culture, the analysis of meaning, and the continuity between observation and explanation in interpretive analysis: “Hopping back and forth between the whole conceived through the parts that actualize it and the parts conceived through the whole that motivates them, we seek to turn them, by a sort of intellectual perpetual motion, into explications of one another” (1983, 69).

Finally, this digression on the meaning of meaning in interpretive analysis can be concluded with a more practical hands-on statement of methodological import. The dual nature of meaning implies that, whatever our research interest—for example, the intentions of mental patients navigating the revamped social service landscape of a large American city in the 1980s (Lewis et al. 1991; Wagenaar 1987), or the emergence of the school as we know it from the vagaries of institution building in the Prussian state (Hunter 1996), or the evaluation of a particular educational reform (Dunne 1993)—our work begins with the careful and precise registering of the concrete behaviors of concrete actors. Now, these behaviors can have many different guises and many different substrates. They can be statements in interviews, observed activities, written statements in documents, both formal (reports, laws, position papers) and informal (letters, diaries). They can take the form of stories that people tell to explain their actions in particular circumstances. They can be our renderings (in research notes) of what we believe we have observed. They can be descriptions (part descriptive, part interpretive) of artifacts such as buildings, cartoons, or office spaces, or of performances or rituals. Or they can be a carefully put together reconstruction of some developmental trajectory. But what ties all these different forms of registering behaviors together is that we regard them as the expressions of, the carriers of, social meaning. Behaviors are a window upon meaning; and, safe

for the a priori imposition of theoretical schemes upon the research material (a practice that Glaser and Strauss call, “pseudo-verification”), there exists no shortcut to the extrapolation of meaning from concrete, microscopic behavior. As Geertz puts it, “Behaviors must be attended to, and with some exactness, because it is through the flow of behavior—or more precisely social action—that cultural forms find articulation” (2003, 17). The interpretive analyst acts on the assumption that the general is folded into the particular. The analogy is with chromosomes here. As chromosomes carry the full complexity of particular life form in their genetic code, so the cultural life form in all its meaningful complexity is carried within the minutiae of observed behavior.

3 VARIETIES OF INTERPRETATION IN POLICY ANALYSIS

Although the various approaches to interpretation all focus on the meanings that shape actions, they differ in important ways in how they understand and explain meaning, how they view the position of the subject in analysis, in their philosophical assumptions, and in how they articulate the role of the policy analyst. This section describes and gives examples of two well-known approaches to interpretation in policy analysis. In the course of doing this, the discussion will also explore some further complications with interpretive analysis. I will discuss respectively Dvora Yanow’s hermeneutical approach to interpretive analysis, and Mark Bevir and Rod Rhodes’ interpretivist third way between hermeneutics and poststructuralism. This doesn’t exhaust the family of interpretive approaches. It is often overlooked, for example, that qualitative research is, in method, analytical thrust, and explanatory logic, an interpretive approach. Some of the best known examples (Estroff 1981; Liebow 1967; Wiseman 1979) succeed in imaginatively reconstructing the experiential world of the subjects of study. In strictly numerical terms, qualitative research is the method of choice for most policy researchers (at least in Europe). Narrative analysis, discourse analysis (including poststructuralist analysis), the analysis of social practices, and deliberative policy analysis are also significant, vibrant ways of engaging in interpretive policy analysis that have resulted in important work. These are discussed in other sections of the book.

3.1 DVORA YANOW: HOW DOES A POLICY MEAN?

It is probably not an overstatement to claim that Dvora Yanow’s *How Does A Policy Mean?* (Yanow 1996) was one of the books that put the interpretive approach on the agenda in post-empiricist policy analysis. For many people, her approach to interpretation has become synonymous with interpretive policy analysis proper. The book’s argument is cleverly organized around a puzzle: according to any instrumental criterion, such as efficacy or efficiency in reaching the policy’s goal, the Israeli policy of creating community centers in new settlements in the 1970s was deemed a failure. Nevertheless, the policy remained well-funded for a period of over twenty years, and drew continuing support from a range of political actors in Israel. How could this be? Yanow’s answer to this seeming anomaly is that in the context of Israeli society and Israeli politics, the policy had a particular *meaning* for key audiences. Yanow urges the policy analyst to become sensitive to the expressive, symbolic aspect of policy. Not as an add-on to the “real”—read instrumental, material, power-related—aspects of policy making, but as an intrinsic aspect of each and every act of policy making. These meanings reside in all aspects of a policy; not just the legislative texts that state the policy’s intent, but also in the actions of key groups to implement the policy and in the artifacts, such as agency buildings, their furnishings, and, one could add these days, their Web sites (Yanow 1996).

In a small and useful successor to the first book, Yanow explains how to conduct interpretive policy analysis. Conceptually, interpretive policy analysis, according to her, consists of the following elements: (1) identify the artifacts (language, objects, acts) that are the carriers of meaning; (2)

identify the interpretive communities, relevant to a policy, that are the perceivers of this meaning; (3) identify the discourses through which these meanings are communicated; (4) identify any point of conflict that suggests that different groups attach divergent meanings to some aspect of a policy (Yanow 2000).

The French philosopher Paul Ricoeur has famously claimed that social behavior can be seen as a text. Yanow uses this metaphor to further clarify her position in conducting interpretive policy analysis. Public policies, both in their formulation and their enactment, should be seen as texts that are “read” by various stakeholder groups and, of course, by the analyst. Apart from a limited metaphorical value, it is not always completely clear what the added value of the text metaphor is in Yanow’s approach. (And in one, important way, it introduces a questionable element of meaning realism in the analysis. I will return to this later.) Yanow’s methodological approach, in its careful reconstruction of the perspective of the groups that are involved and the wider context from which the policy derives its meaning, is in fact quite close to the steps in traditional qualitative analysis. For example, in one key step in her approach to interpretive policy analysis, “identifying interpretive communities,” Yanow suggests to the reader that relevant information may be found in written sources (newspapers, magazines, agency newsletters, annual reports, government documents, etc.), oral sources (interviews with key actors), observation (of actions, interactions, and the material context in which these actors move about), and participation. In accessing these sources and gathering research materials, the analyst is urged to begin the process of analysis, for: “The interpretive policy analyst needs to build a context in which to access local knowledge. Knowing what specific object or piece of language has significance comes from situational familiarity—understanding what is important to stakeholders, to policy-relevant publics” (2000, 38). The actual process of analysis entails two steps: “(1) a daily sense making, out of which (2) puzzles emerge (events or acts or interactions that contradict what the analyst expected, or which he cannot make sense of, given what he knows at that moment, or which contradict one another)” (ibid.). In short, these are the very same data sources and analytical steps that make up any good qualitative study. Finally, in addition to identifying interpretive communities and how they understand a particular policy, Yanow suggests some interesting other foci of analysis that open up windows on public policy. These are the analysis of metaphors, of policy categories (the contradictions and ambiguities that reveal the hidden assumptions behind the way a particular policy carves up the world), the analysis of policy artifacts (particularly buildings), policy programs (by which Yanow, going by her text, seems to mean policy instruments), and of policy rituals.

Yanow’s version of interpretive policy analysis, as expounded in her two books and various articles, pairs clarity of exposition to practicality in its presentation of how to go about doing it. Yet it also suffers from two problems: (1) a tendency to reify meaning, and a concomitant instrumental notion of the stance of the interpretive analyst’ and (2) the absence of conflict and power in her analytic scheme.

Yanow’s version of interpretive policy analysis suffers from what is sometimes called “meaning realism.” Meaning realism is the view that “meanings are fixed entities that can be discovered and that exist independent of the interpreter” (Schwandt 2000). Meaning realism is a feature of those versions of hermeneutic analysis that aim at exegesis, the elucidation of the meaning of texts. The method of exegesis revolves around two related premises: (1) the interpreter and the object of interpretation are distinct, and (2) the first is not involved with the latter. The second premise must be taken in an epistemological way. The analyst is not necessarily emotionally uninvolved, but he is, or more precisely, he must always remain external to and unaffected by the act of interpretation (Schwandt 2000). To get the interpretive analysis started, the analyst not only has to project an a priori, and in practice more or less distinct and monolithic, “meaning” in the world, the exact nature of which is to be discerned by the analyst, but simultaneously, the analyst has to place himself outside the process of meaning-making (despite protestations that the analyst is part of the world that he analyzes) to function as an Archimedean point. The analyst gains knowledge about an object

(the meaning of human action), and the (implicit) implication is that there is one right meaning to be discovered out there. Meaning is objectified

It is at this point in particular that Yanow's text-analogy is significant. She introduces the claim that policies can be seen as texts not to elucidate a decentered, relational system of meaning-formation (such as is common in poststructuralist and deliberative approaches to interpretation. See the respective chapters in this book.), but to set out her exegetic approach to interpretation. The meaning of the policy as a "text analogue" is then "read" by the various constituencies *and* the analyst. In fact, it is the task of the analyst to "clarify" meanings, while remaining aloof from the interactions between actors by which meaning is established (Yanow 2000, 17–18). This puts Yanow squarely in the hermeneutical-essentialist tradition of finding the true meaning of texts, as some relation of correspondence between some fixed meaning "out there" and its representation by the analyst. Differently put, her aim is not to explore the internal relations (consonances and differences) between the elements of her policy system, and so to infer meaning, more or less a la Geertz, but to read the meaning that is somehow residing in the policy (Yanow 2000, 19). And although Yanow's "reading" is methodologically sophisticated, this doesn't detract from the point that meaning is pulled from the slice of social reality as a rabbit out of a hat. To quote Schwandt once again: "Thus, in interpretive traditions, the interpreter objectifies (i.e., stands over and against) that which is to be interpreted. And, in that sense, the interpreter remains unaffected by and external to the interpretive process" (2000, 195). This is a problem that affects most hermeneutically oriented approaches to interpretive policy analysis.

Second, and related to the preceding point, in Yanow's version of interpretive analysis there is little room for ambiguity, indeterminacy, power, and conflict. In general, for policy analysis to be appropriate to its intended use, it must be consonant with its political setting. This is not a "secondary consideration," as Dryzek rightly points out, for policy analysis differs from pure social science in that it is intended to be used in practical political settings. Thus, "social science may fail as policy analysis as it fails to address its political setting" (Dryzek 1982, 310). And as countless analysts have pointed out, that setting is characterized by interaction, power play, structural inequality, deep complexity, indeterminacy, dispersed decision making, lack of trust among actors, value pluralism, and a fundamental orientation to practice (Bohman 1996; Dryzek 1982, 1990; Forester 1999; Hajer and Wagenaar 2003b; Stone 1997; Wagenaar and Cook 2003). Very little of this resonates in Yanow's version of interpretive analysis. At best, she is willing to "map" the various meanings that populate the particular policy landscape that is the object of analysis. For a more direct rendering of the typical characteristics of the setting of policy analysis, we need to turn to such approaches as frame analysis, poststructuralism, and deliberative policy analysis.

3.2 MARK BEVIR AND ROD RHODES: INTERPRETING BRITISH GOVERNANCE

Bevir and Rhodes' approach to interpretive political analysis distinguishes itself from Yanow's approach in that it attempts to supply to interpretation a deeper philosophical context. Toward this end, it centers on three concepts: *tradition*, *dilemma*, and *decenteredness*. In their main text *Interpreting British Governance* (Bevir and Rhodes 2003), the authors argue the case for interpretation in political science by stating two key assumptions: (1) people act on their beliefs and preferences, and (2) we cannot infer people's beliefs from objective facts about them (such as income level) or general assumptions (such as the rationality of human actors) (2003, 19). Taken together these two premises lead to the conclusion that we cannot get around interpretation in political science. Bevir and Rhodes' version of interpretive analysis is sophisticated in that it shows awareness of the strengths and weaknesses of a large chunk of the family of interpretive approaches. In fact, it explicitly announces itself as providing a "third way" between hermeneutics and poststructuralism that, although indebted to both traditions, attempts to avoid some of the problems that the authors

ascribe to both of them.³ In particular, Bevir and Rhodes are sympathetic to the decentered approach of poststructuralists such as Foucault, who see meaning as emerging from an almost randomly thrown together assemblage of practices, beliefs, and meanings that make the very existence of certain social categories possible. To understand a social object or a particular behavior is to interpret it in the wider discourse that makes that object of behavior possible (2003, 23). On the other hand, they reject the poststructuralists' hostility toward the role of human agency in social affairs, which makes these approaches "come dangerously close to denying any scope to the subject and reason" (2003, 43). Hermeneutic interpretivism departs from an epistemologically dubious subjectivity and essentialism (the all-knowledgeable, autonomous subjects who "think and act according solely to their own reasons and commands" (2003, 32), so that this approach can "come dangerously close to embodying an analysis of the subject as autonomous and an analysis of reason as pure and universal" (ibid.).

Bevir and Rhodes introduce the concept of "tradition" to balance agency and determinism in understanding intention and meaning in the world of politics. As they state:

(A) rejection of autonomy need not entail a rejection of agency. To deny that subjects can escape from all social influences is not to deny that they can act creatively for reasons that make sense to them. On the contrary, we must allow for agency if only because we cannot separate and distinguish beliefs and actions by reference to their social context alone. Different people adopt different beliefs and perform different actions against the background of the same social structure. Thus, there must be a space on social contexts where individual subjects decide what beliefs to hold and what actions to perform for their own reasons. . . This view of agency suggests that we see social context not as episteme, languages or discourses, but as traditions. The concepts of episteme, language and discourse typically invoke social structures that fix individual acts and exist independently of them. In contrast the notion of tradition implies that the relevant social context is one in which subjects are born, which then acts as the background to their beliefs and actions without fixing them. Traditions allow for the possibility of subjects adapting, developing and even rejecting much of their heritage. (2003, 32)

Bevir and Rhodes take pains not to reify tradition. Traditions are not immovable superstructures with an inexorable inner logic that determine people's beliefs and actions. Traditions are not cultural prisons. Rather, traditions are an "initial influence" on people that "colors their later actions." Whenever the situation calls for it, people may feel the need to alter traditions. Traditions are "contingent products of the way in which people develop specific beliefs, preferences and actions" (2003, 34). Traditions emerge from "local reasoning" and "micro-practices" (2003, 35). It is here that that Bevir and Rhodes stake out the middle position between hermeneutics and poststructuralism. On the one hand: "We have to redefine tradition in a nonessentialist, decentered manner to aid any lingering sense of objective reason." On the other hand: "While a rejection of the autonomous subject prevents a belief in a neutral or universal reason, the fact of agency enables us to accept local reasoning in a way that Foucault often seems reluctant to do" (2003, 35).

How do traditions change? They change because actors struggle with dilemmas. Sticking to their nonessentialist program, the authors emphasize that dilemmas are not hardwired into reality. Dilemmas may arise from people's experiences, but this need not be the case. "Dilemmas can arise from both theoretical and moral reflection and from experiences of worldly pressures" (2003, 36). The point is that traditions and dilemmas are both defined in a *decentered* way. Traditions, dilemmas, and local practices are mutually constitutive: "Because people confront these dilemmas in diverse traditions, there arises a political contest over what constitutes the nature of the failings and what should be done about them" (2003, 64). Bevir and Rhodes' version of interpretivism thus hinges on a decentered approach to the study of political phenomena. Basic categories such as policy institu-

tions, problems, programs, networks, or governance, are not pre-given, but should be explained as the contingent products of actors' ongoing actions, struggles, and negotiations. They summarize their decentered version of interpretivism by commenting on the concept of policy networks: "We build change into the heart of our account of networks by exploring how individual actors respond to dilemmas to reinterpret and reconstruct practices and the traditions they embody" (2003, 71). Methodologically, Bevir and Rhodes propagate the microsociological approach that Geertz argued for. Decentered studies of political phenomena require that we "build a multifaceted picture of how the several actors understand and construct" the phenomenon. We should not expect to find one overarching truth, but rather, as Yanow also noted, a fundamentally pluralistic world; a world made up of "narratives about how (. . .) people understand what they are doing in networks, where these understandings usually both overlap and conflict with one another" (2003, 66).

In its nonfoundational understanding of meaning, and in its emphasis on the micro-analysis of the beliefs and actions of all actors who are involved with a particular policy sector, this approach attempts to steer free from the meaning realism of more exegetically minded forms of hermeneutic analysis. And with its singular focus on actors' struggles with and over policy dilemmas and unintended consequences, it is consonant with the complex, contested world of public policy. Yet, it suffers from the problem that it is not always clear what the epistemic status of traditions is. On the one hand, traditions are observer-independent entities, or phenomena, out there in the world that form the object of study. ("Traditions are contingent products of the ways in which people develop specific beliefs, preferences and actions" (Bevir and Rhodes 2003, 34)). On the other, they are described as analytical categories that serve as an explanatory tool that is specifically tailored to the goals of the analyst. ("Political scientists construct traditions in ways appropriate to explaining the particular sets of beliefs and actions in which they are interested" (2003, 33)). In their examples, the authors vacillate between both. Their analysis of Thatcherism, for example, is mostly a categorization of the different understandings of the academic literature on the Thatcher reforms organized according to the four well-known, but preconceived political traditions in Britain (liberal, Tory, Whig, and socialist). The four "narratives" are not based on any empirical inquiry into the way the Thatcher reforms were experienced by local administrators, professionals at public service agencies, or residents in public housing projects. Their analysis of the reforms by New Labor, however, trace the tortuous emergence of joined-up government as the result of labor officials struggling with a series of political dilemmas, policy problems, and the unintended consequences of Thatcherite reforms.

4 CONCLUDING REMARKS: POLICY INTERPRETATION, GOVERNANCE, AND DEMOCRACY

To what extent has interpretive policy analysis succeeded in becoming a viable alternative to institutionalized empiricist policy analysis? The answer must be guarded and qualified. As a theoretical endeavor, as manifested by the number and sophistication of the articles, books, and conferences that are devoted to one or another form of interpretive policy analysis, it is by now a blossoming branch of the academic discipline of policy studies. Most scholars working in this tradition no longer have much trouble in getting their work published, even in the mainstream policy and public administration journals. Certain books, such as Fischer and Forester's *The Argumentative Turn in Policy Analysis and Planning* (1993), or Deborah Stone's *Policy Paradox* (1997), have found their way into undergraduate policy curricula. And both the American Political Science Association and its European counterpart, the European Consortium of Political Research regularly devote space in their conferences to interpretive approaches to the policy sciences.

In the professional field the picture is less clear. If we restrict the interpretive approach to qualitative research, then the interpretive turn is resounding success, certainly in Europe. Much applied policy research is qualitative, generally following the format of a short case study, followed

by some conclusions and recommendations. However, it must be feared that a lot of this work is what Glaser and Strauss despairingly call “opportunistic,” with “tacked-on conclusions” (and ditto recommendations, one should add), and with little guarantee of the quality of the interviewing and data-analysis. Solid studies that, for example, shed light on the implementation of a policy initiative by inquiring into interpretive communities and the language and artifacts of a policy program (Yanow 2000), or that map stubborn policy controversies (Rein 1983) are much harder to find within government agencies and for-profit think tanks. In this sense, it must be feared that the lack of relevance that has been ascribed to empiricist policy analysis (Fischer 2003; Rein 1976) has not been alleviated by a shift to quick-and-dirty qualitative research. In practical professional terms, in these instances the interpretive turn amounts to not much more than “interpretation-lite.”

Yet, this is not all that there is to it. Interpretive policy analysis, rooted in a different understanding of what amounts to valid and justified knowledge of the social world, has always held out a different conception of democracy; a different understanding of the role of experts and citizens in the organization of democratic policy making. Interpretive social science, with its focus of making the meaning of actions transparent—both one’s own and those of others—is seen to increase the possibility of increased communication between different groups in society (Fay 1975, 80; Geertz 1973, 24). With hindsight, this promise of enlightenment and the subsequent increase of communication in a pluralistic society was overly optimistic. In a complex, conflicting world with deep, structural inequalities of power and access to essential resources, there is little chance that constructive communication spontaneously increases when competing groups are informed about the meaning that a particular government action has for different groups (Bohman 1996). For that to happen, more conditions have to be fulfilled, and it is precisely along these lines that interpretive approaches have made their greatest inroads in the last two decades.

Looking back, what has become clear is that policy analysis has not changed policy making, but instead that changes in policy making have created the possibilities, and in many cases the *necessity*, for allowing interpretive inquiry into policy analysis. Spurred by the emergence of what has become known as the network society, policy is increasingly made in complex, more or less autonomous networks of governmental and societal actors, often blurring the boundaries between the traditional levels of government (Pierre 2000; Rhodes 1996). Participants in these networks, realizing their mutual dependency in getting things done, have to find ways to collaborate—even in the face of conflicting interests and values. In addition, due to the technical and social complexity of various policy fields, government actors increasingly run into the limits of hierarchical-instrumental policy styles (Hajer and Wagenaar 2003a). The usual strategies to deal with policy complexity—such as disaggregating a complex problem in its constituent parts to solve the problem piecemeal, step by step, or to design a systems model of the problem—are extensions of instrumental rationality. In actual practice they fall short of solving the problem because they are unable to capture the dynamic interaction between the parts that is the hallmark of complexity (Urry 2003). For this reason Dryzek suggests that only nonreductionist strategies, in particular the collaboration of a wide range of participants in a communicatively rational way, will be able to deal with policy complexity (Dryzek 1990).

In many advanced liberal democracies, this situation has led to efforts to involve those affected by policy initiatives in governing through interactive policy making or coproduction. Although initially these experiments in governance were often dominated by administrators, and amounted to little more than elaborate consultation models, increasingly nongovernment actors are given genuine decision power, leading to collaborative policy making (Innes and Booher 2003), empowered participatory governance (Fung and Wright 2003), and deliberative planning (Forester 1999; Healy 1997) In this changing and fragmented policy landscape where policy is often made outside official hierarchical channels, and with actors who were, until recently, removed from any decision-making power, the consonance between an interpretive epistemology, communicative rationality, and a participative, deliberative mode of democracy, has the chance to achieve greater institutional

expression. In this way, policy analysis seems to return to Lasswell's ideal of a policy science of democracy. In the "contextual orientation" that is the heart of Lasswell's vision, policy analysis was always to include the knowledge and judgments of citizens in the solution of collective problems. Articulating and grasping meaning is a central part of this endeavor, because meaning making, as Hajer and Wagenaar conclude (Hajer and Wagenaar 2003a), although ambiguous and open-ended, is remarkably well adapted to the inconsistencies and contradictions that are characteristic of the pluralistic, complex, and indeterminate everyday policy world; where rationality is no longer seen as the efficient achievement of predetermined goals, but rather as the difficult task of trying to imagine the other's perspective through a process of open, reciprocal, and respectful communication.

NOTES

1. In the philosophy of science literature a distinction is often made between "explanation" and "understanding." The term "explanation" is used for causal explanation in the natural sciences, and "understanding" for a different kind of explanation in the humanities or "Geisteswissenschaften." The difference is sometimes said to reside in the fact that understanding has a certain psychological ring to it. Methodologically, this implies that understanding requires empathy, or the "re-creation in the mind of the scholar of the mental atmosphere, the thoughts and feelings and motivations, of the objects of his study" (von Wright 1971, 6). Hermeneutic philosophy, the branch of philosophy that takes the interpretation of the meaning of language as its entrance into grasping the world of human affairs, also rests on the same distinction between (causal) explanation and (interpretive) understanding. However, it considers the latter not as a psychological but as a language-oriented, semantic category. The empathic and the language-based version of understanding have in common that they see it as a distinct, *sui generis*, form of obtaining knowledge about the world that derives its special character from the nature of its object, namely human action. In this chapter I tend to steer clear from the debates and controversies that surround the alleged distinction between explanation and understanding. Instead I use the word "explanation" to refer both to causal and intentional explanation (Elster 1983; von Wright, 1971).
2. "The whole point of a commissive is to commit the speaker to a certain course of action. Examples are: promise, covenant, contract, undertake, bind myself, give my word, am determined to, intend, declare my intention, mean to. . . . (etc.)" (J. L. Austin, in Coulter, 1979, 163).
3. Poststructuralism in policy analysis encompasses a variety of approaches such as narrative analysis, Foucauldian genealogical analysis, governmentality, and discourse analysis, with different methodological emphases and varying substantive interest. They have in common that they consider meaning not as residing in the external world (in which meanings could be "read" by an observer, and in which language would be an expression of this external meaning), but as immanent to language systems. Meaning is in the *relation* between elements. (Howarth, 2000) Where poststructuralism differs from structuralism is that it situates the interplay of symbols in a wider context of language and action that informs the meanings thus derived. The assumption is that semantic meaning—and in its wake, institutional and personal identity—derives from the interplay of the elements of the symbolic system in relation to the wider world—itself a structure of symbols. Differently put, poststructural approaches share the insight that language is *constitutive* of social reality.

REFERENCES

- Bevir, M., & Rhodes, R. A. W. (2003). *Interpreting British Governance*. London: Routledge.
- Bohman, J. (1996). *Public Deliberation. Pluralism, Complexity, and Democracy*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Coulter, J. (1979). Transparency of Mind: the Availability of Subjective Phenomena. In J. Coulter (Ed.), *The Social Construction of Mind. Studies in Ethnomethodology and Linguistic Philosophy*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Dryzek, J. S. (1982). Policy Analysis as a Hermeneutic Activity. *Policy Sciences*, 14, 309–329.

- Dryzek, J. S. (1990). *Discursive Democracy. Politics, Policy, and Political Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dunne, J. (1993). *Back to the Rough Ground: 'Phronesis' and 'Techne' in Modern Philosophy and in Aristotle*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Elster, J. (1983). *Explaining Technical Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Estroff, S. E. (1981). *Making It Crazy. An Ethnography of Psychiatric Clients in an American Community*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Fay, B. (1975). *Social Theory and Political Practice*. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Fischer, F. (2003). Beyond Empiricism: Policy Analysis as Deliberative Practice. In M. Hajer & H. Wagenaar (Eds.), *Deliberative Policy Analysis. Understanding Governance in the Network Society* (pp. 209–227). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Forester, J. (1999). *The Deliberative Practitioner. Encouraging Participatory Planning Processes*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
- Fung, A., & Wright, E. O. (Eds.). (2003). *Deepening Democracy. Institutional Innovations in Empowered Participatory Governance*. London: Verso.
- Geertz, C. (1973). Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture. In C. Geertz (Ed.), *The Interpretation of Cultures* (pp. 3–32). New York: Basic Books.
- Hajer, M., & Wagenaar, H. (2003a). Introduction. In M. Hajer & H. Wagenaar (Eds.), *Deliberative Policy Analysis. Understanding Governance in the Network Society* (pp. 1–33). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hajer, M., & Wagenaar, H. (Eds.). (2003b). *Deliberative Policy Analysis. Understanding Governance in the Network Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Healy, P. (1997). *Collaborative Planning: Shaping Places in Fragmented Societies*. London: Macmillan.
- Howarth, D. (2000). *Discourse*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Hunter, I. (1996). Assembling the School. In A. Barry & T. Osborne & N. Rose (Eds.), *Foucault and Political Reason. Liberalism, Neo-liberalism and Traditionalities of Government* (pp. 143–167). London: UCL Press.
- Innes, J. E., & Booher, D. E. (2003). Collaborative Policymaking: Governance through Dialogue. In M. Hajer & H. Wagenaar (Eds.), *Deliberative Policy Analysis: Understanding Governance in the network Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kekes, J. (1993). *The Morality of Pluralism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Lewis, D., Riger, S., Rosenberg, H., Wagenaar, H., Lurigio, A. J., & Reed, S. (1991). *Worlds of the Mentally Ill. How Deinstitutionalization Works in the City*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Liebow, E. (1967). *Tally's Corner. A Study of Negro Streetcorner Men*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company.
- Pierre, J. (Ed.). (2000). *Debating Governance: Authority, Steering, and Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rein, M. (1976). *Social Science and Public Policy*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Rein, M. (1983). Value-Critical Policy Analysis. In D. Callahan & B. Jennings (Eds.), *Ethics, the Social Sciences, and Policy Analysis*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Rhodes, R. A. W. (1996). The New Governance: Governing without Government. *Political Studies*, 44, 652–667.
- Schwandt, T. A. (1997). Evaluation as Practical Hermeneutics. *Evaluation*, 3(1), 69–83.
- Schwandt, T. A. (2000). Three Epistemological Stances for Qualitative Inquiry. Interpretivism, Hermeneutics, and Social Constructivism. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2nd ed., pp. 189–215). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Searle, J. R. (1995). *The Construction of Social Reality*. New York: The Free Press.
- Stone, D. (1997). *Policy Paradox. The Art of Political Decision Making*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Taylor, C. (1977). Interpretation and the Sciences of Man. In F. R. Dallmayr & T. A. McCarthy (Eds.), *Understanding and Social Inquiry*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Thomas, D. (1979). *Naturalism and Social Science. A Post-Empiricist Philosophy of Social Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Urry, J. (2003). *Global Complexity*. Cambridge: Polity.
- von Wright, G. H. (1971). *Explanation and Understanding*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

- Wagenaar, H. (1987). *Virtual Institutions: Community Relations and Hospital Recidivism in the Life of the Mental Patient*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA.
- Wagenaar, H. (2002). Value Pluralism in Public Administration: Two Perspectives on Administrative Morality. In J. S. Jun (Ed.), *Rethinking Administrative Theory. The Challenge of the New Century* (pp. 105–130). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Wagenaar, H., & Cook, S. D. N. (2003). Understanding Policy Practices: Action, Dialectic and Deliberation in Policy Analysis. In M. Hajer & H. Wagenaar (Eds.), *Deliberative Policy Analysis: understanding governance in the network society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Weiss, R. S., & Rein, M. (1970). The Evaluation of Broad-Aim Programs: Experimental Design, Its Difficulties, and an Alternative. *Administrative Science Quarterly* (March), 97–109.
- Wiseman, J. P. (1979). *Stations of the Lost. The Treatment of Skid Row Alcoholics*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Yanow, D. (1996). *How Does a Policy mean? Interpreting Policy and Organizational Action*. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Yanow, D. (2000). *Conducting Interpretive Policy Analysis* (Vol. 47). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

30 Context-Sensitive Policy Methods

Susan E. Clarke

I. WHY CONTEXT-SENSITIVE POLICY METHODS?

Talking about “context-sensitive policy methods” seems an awkward and unnecessarily cumbersome way to characterize policy research. Why not just refer to qualitative methods or even post-positive orientations to distinguish contextual policy approaches from conventional policy analysis strategies? Context-sensitive policy methods share some, but not all, of the assumptions of qualitative and post-positive approaches. Most importantly, context-sensitive methods highlight policy research tools and analytic strategies that allow more systematic and rigorous research in situations where variations in context and setting are important aspects of data observations. Where data is not obvious or not easily available, both data collection tools and analysis procedures must be sensitive to the contextual specificity of the information and measurements in play.

Policy researchers often—but not always—deal with policy problems where variations in context and setting are important elements to be retained in data collection and analysis. More conventional variable-wise strategies often divorce the observations from their context in order to meet assumptions of independence for testing purposes. As a result the meaning of the observation also disappears. Contextual approaches redress this through use of analytic tools and strategies that do not rely on these conventional assumptions. Context is a critical explanatory element, not a residual category in context-sensitive research (Maxwell 2004). This chapter makes the case for context-sensitive policy research methods, describes some tools that support this approach, and identifies some of the issues raised by context-sensitive policy research.

A. CONFRONTING DUALISMS

Weimer (1999) characterizes the stance of many policy researchers in saying that, as a policy analyst, he is willing to “embrace any method that can potentially help me give better advice.” The argument here is that contextually-sensitive methods—whether they be quantitative or qualitative—are likely to generate better advice because their findings and inferences are interpretable—that is, can be plausibly defended (Collier, Brady, and Seawright 2004, 238). In addition, they are accessible and knowable to policy makers and citizens because the case-oriented tools retain the contextual features that give the observation meaning and emphasize the processes that connect events and factors to outcomes. Methods sensitive to context, therefore, contribute to valid inferences as well as increase the potential impact of policy research on policymaking.

To move toward context-sensitive policy research, rejecting, or at least sidestepping, the dualism of quantitative and qualitative methods is an important first step. Although the rhetoric in some disciplines and many departments continues to reify this purported research divide, only the most primitive form of empiricism or positivism continues to assume such stark differences (see Brower et al. 2000; Miles and Huberman 1994). The most influential book on social science research in the

last few decades, King, Keohane, and Verba's *Designing Social Inquiry* (1994) explicitly rejects this dualism. Brady and Collier's (2004) path-breaking *Rethinking Social Inquiry* now pushes this debate further by claiming these methods share a similar epistemological foundation, share similar inferential challenges stemming from their reliance on observational data, but employ diverse tools in their analyses and approach these challenges in different ways (Brady, Collier, and Seawright 2004, 11). Their call for developing shared standards for social science research underscores the need to more systematically document both the diverse tools and often implicit standards used in different research traditions.

1. The Quantitative Methods Template

This dualism is grounded in the distinctive attributes associated with these research approaches. Briefly, using quantitative methods allows the researcher to make inferences and possibly predictions about the generalizability of their findings to a larger population. To do so requires a probability sampling strategy that will allow such generalizations and a large enough number of cases to permit statistical analyses with a narrow margin of error. Researchers often approach their experimental or correlational projects armed with research designs testing theories and hypotheses generated by other scholars; both the cases and the populations are given (Ragin 2004). These assumptions and procedures encourage the researcher to choose falsifiable research questions, to rely on precise quantitative measures (especially interval or ratio-level measures), to test alternative hypotheses with statistical tools, to seek outcomes or dependent variables with sufficient variation across cases, to focus on the discrete variables "explaining" the greatest amount of variation in the dependent variable, and to set aside outliers that don't fit the most parsimonious explanations (see Ragin 2004; Maxwell 2004). Causation is inferred through correlations of variations in independent and dependent variables rather than through direct observation. Most researchers using these methods see their findings as amenable to replication by other researchers and as contributions to testing and building a larger body of theory.

2. The Qualitative Methods Template

Qualitative research is, unfortunately, often defined in terms of the absence of these features of quantitative research. As an inductive research strategy, qualitative research does not necessarily rely on hypotheses and theory. An emphasis on "thick analysis" is one of the most distinctive features of qualitative research.¹ This entails direct observation to gain detailed knowledge about a case in order to understand the meaning of the behaviors observed to the actors involved. Trying to understand "how" things happen, what the "facts" mean is a key goal and such understandings can only be developed through observing particular settings. As a result, researchers focus on a small number of cases that are theoretically or substantively important; these cases may indeed change in the process of research (Ragin 2004). Large N studies are not feasible since detailed knowledge of each case is less possible and less important in such approaches.

Making causal inferences is not necessarily the goal of all qualitative researchers. Indeed testing theory and linking findings to broader theories often appears sacrificed to the "unique" character of the particular case (Blee 2004). To some extent, qualitative researchers seem to be collecting and analyzing data simultaneously, rather than the more sequenced procedures of more quantitative research. Sampling is seemingly erratic and unstructured and theory-testing is not always a high priority. The focus often is on the processes linking events (Maxwell 2004); this emphasis

on process and causal mechanisms constitutes a distinctive approach to explanation and causality (Maxwell 2004).

In order to build theory, qualitative researchers find it essential to remain open to all the possible factors that might be important in the research setting rather than an a priori list of factors to investigate. These attributes are especially likely to characterize more ethnographic approaches which emphasize the importance of “letting the data speak for themselves” rather than constraining it with preconceived frameworks and categories (see Bayard de Volo and Schatz 2004). Overall, as Bashi (2004) points out, qualitative researchers put a premium on the virtue of avoiding “control” of all the factors that quantitative researchers see as important—the subjects, the research protocols, the relationship of the researcher and the respondent, and the context itself. They emphasize that the researcher is constructing knowledge or data, not relying on some package of assembled data. The fluidity and unstructured nature of these processes make qualitative research methods appear “nearly antithetical to the scientific method influenced by a longstanding positivist tradition” (Bashi, V. 2004; see also, Flick 2002).

B. WHICH TEMPLATE BEST GUIDES RESEARCH?

NSF’s recent workshop on qualitative methods characterized many of the “best practices” for qualitative research as systematic and rigorous approaches that can document the reliability and validity of their findings (NSF 2004; Blee 2004). They also emphasized the importance of using research questions rather than descriptive goals to frame the research as well as designing a sampling and analytic framework allowing exploring alternative explanations, even if these change during the course of research (Blee 2004). Validity issues, often the bane of qualitative research, should be continuously assessed. Nevertheless, the major assets of qualitative research—the emergence of nonparsimonious explanations and stories, the contextual focus, the information of respondent’s perceptions, the long-term engagement of the researcher—are to be highlighted (Bless 2004, 56).

To many, the NSF report sounded like a set of mixed messages. Neither data nor methods are inherently quantitative or qualitative. Social science research overwhelmingly draws on observational data—data that is amenable to analysis through any number of techniques, often both quantitatively or qualitatively. This is especially so for documents, interviews, and text—there is nothing about this “data” that is obviously quantitative or qualitative. Even naturalistic observations can be coded and analyzed with quantitative methods although the researcher may well complain that doing so robs the “data” of the meanings so laboriously collected. Similarly, characterizing some analysis strategies as more obviously qualitative or quantitative is open to challenge. Positivism does not encompass only quantitative research (Weimer 1999). And as Lin (1998) points out, there are many different approaches under the umbrella of “qualitative methods.” In addition to the more interpretivist views noted above, qualitative researchers also engage in tracking processes that appear to lead consistently to one set of outcomes rather than another, in determining which characteristics are—and are not—typically associated with certain policy problems, and in mapping patterns across settings and actors (see NSF 2004).

These are different modes of inquiry although perhaps more similar than some adherents are willing to admit (Brady and Collier 2004). The more effective research approach is likely to draw on the strengths of both traditions in a multi-method strategy rather than “improving” qualitative research with a template derived from a narrow quantitative approach. More specifically, policy researchers are better served by developing and documenting the diverse array of tools that meet their needs rather than feeling pushed into either the quantitative or qualitative camp. The question then is what is it about policy analysis that makes neither qualitative nor quantitative methods the obvious research template?

C. DOES POLICY RESEARCH REQUIRE A DISTINCTIVE CONTEXT-SENSITIVE TEMPLATE?

Most policy researchers are problem-oriented rather than concerned with theory development. Theory development is not an irrelevant concern but often a secondary one. Unless the analyst is concerned with evaluating the impact of a program (see Geva-May and Pal 1999), the focus tends to be on a set of problems in distinctive settings. This usually engenders a smaller number of cases to study since the researcher is looking at the whole case rather than extracting variables from each for analysis. Falsification is not a relevant criterion for designing the research question; rather, the research question is about the problem itself. Some qualitative researchers would reject the notion that reliability and validity are the appropriate primary criteria for evaluating qualitative research. Policy researchers rarely can afford that stance, however, although many would agree that these criteria need to be adapted for qualitative or contextual research (Weitzman 2004, 1999). Parsimony is less important than gaining a full and accurate understanding of the trends and conditions contributing to the problem and understanding the likely impacts of alternative solutions. Policy researchers are less likely to see data in terms of theory testing or building but they are also not likely to “let the data speak for themselves” either. Finally, one of the most important departures from conventional analyses is the need in context-sensitive research to abandon the assumption that variables or factors operate—and thus can be analyzed— independently of each other. Instead, policy researchers are acutely aware of the interdependence and complexity of the problems they are involved in.²

Context-sensitive policy researchers are more likely to be interested in understanding causal mechanisms than in searching for causal relationships (Lin 1998). Yet this is not to argue that causal explanations are not possible in more qualitative and contextual research: Miles and Huberman (1984) argue that field research is better than quantitative methods in developing understandings of what they call “local causality”—the causal mechanisms—while Maxwell (2004) details a number of process-oriented approaches that can rule out alternative explanations in developing a causal argument.

An interest in context in itself does not necessarily distinguish quantitative and qualitative approaches. Some researchers might argue that context is an interaction term and can be incorporated in more conventional regression analyses. As Collier, Seawright, and Brady (NSF) note, such practices have become increasingly common in regression analyses: they cite Franzese’s study (2003, 21) reporting that between 1996 and 2001, interaction terms have been used in 25 percent of the quantitative articles in major political science journals.” Although this may well encourage further multi-method analyses, interaction terms are not appropriate surrogates for the contextual effects important to policy researchers. They tell little about the processes that contribute to the problems and potential solutions of interest to policy analysts.

To meet the problem-oriented needs of policy researcher, to allow for interdependent configurations and processes, to truly understand contextual effects, it is necessary to work with tools that do not separate the observation and the context. This generally requires case-wise rather than variable-wise analysis. This also affects both how the researcher collects and analyzes the data. In a word, it requires a research template featuring context-sensitive tools.

II. CONTEXT-SENSITIVE TOOLS FOR CONSTRUCTING AND COLLECTING DATA

While policy researchers can identify a number of factors that distinguish their methodological needs from those of more conventional qualitative and quantitative researchers, one of the most important issues is their very direct involvement in the data collection and analysis process. Although it is disingenuous to assume that problem selection, data collection, and data analysis in more conventional approaches is not vulnerable to researcher bias, it is nevertheless important to

recognize that the close engagement of policy researchers with respondents makes the issue more visible. This also makes the need for reflectivity especially significant. This is standard practice in most policy analysis protocols; it is emphasized particularly in Lasswell's policy sciences approach where researchers devote significant resources to locating their own values and perspectives relative to the problem being analyzed.

In its recent report, NSF (2004) recommends that any researchers working with qualitative methods assess the "possible impact of the researcher's presence and biography" at every step of the research process. While there is no reason not to extend this admonition to all researchers (witness the unquestioned decades of NSF-sponsored research on gender-less political behavior), the potential for bias is seen as especially acute when researchers are present during the data collection process.

A. CONSTRUCTING AND COLLECTING POLICY-RELEVANT DATA

But most policy researchers have little recourse to constructing their own data. To the extent they are problem-oriented, they generally are dealing with a specific problem in a particular setting. With luck, there will be data available on the trends and conditions contributing to the problem but it is up to the researcher to gain a better understanding of the problem from the perspective of those involved with it and affected by it. Collecting and constructing data about these perceptions and contextual factors is the task.

In contrast to more qualitative research, policy researchers are more likely to begin with a relatively "structured data collection plan." That is, as the researcher becomes oriented to the problem, some types of data collection become obvious and can be planned in advance. Other data, admittedly, may be identified during the research process but this is a strength of contextual research, not a flaw in research design. Few policy researchers face such questions as "what are my cases" or "what are their relevant features" as may be the case in qualitative research (NSF 2004). Most begin with an analytic framework that helps them select the cases and identify the factors to take into consideration in their research. These frameworks are relatively straightforward and convergent; the most distinctive is the policy science's emphasis on problem orientation, decision processes, and mapping. All these frameworks emphasize a series of categories and features to take into account, not to impose a priori constraints on the researcher but to overcome the bounded rationality limiting every researcher.

B. Q-METHODOLOGY

Given the task of understanding perceptions about policy problems and the context in which these occur, it is not surprising to rely on interview methods. There is a long and honorable tradition in the social sciences of gaining observational data through interviewing those directly involved in the situation being researched (see Leech 2002; also, Beamer 2002; Lieberman 2004; Maestas 2003; Morgan 1996; Murphy 1980; Sturges and Hanrahan 2004; Stroh 2000; Roulston et al. 2003). This is also the point at which researchers are most vulnerable to charges of bias. To overcome some of these concerns, alternative interview techniques allow the interviewer to collect information without imposing her values and biases on the process. Indeed, it is possible to argue these strategies are less vulnerable to researcher bias than the categories and closed-ended options imposed on respondents in survey research.

One of the more innovative interview strategies involves Q-methodology, a tool in use for over 50 years in business and management, psychological, and planning research but less well known to policy researchers. Its advocates see it as an empirical tool for charting subjective perceptions,

preferences and values. The objective is not to create causal arguments based on individual actions and choices but to work with a “subject-centered” perspective. Indeed, it was referred to as the foundation for “a science of subjectivity” by its founder (Stephenson 1953) because it relies on the self-reference of the respondent and depicts the world as experienced from their point of view.³ The assumption is that these internal frames of reference have a structure and form that can be made manifest and comparable by using the same formal interview instrument across respondents (Brown 1980). Q-methodology allows each respondent—rather than the researcher—to model their own views about an issue in terms of their intensity. At the end of each interview, the researcher has the respondent’s unique schematic configuration of ideas, beliefs, and opinions that can then be compared with the similarly unique configurations of other respondents to identify areas of agreement, overlap, and potential conflict.

1. Doing Q

While the core activity is an interview with those seen as holding a representative range of views and understandings of a problem (usually 25–30), the interview tool is distinctive. In becoming oriented to the problem and the different values and interests potentially in conflict, the researcher constructs a matrix or factorial design of the dimensions most important to explore with the participants. This matrix often is based on a theoretical or analytical framework and is specific to the problem being analyzed. One axis usually includes dimensions of the problem under study while the other axis of the matrix often includes the policy attributes considered especially salient for this issue. This could include, for example, the different aspects of problem orientation—the goals, the varying views on the trends and conditions contributing to the problem, possible alternative solutions, and projections of future conditions.

Here is where Q-methodology diverges from traditional interviewing (see Brown 1980; Durning 1999). Rather than asking the respondent their views on each of these dimensions, the researcher devises statements for each cell by drawing on newspaper accounts, reports, expert interviews, and other sources of information. In each cell, the researcher puts two to three items that reflect the intersect forming that cell, e.g., policy goals about growth. These include positively as well as negatively constructed statements; developing unambiguous statements is as important in Q research as in survey research. This is not a standard “sample” of statements but one that is broadly representative of the discourse on the topic being analyzed. This usually means around 40–60 statements distributed across the cells. After pre-testing the statements, the researcher randomly numbers each statement and puts each statement on a 3×5 card—this deck of cards constitutes the Q sort.

In meeting with each of the purposively selected participants, the researcher sets out a strip of paper with 0 in the middle and a continuum of \pm on each end up to +5 and –5. These represent the extent to which the participant agrees or disagrees with each statement. The respondent is asked to rank the statements relative to each other by arraying the cards across the continuum, putting those she is uncertain of on the 0 position but encouraged to distribute the others in a normal distribution. This allows the respondent to model their own point of view by sorting and “bundling” their values, beliefs, and ideas in ways that reflect both the direction and the intensity of their overall belief structure. At the end of the session, the researcher records the distribution of statements in each cell. Both cases and items can be analyzed; for policy purposes, cluster analysis is often the most useful analytic tool because it retains the case while mapping belief structures systematically and reliably across cases in terms of those who sorted their statements in similar or dissimilar ways. Essentially, people are correlated across a sample of statements (Durning 1999).

What are the advantages of this seemingly odd procedure? The primary advantage is that this method takes the self-referential perspective of the respondent seriously (Durning 1999). This

is especially important in exploring values, preferences and other views not easily articulated or anticipated (Durning and Osuna 1994; Steelman and Maguire 1999). These bundles of statements often reveal unexpected juxtapositions of interests and values, in many cases indicating common ground in a policy conflict where none was anticipated. Clarke and Moss (1990), for example, found that housing needs provided common ground among environmentalists, social service providers, and developers in Boulder, Colorado. In addition, Q is often appealing and engaging to participants, especially those elites fatigued by conventional interview tools and too likely to give canned responses to easily anticipated questions. The potential reduction of interviewer bias also is often cited as an advantage of using Q over other techniques. The interviewer is present but more distant from the interview “process” than in phone or mail surveys or other conventional interview settings; thus the pressure to give the socially desired response is lessened.

For the researcher, the matrix provides the researcher with a direction for initial analysis by illustrating the areas and dimensions with greatest convergence, divergence, intensity, and so on. Thus Q method does not remove bias but certainly limits it (Robbins and Krueger 2000). To Durning (1999, 403), it holds the promise of “subtly subverting the premises of positivist policy analysis” by providing “procedures for the empirical study of human subjectivity.” Q also contributes to discursive democracy, according to Dryzck (1990; see also Steelman and Maguire, 1999), by acknowledging the analyst and the respondents as active participants in the research process.

Being a nonrandom sample, it is not possible to make inferences about the findings or to generalize beyond the relatively small number of cases. But the goal is often to understand viewpoints within a particular group, such as agency officials or citizens involved in disputes (e.g., Steelman and Maguire 1999). Q provides contextually-sensitive quantitative data in settings where usually only qualitative data exists (Brown 1980), and is amenable to replication (see Durning 1999). In doing so, it can give the policy researcher an invaluable means of understanding complex views on complex problems, insights that are often “unavailable through other methods” (Durning 1999).

B. RAPID ETHNOGRAPHIC ASSESSMENT PROCEDURE (REAP)

Using a Rapid Ethnographic Assessment Procedure (REAP) is another data collection technique helpful in context-sensitive policy research, particularly when time and money are limited. REAP is a tool brought to more developed societies from policy research on public health (Rapid Assessment Procedures), poverty (Participatory Wealth Ranking), and agricultural issues (Rapid Rural Appraisal) in less developed areas. In the United States this tool is increasingly used for societal impact assessments, community needs assessments, and cultural resource management issues (Low et al. 2005). Less structured than Q method, REAP relies on triangulation and iteration to strengthen the validity and reliability of the findings. As Low and her colleagues point out (2005, 664), “the semi-structured interview, expert interview, and the community focus group, are the characteristic elements of a triangulated methodology.” Participants are not chosen through formal sampling techniques so the generalizability is low but the accuracy in characterizing situations, attitudes, and values is high. Less than 100 interviews are often sufficient, given the time frame involved. With an often multidisciplinary team rather than an individual researcher in the field, different data collection elements can unfold simultaneously with frequent and intense interaction among team members. Similar to more qualitative approaches, as the new data comes in and the findings are reevaluated, it is possible that new research questions emerge in the process of the research project. Given the rapid pace—often a four month or less time frame—of the data collection and the multiple researchers, construct validity can also be an issue. Low et al suggest that triangulation and the multidisciplinary nature of the research teams can correct these problems and mitigate concerns with internal validity.

REAP data is analyzed by collaborative exchanges on themes emerging from the multiple data collection projects. These themes are used to develop more detailed coding schema for the transcribed field notes and interview materials. While these are amenable to more quantitative analyses, the priority is on retaining the contextual detail in each case.

C. INTRODUCING INTENSIVE AND CONTEXTUAL DIMENSIONS TO SURVEY RESEARCH

Satterfield (2004) argues that the intensive and contextual aspects of qualitative research methods can be incorporated into telephone survey research by using CADI (Computer Aided Design Instrument) systems. These systems allow a programmed sequence of questions to be created in which the queries, contingent on each respondent's previous response, resemble a conversation rather than the flat responses generated by conventional surveys. Such "pathway surveys" (Satterfield and Gregory 1998; Gregory et al. 1997) map participant perceptions of complex policy decisions as well as their accounts of how they move from their goals and values to actual decision choices. As Satterfield points out, these "linked question sets" can be used to trace the reasoning processes that lead participants down one decision pathway and not another. The survey design incorporates the major pathways and opinion streams identified in pre-survey interviews. Although many potential decision pathways can be incorporated in the survey instrument, most responses tend to cluster around a few key pathways (Satterfield and Gregory 1998). Advocates see pathway studies as taking standard survey methods to a more subtle and nuanced level; from a contextual perspective, they support mapping participants' subjective perceptions, perspectives, and values about complex issues and allow the researcher to identify whether these responses are conditional on other factors.

D. EMERGING DATA COLLECTION TECHNOLOGIES

Technological advances clearly are changing the data collection landscape. As noted above, CADI systems are transforming survey research in ways that incorporate contextual sensitivities of qualitative methods. PDAs and other hand held devices now allow the researcher to record and transmit interview data, whatever the interview process, in a matter of minutes. The agreement between data collected with paper forms and data collected with handheld computers was greater than 95 percent in a recent study (Fletcher et al. 2003; see also, Ice 2004.). EthnoNotes, an Internet-based field note management tool, facilitates the writing, sharing, and analyzing of field notes in collaborative and multisite research projects (Lieber et al. 2003). It also supports indexing and coding of text and integration with quantitative materials. These improvements in the speed, efficiency, and sensitivity of data entry and collection are especially important when analysis overlaps data collection in the field as is often the case in policy research

III. ALTERNATIVE ANALYSIS STRATEGIES IN CONTEXT-SENSITIVE POLICY RESEARCH

It is becoming increasingly common to characterize methodological approaches as emphasizing variable-wise or case-wise analysis (Ragin 1987; Brunner 1996). The former is associated with conventional quantitative analyses in which an observation is converted into a series of discrete variables that are comparable across observations; the relationships between variables can be compared while "holding constant" the effects of other discrete variables. To achieve this, the meaning of each variable is determined prior to the observation—e.g., educational achievement is presented

as cumulative years in formal schooling—and is presumed to be invariant across observations. By divorcing the meaning from the context of the observation—it is not important whether a respondent sees her educational achievement in different terms—the researcher gains enormous analytical leverage by comparing patterns across cases.

But case-wise analysis retains the case as a whole, without divvying it up into variables determined on an *a priori* basis. Separating variables out on the basis of prior assumptions and categories introduces researcher bias and results not only in distorted interpretations of the research findings but in missed opportunities to uncover the patterns that give meaning to the data. The case-wise rationale is that the context for each observation is essential to understanding the meaning of the information gathered. Rather than discrete variables, the important factors in each case are assumed to be interactive and multi-collinear, with distinctive process configurations within each case. Accordingly, Collier, Brady, and Seawright (2004, 252) characterize this as causal process observations rather than the variable-wise data set observations. Case-wise analysis demands complex analytic strategies, given the uncategorized (and often unstructured) data (Becker 2004) and the interest in preserving the contextual features.

A. DISCOURSE, NARRATIVES, AND ARGUMENTATION

Analysis of discourse, narrative and argumentation is a bridge between more traditional qualitative methods and contextual policy research methods. Narratives are important elements in both approaches. Satterfield (2004, 117) describes narratives as “both the storied talk that characterizes conversation, musings, and social discourse in everyday life as well as more formal definitions pointing to the attributes of this form including plot, narration, the imagistic and affective valence of a narrative vignette, and so on.” Ethnographic research puts a premium on such materials; researchers often use participant observation and other ethnographic tools to collect individual narratives in relatively unstructured fashion.

1. Narrative and Argumentation in Policy Research

Narratives and argumentation figure prominently in policy concepts such as discourse coalitions (Hajer 1993), causal stories (Stone, D. 1989), frames (Morth 2000; Pal 1995; Wanta 1993; Hershey 1994) and other approaches featuring problem definition processes (Rocheftort and Cobb 1994; Rydin, 1998; Pollock et al. 1994; Sharp 1994;). These approaches share a perspective emphasizing the multiple ways in which people come to understand an event or phenomenon. The emphasis can be interpretivist—assuming multiple realities, uncovering the meanings different situations or ideas have for people in everyday life, and asking how they explain what they do and believe (Lin 1998; Yanow, 2000; Gamson, 1992). It can also be more directly constructivist—the processes by which people construct meanings and rationales for their acts (Ingram and Schneider 1994). Narratives do not merely illuminate an issue but represent blueprints for understanding how issues are identified, who is assigned blame or responsibility for problems, how groups are mobilized around some policy solutions and not others, and other processes.⁴

Narratives also serve to connect events and processes in a specific context (Maxwell 2004). Tracing processes through narratives or stories about sequences of events is an important dimension of using narratives as evidence (Abbott 1992; Stryker 1996; Buthe 2002; Franzosi 1998). These “connecting strategies” are essential to understanding causal processes although they are also subject to the criticism that they tend “to underspecify causality” and “often miss the distinction between chronology and causality” (Maxwell 2004, 256).

2. Discourse Analysis Using Computer-Aided Tools

Discourse analysis is one of the more loosely applied terms in the humanities and social sciences. While there is general agreement that language and rhetoric are important subjects of analysis in themselves—since they are used to shape and frame policy issues—there are few standards guiding such analyses and directing the researcher in how to analyze discourse in order to understand policy problems (deLeon 1998). For example, content analysis is often mistaken for discourse analysis (see Herrera and Braumoeller 2004). While its emphasis on the frequency of certain phrases and terms can be important, content analysis in itself is often less relevant to problem-oriented research. The relevance or salience of the frequency distribution is not always obvious unless there is an analytical framework available for interpreting these trends. Brunner (1987), for example, traces the symbolic dissociation in the meaning of the term “Watergate” from reference to the actual burglary at the Watergate residential complex during the Nixon administration to its subsequent use to refer to numerous instances of lack of trust in government. Few exercises in content analysis meet this analytic standard, however.

Discourse analysis examines the structure and the content of different “strings” of reasoning or beliefs expressed by a range of respondents or in documentary materials. The links between these strings and different actors as well as the ways in which these strings can shape problem definitions and privilege some solutions and exclude others are amenable to analysis, using software developed for this purpose. Basically, these software tools allow the researcher to find, display, and analyze “patterns of co-occurrences of codes, text strings and case-variables” in consistent and reliable ways (Weitzman 2004). Or in Lewis’ (2004, 439) more instrumental terms, the researcher can use these programs to “associate codes or labels with chunks of text, sounds, pictures, or video; to search these codes for patterns; and to construct classifications of codes” that are amenable testing.

One of the earliest programs developed for discourse analysis was the unfortunately named NUD*IST software for Non-Numerical Unstructured Data with Indexing Searching and Theorizing (Richards and Richards 1995). NUD*IST evolved over time to allow the researcher to code text of any sort, to develop categorizations based on the data, to sort and analyze patterns in the data, and to perform various statistical tests ranging from crosstabs to measures determining whether the patterns appearing to emerge from the data were “statistically significant.” Sidney (2002), for example, analyzed the different problem definitions used by Latinos, African Americans, Asians, and Anglos to describe “the problem with schools” in their cities. Her discourse analysis, using NUD*IST, indicates that these varying problem definitions across racial and ethnic boundaries hinder coalitional strategies for those interested in reforming urban public schools. Similarly, Clarke (1999) compared abortion narratives over time in Denver by using NUD*IST to analyze newspaper accounts of abortion conflicts. Over time both pro-choice and anti-abortion advocates shifted their frames away from their original value-driven perspectives; an alternative narrative emphasizing public order emerged as city officials become concerned about the city’s image in the face of these conflicts.

Computer-aided analysis is particularly important for discourse analysis and other text analysis tasks. This use of computers for analysis of qualitative research marks a number of distinctive approaches that promise more rigorous and consistent contextual analyses (see discussion of software tools in Weitzman and Miles 1995; Weitzman 1999, 2000). These promises of greater rigor and reliability place contextual research on discourse closer to conventional quantitative research and beyond ethnographic research. They also promise greater ability to integrate qualitative and quantitative data. Critics argue, of course, that the meaning of the text can be lost in the coding and categorization. Collier, Brady, and Seawright (2004, 266) disparage this as the “trend toward technification” as an end in itself, displacing simpler and more sensitive tools. But the more recent versions of NUD*IST, its successor NVivo, and Atlas.ti provide for categorization based on patterns of relationships in the text. Although these computer-aided tools increase the speed and consistency of discourse analysis, there is little evaluation to date of the effects of the software on the outcomes

(Weitzman, 2004). And most software is limited to analysis of text although analysis of media such as audio and video is now possible with some programs, e.g. Atlas.ti 5.0, NVivo 2.0, HyperResearch, interClipper, C-I-SAID, and Transana (see Weitzman 2004; Lewis 2004).

B. QCA AND FUZZY SET APPROACHES

Case studies are a mainstay of policy research but also remain significant methods in political science, sociology, and public administration (see Bennett et al. 2003; Brower et al. 2000; also, see Yin 1994; “Symposium” 2000). Within-case analyses of a single case are valued in many fields as well, with a rich intellectual tradition supporting their contributions to theory development as well as their relevance in policy research. But since multiple sites or analyses over time provide opportunities for comparison and stronger arguments about causal processes, many researchers are interested in contextually-sensitive comparisons of larger numbers of cases. One of the most significant breakthroughs for social science researchers and policy researchers is Ragin’s adoption of Boolean algebra for Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) of multiple case studies. QCA allows the researcher to work with relatively large numbers of cases using Bayesian inference to evaluate necessary and sufficient causes of outcomes.

QCA highlights the different assumptions about causality characterizing contextual policy research methods. As Ragin (2004) points out, conventional positivist research tests the independent effects of competing explanations of the outcome but more qualitative research sees causation in terms of a combination of causes. Indeed different combinations or configurations of characteristics may produce the same outcome through distinctive causal paths. This potential for “multiple, conjunctural causes” is especially relevant to policy research.

The Bayesian logic in Ragin’s QCA yields “truth tables” to sort out these causal paths, sorting out the different combinations of dichotomous factors in each case associated with the presence and absence of the outcome being studied. The researcher identifies the dichotomous factors to be included in the tables—generally informed by some theoretical or analytical framework—and also determines whether they were present or absent in each case being compared (Amenta and Poulson 1994; Wichkam-Crowley 1991). This makes the analysis vulnerable to claims of researcher bias since any shift in coding from the dichotomous characteristics can alter the findings substantially.

In his fuzzy set approach, Ragin introduces continuous variables and a software program that makes QCA an efficient and rigorous means of testing hypotheses about the necessary and sufficient conditions associated with the outcomes. Mahoney (2004) points out that fs/QCA allows researchers to: (1) analyze probabilistic patterns of necessary or sufficient causation, (2) explore how different combinations of variables are each jointly sufficient for an outcome, and (3) assess the statistical significance and statistical relevance of necessary and sufficient causes. Kilburn (2004) uses QCA to identify the necessary and sufficient conditions for different regime types in 14 U.S. cities. His analysis considers market conditions (a city’s fiscal resource base and mobility of local capital) and democratic conditions (local civic participation and ward-style representation) but he finds that neither is necessary or sufficient for supporting the emergence of a more progressive, as opposed to a developmental or caretaker, regime. Instead, three interactions between the components of market and democratic conditions explain the presence of progressive regimes.

C. CLUSTER ANALYSIS

Cluster analysis is appropriate when the researcher is interested in determining how cases are similar and different in the absence of a priori categorization or classification. The assumption is that each case is unique but that they can be classified based on their similarity to other cases; this

is a common classificatory device we all do in everyday life. Available as part of SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) and STATA, cluster analysis is a variant of factor analysis in which the cases (rather than the variables) are systematically and sequentially paired in terms of the means of each attribute.

Any type of data is amenable to cluster analysis; it is an innovative way to integrate quantitative and qualitative data in case-wise analysis. Cluster analysis is useful for exploratory research rather than causal predictions;⁵ by retaining the case and systematically comparing to other cases, it is especially useful for context-sensitive policy research.

Although the researcher can specify a certain number of clusters to get a quick sense of the data, the most effective strategy is to decide on cluster methods and distance measures and run the cluster procedure to view the emerging clusters. Using a variety of algorithms, the cluster procedure will pair up cases until it is clear that the coefficients of any additional cases are different enough from the established cluster to indicate a new cluster is called for. That cutoff point is subjective; it can be determined visually or preset. A dendrogram displays the formation of clusters or groupings by plotting each step of agglomeration in terms of the coefficients of the cluster and the potential new case.⁶ Tables present the means of each variable in the cluster and report the F statistic and F significance values to determine how “loose” or “tight” the clusters are as well as how different each cluster is from the others. These allow the researcher to characterize the clusters by looking at the mean values for the attributes defining the cluster; it is also possible to identify the demographic features associated with each cluster if the data involves human subjects.

The now familiar labels of “soccer moms” and “NASCAR dads” were derived from cluster analysis—rather than variable-wise analysis—of polling results. This highlights one of the main virtues of cluster analysis: it offers a systematic, rigorous, valid means of presenting data in a narrative or story format intuitively understandable by policy makers and citizens. By focusing on the interaction of different features within a case, cluster analysis also illustrates the importance of variations within categories as well as across grouping. Indeed, it often illustrates unexpected interactions among conventional factors. In Staeheli and Clarke’s (2004) analysis of the differential effects of work and household responsibilities on political participation, it became clear that the generational differences among Latinos were equally or more important than the differences between Latinos and Anglos. Needless to say, assuming that ethnic differences are the critical factor prior to the analysis would obscure such findings. Brunner (1986) used cluster analysis to demonstrate the multiple meanings of poverty and the importance of understanding which type of poverty is being targeted by policy interventions. This demonstrates the utility of cluster analysis for needs assessments and other diagnostic tasks, especially with underserved populations with complex, distinctive needs.

As an inductive research tool, cluster analysis is open to criticism that the classifications—the clusters—are too fluid and too vulnerable to changes depending on the items being considered. On the other hand, the claim that it is an improvement over a priori categorization must be tempered with the recognition that the researcher is still selecting data, cutoff points, and making a number of other subjective choices. If the researcher is clear on the advantages as well as limitations of cluster analysis, it is a powerful and versatile tool for context-sensitive policy research.

V. ISSUES RAISED BY CONTEXT-SENSITIVE RESEARCH METHODS

The NSF workshop recommendations for more qualitative researchers are deceptively simple. The researcher should provide an account of how the conclusions were reached, why the reader should believe the claims and how one might go about trying to produce a similar account. Most researchers would agree with the importance of transparency and the need to provide evidence for the claims made.⁷ Making evidence-based claims based on contextually-sensitive research, however,

is a more challenging issue. Some of the most thought-provoking issues raised in context-sensitive research center on these issues of transparency and systemization and sources of leverage for causal inference.

A. TRANSPARENCY AND SYSTEMIZATION

Throughout the research process, contextual policy methods provide a means for conducting consistent, systematic, and rigorous data collection and analysis when important data is not readily available. As noted above, there are many challenges to this approach, from both qualitative and quantitative researchers. Nowhere are these challenges greater, however, than in the writing up of contextual policy research and the responsibility for providing evidence for the claims and conclusions drawn from the research.

One of the most important ways to strengthen reporting of contextual policy research materials is also the simplest—documenting the research question, the methods used and why, the time frame, the number of cases or respondents, how they were selected, the assumptions being made about causality and evaluative criteria, and other nuts and bolts features of doing good research. This material can be woven into the text or included in an appendix (see Huff 1999). The failure to include such detail weakens the persuasiveness of whatever findings are presented and raises unnecessary doubts about the reliability of the results.

At this point there are few explicit guidelines for carrying out context-sensitive policy research. Although there is some dispute over the need for “rules for a more systematic use of qualitative evidence” (Tarrow 2004, 179; Collier, Brady, and Seawright 2004), steps can be taken to move toward a more coherent, systematized body of context-sensitive policy research methods. Clarifying some of the epistemological common ground shared by quantitative and qualitative methods would encourage more integrative strategies as would better training in contextual research methods (see Bennett et al. 2003; also CQRM 2003). In addition to setting out some of the available methods for contextual policy research, it is useful to consider how we might think about the “best practices” for collecting and analyzing context-sensitive materials (see e.g. Brower et al. 2000).

B. SOURCES OF LEVERAGE FOR MAKING EVIDENCE-BASED CLAIMS

Since the contextual policy researcher lacks the tropes or accepted language of reliability and validity available to the quantitative researcher—particularly measures of “significance”—making claims based on the findings is contested terrain (Kritzer 1996; see also, Brady and Collier 2004; Brower et al. 2000). Few policy researchers are willing to settle for “illuminating” rather than “convincing” findings (NSF 2004). But the nature of the problem-oriented enterprise and the unique data collection and analysis demands of contextual policy research exacerbate the difficulties of supporting the validity and plausibility of the research findings.

Yet this is a critical task facing policy researchers, whether using quantitative or contextual approaches; more qualitative researchers, however, seem more vulnerable to validity claims. Weitzman (2004) recalls Miles and Huberman’s (1994, 247) warning: “Qualitative analyses can be evocative, illuminating, masterful, and wrong. The story, well told as it is, does not fit the data. Reasonable colleagues double-checking the case come up with quite different findings. The interpretations of case informants do not match those of the researchers.”

The standards of evidence for qualitative data remain contested and unstandardized, with little agreement on what constitutes “proof” or “plausibility” (NSF 2004). Both qualitative and quantitative researchers are concerned with causal inference. Some techniques, such as Ragin’s fuzzy set approach, provide for testing hypotheses in the same manner as more traditional quantitative

methods. But most contextual policy research will rely on a broader set of strategies to address the issue of causal inference and causal validity in contextual research. Contextual researchers are more likely to see causality in process terms or as a series of necessary and sufficient conditions than the positivist notion inferring causality from the statistical association between discrete factors. Contextual researchers often direct their attention to the processes appearing to link cause and effect —“process analysis” (Brady and Collier 2004) in order to infer causality.

A brief inventory of strategies to increase the leverage of contextual research findings would highlight Miles and Huberman’s (1994) extensive list of innovative logical exercises that allow the researcher to eliminate alternative explanations and support the conclusions presented.⁸ Maxwell (2004) also takes on this challenge, sketching a set of strategies for assessing causal claims such as searching for discrepant or disconfirming evidence, triangulation of different sources of information, different investigators, or different methods of data collection (Weitzman 2004; Creswell 1994), feedback on interpretations from participants themselves. Munck (2004) systematically tracks qualitative tools relevant for each step of the research process and able to shore up context-sensitive evidence. Tarrow (2004, 175) reviews tools capable of bridging the quantitative–qualitative divide, emphasizing process tracing, a focus on tipping points, framing qualitative research within quantitative profiles, triangulation, and sequencing qualitative and quantitative studies.

Brady and Collier (2004) also emphasize the strong leverage to be gained by employing both thick analysis and statistical tests—“nested analysis” featuring the strength of each approach.⁹ The large N analysis sets out the patterns among the variables while case studies, if carefully selected, can provide some understanding of the processes underlying these patterns. There are many grounds for case selection but multimethod strategies beginning with the aggregate analysis offer several prospects: using outliers to select cases, using cluster groupings to identify prototypical cases, and other means of selecting cases to clarify processes that distinguish among outcomes (Collier and Mahoney 1996; Collier, Mahoney, and Seawright 2004; Geddes 1990). In contrast, some scholars may start with case studies in order to identify the critical factors for an aggregate level analysis.

Despite the obvious advantages of research using both quantitative and qualitative techniques, multi-method strategies are often sequential rather than truly integrative and iterative. To some extent, this occurs from thinking of methods in a dualistic manner—seeing qualitative methods as only suited to certain types of information and considering quantitative methods as able to provide better measures of other features (e.g., NSF 2004). Truly integrative strategies are rare but involve iterative methods rather than placing quantitative and qualitative research side by side in a project. As Tarrow (2004) and others note, bridging strategies recognize the distinctive research traditions shaping both qualitative and quantitative research but find intermediate means to link these specializations.

VI. CONCLUSION

Good research depends on matching the research question with the appropriate research methods—for policy researchers that often means contextually sensitive research methods. As the previous sections sketch out, there are several contextually sensitive techniques that policy researchers can add to their kit of analytic tools. The premium is on methods that attempt to balance rigor and flexibility; policy researchers, particularly those working outside academe, continually face challenges to the validity and reliability of their work. Context-sensitive tools allow them to make persuasive and accessible arguments and provide evidence to back their claims. They also encourage engagement with a broader public and thus contribute to democratic discourse (Fisher 1993; Geva-May and Pal 1999; Drycek 1990).

NOTES

1. Clifford Gertz's characterization of "thick description" is the most familiar phrase (Geertz 1973). Brady, Seawright, and Collier refer more generally to "thick analysis" (2004).
2. As I often say in my seminars, "the world is multi-collinear—get over it."
3. The term "Q" derives from the contrast with the "objectivist" assumptions of "R" methodology, with data collected through surveys, etc. for correlational analyses in which measurement is independent of the individual's self-reference and it is assumed the answers have the same meaning and intensity for all respondents (see Brown, 1980).
4. For these more structured purposes, policy researchers often turn to more systematic data collection processes such as interview protocols or REAP (above; see Low 2005) and often rely on more structured text analysis procedures.
5. But see Schrodt and Gerner (2000) for an example of developing early warning indicators using cluster analysis.
6. Clustergrams (Schonlau, 2002) can be used to demonstrate how cluster members are assigned to different clusters for nonhierarchical clustering in addition to the dendograms used to illustrate hierarchical clustering processes. It is also possible to graphically represent the structure of cluster linkages with cluster maps (Austrian, 2000).
7. The importance of doing so can not be overstated, although Brower et al. (2000, 376) note the "paradox of transparency and fallibility" in qualitative research—the more transparent the qualitative researcher, the more vulnerable she is to alternative interpretations of the findings.
8. Weitzman reminds us that Miles and Huberman's list (1994) includes: Checking for representativeness, checking for researcher effects, triangulation across sources and methods; checking the meaning of outliers; looking for negative evidence; making if-then tests; ruling out spurious relations; replicating a finding; checking out rival explanations; and getting feedback from informants. They also offer a wide variety of methods for building matrices and other kinds of displays that can assist the analyst in seeing larger patterns, both within and between cases, and performing the kinds of checks referred to above consistently and on broad scales.
9. Brady and Collier adapted this term from Coppedge's (2001) "nested induction" and from Lieberman's "nested analysis" (2003).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbott, Andrew. 1992. "From Causes to Events." *Sociological Methods & Research* 20: 428–455.
- Amenta, E. and J.D. Poulsen. 1994. "Where to Begin—A survey of 5 approaches to selecting independent variables for QCA." *Sociological Methods and Research* 23: 22–53.
- Austrian, Ziona. 2000. "Cluster Case Studies: The Marriage of Quantitative and Qualitative Information for Action." *Economic Development Quarterly* 14: 97–110.
- Bashi, Vilna., 2004. "Improving Qualitative Research Proposal Evaluation," Report on NSF Workshop on Scientific Foundations of Qualitative Research, 39–43.
- Bayard de Volo, Lorraine and Ed Schatz. 2004. "From the Inside Out: Ethnographic Methods in Political Research." *PS* 37: 267–71.
- Beamer, Glenn. 2002. "Elite Interviews and State Politics Research." *State Politics and Policy Quarterly* 2: 86–96.
- Becker, 2004. "The Problems of Analysis." *Report on NSF Workshop on Scientific Foundations of Qualitative Research*, 45–47. <http://www.nsf.gov/pubs/2004/nsf04219/nsf04219-6.pdf>
- Bennett, Andrew, Aharon Barth, and Kenneth R. Rutherford. 2003. "Do We Preach What We Practice? A Survey of Methods in Political Science Journals and Curricula." *PS: Political Sciences & Politics*.
- Blee, 2004. NSF Workshop on Scientific Foundations of Qualitative Research.
- Brady, Henry E. and David Collier, eds. 2004. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Boulder, CO and Berkeley, CA: Roman & Littlefield and Berkeley Public Policy Press.
- Brady, Henry E., David Collier, and Jason Seawright. 2004. "Refocusing the Discussion of Methodology." In

- Brady, Henry E. and David Collier, eds. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Boulder, CO and Berkeley, CA: Roman & Littlefield and Berkeley Public Policy Press. Pp. 3–20.
- Brower, Ralph S., Mitchel Y. Abolafia, and Jered B. Carr. 2000. "On Improving Qualitative Methods in Public Administration Research." *Administration & Society* 32:363–397.
- Brown, Steven R. 1980. *Political Subjectivity: Applications of Q-methodology in political science*. New Haven CT: Yale University Press.
- Brunner, R.D. 1986. "Case-wise Policy Analysis: Redefining Poverty." *Policy Sciences* 19:201–223.
- Brunner, Ronald. D. 1987. "Key Political Symbols: the Dissociation Process." *Policy Sciences* 20: 53–76.
- Buthe, Tim. 2002. "Taking Temporality Seriously: Modeling History and the Use of Narrative as Evidence." *American Political Science Review* 96: 481–493.
- Clarke, Susan. 1999. "Ideas, Interests, and Institutions: Abortion Politics in Denver." In *Culture Wars and Local Politics*. Edited by Elaine Sharp, Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.
- Clarke, Susan E. and Anne K. Moss. 1990. "Economic Growth, Environmental Quality, and Social Services: Mapping the Potential for Local Positive-Sum Strategies." *Journal of Urban Affairs* 12: 17–34 (Winter).
- Collier, David and James Mahoney. 1996. "Insights and Pitfalls: Selection Bias in Qualitative Research." *World Politics* 49: 56–92.
- Collier, David, Henry Brady, and Jason Seawright. 2004. "Sources of Leverage in Causal Inference: Toward an Alternative View of Methodology." In Brady, Henry E. and David Collier, eds. 2004. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Boulder, CO and Berkeley, CA: Roman & Littlefield and Berkeley Public Policy Press, 229–266.
- Collier, David, James Mahoney, and Jason Seawright. 2004. "Claiming Too Much: Warnings about Selection Bias." In Brady, Henry E. and David Collier, eds. 2004. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Boulder, CO and Berkeley, CA: Roman & Littlefield and Berkeley Public Policy Press, 85–102.
- Collier, David, Jason Seawright, and Henry E. Brady. 2004. "Qualitative v. Quantitative: What Might this Distinction Mean?" *Report on NSF Workshop on Scientific Foundations of Qualitative Research*, 71–76. <http://www.nsf.gov/pubs/2004/nsf04219/nsf04219-6.pdf>
- Coppedge, Michael. 2005. "Explaining Democratic Deterioration in Venezuela through Nested Inference," in Frances Hogopian and Scott Mainwaring, eds., *The Third Wave of Democratization in Latin America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 389–316.
- CQRM. 2003. "Teaching Qualitative Methods Courses." <http://www.asu.edu/clas/polisci/cqrm/QualitativeMethodsAPSA.html>.
- Creswell, J.W. (1994). *Research design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- deLeon, Peter. 1998. "Models of Policy Discourse: Insights versus prediction." *Policy Studies Journal* 26: 147–161.
- Dion, Douglas. 1998. "Evidence and Inference in the Comparative Case Study." *Comparative Politics* 30: 127–146.
- Durning, Dan. 1999. "The Transition from Traditional to Postpositivist Policy Analysis: A Role for Q-Methodology." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 18: 389–410.
- Durning, Dan and Will Osuna. 1994. "Policy Analysts' Roles and Value Orientations: An Empirical Investigation Using Q Methodology." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 13: 629–657.
- Dryzck, John. 1990. *Discursive Democracy*. Cambridge MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Fletcher, Linda A., Darin J. Erickson, Traci L. Toomey, and Alexander C. Wagenaar. 2003. "Handheld Computers: A Feasible Alternative to Paper Forms for Field Data Collection." *Evaluation Review* 27:
- Fischer, Frank. 1993. "Citizen Participation and the Democratization of Policy Expertise." *Policy Sciences* 26: 165–187.
- Flick, Uwe. 2002. "Qualitative Research: State of the Art." *Social Science Information*: 4: 5–24.
- Franzese, R. J. 2003. "Quantitative Empirical Methods and Contest Conditionality." *CP*: Newsletter of the Comparative Politics Organizaed Section of the American Political Science Association, 20–24.
- Franzosi, Roberto. 1998. "Narrative as Data: Linguistic and Statistical Tools for the Qualitative Study of Historical Events." *International Review of Social History* 43:81–104.
- Gamson, William. 1992. *Talking Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Geddes, Barbara. 1990. "How the Cases You Choose Affect the Answers You Get: Selection Bias in Comparative Politics," *Political Analysis* 2: 131–150.
- Geertz, Clifford. 1973. "Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture." In Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books, 3–32.
- George, Alexander L., and Andrew Bennett. 2005. *Case Studies and Theory Development*. Cambridge, MA: MIT.
- Geva-May, Iris and Leslie A. Pal. 1999. "Good Fences Make Good Neighbors: Policy Evaluation and Policy Analysis—Exploring the Differences." *Evaluation* 5: 259–277.
- Gregory, R., Flinn, J., Johnson, S., Satterfield, T., Slovic, P., and Wagner, R. 1997. "Decision Pathway Surveys: A Tool for Resource Managers." *Land Economics* 72: 240–254.
- Hajer, Maarten A. 1993. "Discourse Coalitions and the Institutionalization of Practice: The Case of Acid Rain in Great Britain." In Fischer and Forester (eds.) *The Argumentative Turn in Policy Analysis and Planning*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, pp. 43–71.
- Herrera, Yoshiko M. and Bear F. Braumoeller. 2004. "Symposium: Discourse and Content Analysis." *Qualitative Methods*. Newsletter of the American Political Science Association Organized Section on Qualitative Methods. Vol. 2, #1: Spring.
- Hershey, Marjorie R. 1994. "The Meaning of a Mandate: Interpretations of "Mandate" in 1984 Presidential Election Coverage." *Polity* 27: 225–254.
- Huff, A. S. 1999. *Writing for Scholarly Publication*. Sage.
- Ice, Gillian H. 2004. "Technological Advances in Observational Data Collection: The Advantages and Limitations of Computer-Assisted Data Collection." *Field Methods* 16: 352–375.
- Kilburn, H. Whitt. 2004. "Explaining U.S. Urban Regimes: A Qualitative Comparative Analysis," *Urban Affairs Review* 39: 663–651.
- King, G., R. Keohane, and S. Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- King, G., R. Keohane, and S. Verba. 1995. "The Importance of Research Design in Political Science." *APSR* 89: 475–481.
- Kritzer, Herbert M. 1996. "The Data Puzzle: The Nature of Interpretation in Quantitative Research." *AJPS* 40: 1–32.
- Leech, Beth L. et al. 2002. "Symposium: Interview Methods in Political Science." *PS XXXV*: 663–688.
- Lewis, R. Barry. 2004. "NVivo 2.0 and ATLAS.ti 5.0: A Comparative Review of Two Popular Qualitative Data-Analysis Programs." *Field Methods* 16: 439–469.
- Lieber, Eli, Thomas S. Weisner, and Matthew Presley. 2003. "EthnoNotes: An Internet-based Field Note Management Tool." *Field Methods* 15: 405–425.
- Lieberman, Evan S. "Symposium: Field Research." *Qualitative Methods*. Newsletter of the American Political Science Association Organized Section on Qualitative Methods. Vol. 2, #1 (Spring).
- Lin, A.C. 1998. "Bridging positivist and interpretivist approaches to qualitative methods.(The Evidentiary Basis of Policy Analysis: Empiricist vs. Postpositivist Positions)." *Policy Studies Journal* (March 22): 162–180.
- Low, Setha, Dana H. Taplin, and Mike Lamb. 2005. "Battery Park City: An Ethnographic Field Study of the Community Impact of 9/11." *Urban Affairs Review* 40: 655–682.
- Maestas, Cherie, et al. 2003. "The State of Surveying State Legislators: Dilemmas and Suggestions." *State Politics and Policy Quarterly* 3 (Spring): 90–108.
- Mahoney, James. 2004. "The Distinctive Contributions of Qualitative Data Analysis." *Report on NSF Workshop on Scientific Foundations of Qualitative Research*, 95–799. <http://www.nsf.gov/pubs/2004/nsf04219/nsf04219-6.pdf>
- Maxwell, Joseph A. 2004. "Using Qualitative Methods for Causal Explanation." *Field Methods* 16: 243–264.
- Miles, Matthew B. and A.M. Huberman. 1994. *Qualitative Data Analysis*. Sage.
- Morgan, David L. 1996. "Focus Groups." *Annual Review of Sociology* Vol. 22: 129–152
- Morth, U. 2000. "Competing Frames in the European Commission: The case of the defence industry and equipment issue." *Journal of European Public Policy* 7: 173–189.
- Munck, G. 2004. "Tools for Qualitative Research." In Brady, Henry E. and David Collier, eds. 2004. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Boulder, CO and Berkeley, CA: Roman & Littlefield and Berkeley Public Policy Press, 102–121.

- Murphy, Jerome. 1980. *Getting the Facts: A Fieldwork Guide for Evaluators & Policy Analysts*. Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear.
- NSF. 2004. *Workshop on Scientific Foundations of Qualitative Research*. Washington DC: NSF.
- Pal, L.A. 1995. "Competing Paradigms in Policy Discourse: The Case of International Human Rights," *Policy Sciences* 28: 185–207.
- QCA. <http://www.u.arizona.edu/~cragin/QCA.htm>
- Ragin, C. 1995. "Using Qualitative Comparative Analysis to Study Configurations." In U. Kelle, *Computer-aided Qualitative Data Analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage. Pp. 177–189.
- Ragin, Charles C. 1987. *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Ragin, Charles C. 2000. *Fuzzy-Set Social Science*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ragin, Charles. 2004. "Turning the Tables: How Case-Oriented Research Challenges Variable-Oriented Research." In Henry E. Brady, and David Collier, eds. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Boulder, CO and Berkeley, CA: Roman & Littlefield and Berkeley Public Policy Press, 123–138.
- Ragin, Charles C. 2004. "Combining Qualitative and Quantitative Research." *Report on NSF Workshop on Scientific Foundations of Qualitative Research*, 109–115. <http://www.nsf.gov/pubs/2004/nsf04219/nsf04219-6.pdf>
- Richards, T. and L. Richards. 1995. "Using Hierarchical Categories in Qualitative Data Analysis." In U. Kelle, *Computer-aided Qualitative Data Analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 80–95.
- Robbins, Paul and Rob Krueger. 2000. "Beyond Bias? The Promise and Limits of Q Method in Human Geography." *The Professional Geographer* 52: 636–648.
- Rochefort, David and Roger Cobb. 1994. *The Politics of Problem Definition*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.
- Roulston, Kathryn, Kathleen deMarrais, and Jaime B. Lewis. 2003. "Learning to Interview in the Social Sciences." *Qualitative Inquiry*: 643–668.
- Rydin, Y. 1998. "Managing Urban Air Quality: Language and rational choice in metropolitan governance." *Environment and Planning A* 30: 1429–1443.
- Satterfield, Theresa (Terre). 2004. "A Few Thoughts on Combining Qualitative and Quantitative Methods." *Report on NSF Workshop on Scientific Foundations of Qualitative Research*, 117–119. <http://www.nsf.gov/pubs/2004/nsf04219/nsf04219-6.pdf>
- Satterfield, T. and Gregory, R 1998. "Reconciling Environmental Values and Pragmatic Choices." *Society and Natural Resources* 11, no. 7: 629–647.
- Schneider, Anne L. and Helen Ingram. 1994. "Social Constructions and Target Populations: Implications for Politics and Policy." *American Political Science Review* 87: 334–47.
- Schonlau, Matthias. 2002. "The clustergram: A graph for visualizing hierarchical and nonhierarchical cluster analyses." *The Stata Journal* 2: 391–402.
- Schrodt, P.A. and D. J. Gerner. 2000. "Using Cluster Analysis to Derive Early Warning Indicators for Political Change in the Middle East, 1979–1996." *American Political Science Review* 94: 803–818.
- Sharp, Elaine. 1994. "Paradoxes of National Anti-drug Policymaking." In Rochefort, D. and Roger W. Cobb (Eds.), *The Politics of Problem Definition*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 98–116.
- Sidney, Mara. 2002. "The Role of Ideas in Education Politics: Using Discourse Analysis to Understand Barriers to Reform in Multiethnic Cities." *Urban Affairs Review* 38: 253–279.
- Small n Web site: <http://www.smalln.spr.ucl.ac.be>.
- Staeheli, Lynn A. and Clarke, Susan E. 2004. "The New Politics of Work and Time." *Urban Geography* 24:103–126.
- Stark, Andrew. 2002. "Why Political Scientists aren't Public Intellectuals" *PS* September. <http://www.apsanet.org/PS/sept02/stark.cfm>.
- Steelman, Toddi A. and Lynn A. Maguire. 1999. "Understanding Participant Perspectives: Q-Methodology in National Forest Management." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 18: 361–388.
- Stephenson, W. 1953. *The Study of Behavior: Q-technique and its methodology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Stone, Deborah. 1989. "Causal Stories and Formation of Policy Agendas." *Political Science Quarterly* 104: 281–300.

- Stroh, Matt. 2000. "Qualitative Interviewing." In *Research Training for Social Scientists*, Dawn Burton, ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 196–217.
- Stryker, Robin. 1996. "Beyond History Versus Theory: Strategic Narrative and Sociological Explanation." *Sociological Methods & Research* 24: 304–352.
- Sturges, Judith E. and Kathleen J. Hanrahan. 2004. "Comparing Telephone and Face-to-Face Qualitative Interviewing: A Research Note." *Qualitative Research* 4: 107–118.
- "Symposium: The Case of Case Study Research." 2000. Comparative and Historical Sociology Newsletter Advanced Industrial Democracies, 1974–1980." <http://www.sla.purdue/academic/soc/comphist/chs-00Fall1.html>.
- Tarrow, Sidney. 2004. "Bridging the Quantitative-Qualitative Divide." In Brady, Henry E. and David Collier, eds. 2004. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Boulder, CO and Berkeley, CA: Roman & Littlefield and Berkeley Public Policy Press, 171–179.
- Thomas, D., C. McCoy, and A. McBride. 1993. "Deconstructing the Political Spectacle: Sex, race, and subjectivity in public response to the Clarence Thomas/Anita Hill "sexual harassment" hearings." *American Journal of Political Science* 37: 699–720.
- Wanta, W. and Y.W. Hu. 1993. "The Agenda-setting Effects of International News Coverage: An Examination of Differing News Frames." *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 5: 250–264.
- Weimer, David L. 1999. "Comment: Q-Method and the Isms." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 18: 426–429.
- Wicham-Crowley, Timothy P. 1991. "A Qualitative Comparative Approach to Latin American Revolutions." *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 32: 82–109.
- Weitzman, E. A. 1999. Analyzing qualitative data with computer software. *Health Services Research* 34 (5), 1241–1263.
- Weitzman, E. A. 2000. Software and qualitative research. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.) *Handbook of qualitative research*, 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 803–820.
- Weitzman, E. A. 2004. "Advancing the Scientific Basis of Qualitative Research." *Report on NSF Workshop on Scientific Foundations of Qualitative Research*, 145–148. <http://www.nsf.gov/pubs/2004/nsf04219/nsf04219-6.pdf>
- Weitzman, E. A. & Miles, M. B. 1995. *Computer programs for qualitative data analysis: A software source-book*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Yanow, Dvora. 2000. *Conducting Interpretive Policy Analysis*. Sage University Papers Series on Qualitative Research Methods, Vol. 47. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Yanow, Dvora. 2003. *Constructing 'Race' and 'Ethnicity' in America: Category-Making in Public Policy and Administration*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
- Yin, Robert K. 1994. *Case Study Research: Design and Method*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 99–146.