

Beginnings

It took the proverbial village to launch the Interpretive Methodologies and Methods Conference Group at APSA....

Stirrings

In her 2000 Sage “blue book” *Conducting Interpretive Policy Analysis*, Dvora Yanow sought to answer a question posed by one of her dissertation committee members: How would you teach someone else to do the research you did here? The 1982 dissertation, published as *How Does a Policy Mean?* in 1996, argued for a different way of looking at policy implementation and doing policy analysis—one that, as we would say now, was more “experience-near” (Geertz 1974)—by contrast with the dominant cost-benefit-analysis-type assessments that relied on quantitative data and generalized inferences and which were certainly far distant from the experiences of any persons whose lives were intended to be affected, for the better, by social policies.

At the 1999 Western Political Science Association (WPSA) meeting in Seattle, WA, Dvora had lunch with Peri Schwartz-Shea (University of Utah). The two of them knew each other from the annual 7 a.m. WPSA Women’s Caucus in Political Science breakfast meetings and had followed each other there as presidents. At that lunch they ended up pondering, together, what research methods textbooks actually taught: was it “quantitative” methods alone, or did they also treat “qualitative” ones, and if so, how? They made a search of the books on display, which Peri repeated at that year’s American Political Science Association (APSA) meeting, collecting a set of textbooks offered for “research methods” teaching with those words in their titles. Analysis of those books led to a paper presented at the 2000 WPSA meeting in San Jose, CA, which in turn led to their 2002 *Political Research Quarterly* article, launching their collaborative, methods-focused projects. (At newly appointed editorial board member Christine

DiStefano's encouragement, they submitted the ms. to *PS: Political Science & Politics*, where it was roundly rejected. One of the reviewers wrote that the methods battle we were addressing had been fought, and lost, years before, and he saw no reason to re-open it.)

The first of their joint projects was a Saturday afternoon workshop at the 2003 WPSA in Denver, "Interpretive Research Methods in Empirical Political Science"; in addition to the two of them, Fred Schaffer (now at UMass Amherst), Martha Feldman (UCI), and Ron Schmidt (then at Cal State Long Beach) presented (see Appendix). In October 2002, in anticipation of that Workshop, Dvora and Peri mounted a survey, circulated on the Perestroika listserv, asking who was doing what sort of "interpretive" research (see Appendix).¹

At the 2002 APSA meeting, David Collier (Berkeley) and a group of his students and junior colleagues had set out to collect signatures to support the creation of a "qualitative methods" section in the association. Dvora, Peri, and Kirstie McClure (UCLA) left a Perestroika gathering after someone announced the organizational meeting of the qualitative methods group. There, they met Robert Adcock (then a Berkeley Ph.D. student) and Fred. Dvora was invited, through Robert's efforts, to present her research on state-created categories in May 2003 at Berkeley's Interpretive Political Science Group led by Mark Bevir and Chris Ansell. On sabbatical starting that September, she launched into researching possible contributors to what became the co-edited *Interpretation and Method* book she and Peri had decided that summer to develop. The research initially relied on the spreadsheet of information culled from the 2002 survey. At the same time, Dvora started thinking that a forum was needed to provide an institutional anchor and visibility for interpretive researchers to further grow the community of scholars. That led to the Interpretation and Methods listserv, set up at Virginia Tech through the auspices of Tim Luke and run by Jeremy Hunsinger (which he still does: <http://lists.digital-discourse.org/listinfo.cgi/interpretationandmethods-digital-discourse.org>). The original domain

¹ On the Perestroika movement in US political science, see Monroe (2005).

statement was lost in a denial of service attack on VPI's servers and subsequent transfer to another server, along with the list of founding members, among whom were Robert Adcock (American), Patrick Jackson (American), Ido Oren (Florida), Timothy Pachirat (now UMass Amherst), Fred, Peri, and Dorian Warren (now at Community Change).

Interpretation and Method was published in 2006 (with a second edition appearing in 2014). Colleagues took advantage of the Working Group format APSA started to organize one in 2007 and again 2008 (see Appendix). APSA also launched Short Courses, and a group of colleagues organized one in 2007, "Interpret This!" (see Appendix) Its success led to a series of almost annual Short Courses, organized by different members of the community, following different formats. (See separate listing on the webpage.) The Methods Café, created by Dvora and Peri at both WPSA and APSA in 2005, also became a significant means for developing the interpretive scholarly community and making it visible (see Yanow and Schwartz-Shea 2007, Funk 2019). (Following on the 2016 conference meetings, the WPSA Café was taken over by Julie Novkov and Brent Steele; the APSA Café, by Sam Majic and Timothy Pachirat, who are handing it off in 2019 to Biko Koenig and Sarah Wiebe.)

Meanwhile, Dvora had been key to the creation in 1997 of what is now the Critical Policy Studies Conference Group at APSA. At some point in 2007, she had the idea to see about using the same structure for the burgeoning interpretive research community.

IMM CG @ APSA

Although the Qualitative Methods Section at APSA (later renamed Qualitative and Mixed Methods Research) had sponsored interpretive research panels, including hosting the Methods Café there, interpretive researchers were increasingly feeling the need for some forum that would bring them together as a distinctive scholarly community. A number of colleagues who had been involved with the 2006 book and other activities were going to be in New York for the Spring 2008 International Studies Association meeting—Patrick Jackson, Cecelia Lynch, Ido

Oren, Dvora Yanow—and two others lived there—Timothy Pachirat and Dorian Warren. The six of them met for breakfast somewhere in Manhattan and designed the Interpretive Methodologies and Methods Conference Group, including its first three awards: the Hayward Alker Student Paper Award, memorializing a leading figure in post-positivist thinking who had just died, suddenly, the previous summer; the Charles Taylor Book Award, in honor of a leading theorist of interpretive thinking, whose work is influential beyond the bounds of political science; and the Grain of Sand Award, recognizing longstanding contributions to interpretive theorizing and methodological work. (For descriptions of the award domains and the names of past recipients, see elsewhere on the webpage.)

The required number of signatures was collected and the proposal was submitted to APSA's Council (see separate file), with the Organizing Committee consisting of Mark Bevir, Patrick Thaddeus Jackson, Cecelia Lynch, Julie Novkov (SUNY Albany), Ido Oren, Timothy Pachirat, Kamal Sadiq (UCI), Ed Schatz (Toronto), Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, Dorian Warren, and Dvora Yanow. The concluding paragraph of the proposal says:

Although the Qualitative and Mixed Methods Research section has provided a forum for such papers and panels since its inception, the growing community of interpretive researchers strongly feels the need for a self-standing group, with “interpretive” in its name, that will be able to give voice to these ideas in panels of its own design, concerning issues that are unique to its concerns. A distinctive name will better allow interpretive scholars to locate a specific site in the annual meeting where they can meet those who share these interests, in ways that cannot be sustained through Working Groups and Short Courses. In addition to panels featuring interpretive work, we envision cosponsored panels with QMMR on topics that are of shared interest – e.g., qualitative and interpretive approaches to research design, concept development, etc. – in ways that help understand the similarities and differences; and we hope that the section will be open to such collaboration. We see this Conference Group as an extension of the activities of QMMR, and we will continue to encourage Group members to join the section and attend its panels and other events.

It was accepted at the August 2008 APSA Council meeting, and the first panels ran at APSA 2009.

Executive Committee: The initial “managing” committee consisted of most of the members of the Organizing Committee: Patrick Thaddeus Jackson, Cecelia Lynch, Julie Novkov, Ido Oren, Timothy Pachirat, Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, Dorian Warren, and Dvora Yanow, with Dvora and Peri serving initially as chairs, succeeded by Ido. When Patrick, Cecelia, Julie, and Dorian rotated off, they were replaced by Lee Ann Fujii (Toronto), Joe Lowndes (Oregon), Fred Schaffer, and Joe Soss (Minnesota). Samantha Majic (John Jay @ CUNY) joined the Executive Committee in 2017. Lee Ann agreed to serve as chair in Fall 2017, and Joe Lowndes rotated off that Fall. Then, Lee Ann died, unexpectedly, in March 2018. Her death was a huge shock to her family, students, friends, and colleagues, among them the community of interpretive researchers as well as members of other circles of scholars where she had formed ties and made an impact.

Ido and Dvora stepped back in as interim chairs. Lisa Wedeen (Chicago) joined in 2019. The Committee’s members are now (as of July 2019): Sam Majic, Ido Oren (interim co-chair), Timothy Pachirat, Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, Fred Schaffer, Joe Soss, Lisa Wedeen, and Dvora Yanow (interim co-chair).

Program Chairs: The annual program since the beginning has been created by:

2009: Peri Schwartz-Shea, University of Utah Dvora Yanow, VU University Amsterdam
2010: Kevin Bruyneel, Babson College Julie Novkov, SUNY Albany
2011: Ido Oren, University of Florida
2012: Ron Schmidt, California State University, Long Beach
2013: Fred Schaffer, UMass Amherst

2014: Rich Holtzmann, Bryant University
 2015: Doug Dow, University of Texas at Dallas
 2016: Ed Schatz, University of Toronto
 2017: Lee Ann Fujii, Toronto
 2018: Lee Ann Fujii, Toronto; Denise Walsh, University of Virginia
 2019: Nick Rush Smith, CCNY

Other activities

In 2009, drawing on a dozen members of the interpretive research community, many of them authors of chapters in the 2006 *Interpretation and Methods* book, Dvora and Peri applied for NSF funding to run a Workshop on interpretive methods and methodologies across the subfields of US political science. With the hosting and local support of Ed Schatz, the workshop met at the University of Toronto for two days prior to the APSA conference, meeting in Toronto that year. Some two dozen doctoral students, post-docs, and junior faculty joined as participants in the gathering.

In 2018, a fourth award was added, with sponsorship from Routledge, commemorating our late and very much lamented colleague Lee Ann Fujii: the Lee Ann Fujii Award for Innovation in the Interpretive Study of Political Violence.

Appendices

2002 Survey
 Denver WPSA Workshop program
 2007 Short Course
 Founding proposal
 Working Groups: 2007, 2008

References

Funk, Kevin. 2019. "Making interpretivism visible: Reflections after a decade of the methods café." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 52/3: 465-69.

Geertz, Clifford. 1974. "From the native's point of view": On the nature of anthropological understanding. *Bulletin of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences* 28/1: 26-45.

Monroe, Kristen Renwick, ed. 2005. *Perestroika! The raucous rebellion in political science*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Schwartz-Shea, Peregrine and Yanow, Dvora. 2002. "'Reading' 'methods' 'texts': How research methods texts construct political science." *Political Research Quarterly* 55/2, 457-486.

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 and Schwartz-Shea, Peregrine, eds. 2006. *Interpretation and method: Empirical research methods and the interpretive turn*. Armonk, NY: M E Sharpe (2nd edition 2014).

Yanow, Dvora and Schwartz-Shea, Peregrine. 2007. "The methods café: An innovative idea for methods teaching at conference meetings." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 40/2: 383-86.

October 13, 2002 Draft

DATA BASE
Interpretive Methods for Empirical Political Research
15 minutes of your time!

Organizers

Dvora Yanow
Department of Public Administration
California State University, Hayward
dyanow@csuhayward.edu

Peregrine Schwartz-Shea
Department of Political Science
University of Utah
psshea@poli-sci.utah.edu

If you have questions, email Peregrine Schwartz-Shea.

Purpose of the Date Base

The purpose of this data base is to compile a directory of scholars who use “interpretive methods” of scholarly research. This fully searchable directory will be made available to participants of the Workshop on Interpretive Research Methods in Empirical Political Science (Western Political Science Association, Denver 2003), editors of journals looking for reviewers for such work, doctoral students, and other interested scholars. In the absence of an American Political Science Association organized section in Interpretive Methods, we are undertaking to compile information about researchers who use these methods.

By “interpretive methods” we mean research grounded in interpretive philosophies and methodology, i.e., that focus on meaning and meaning-making in context and that seek to analyze words as words rather than necessarily turning them into numbers (as in traditional content analysis).

We seek to make visible interpretive methods and methodologies as part of, but distinct from, the broader label of “qualitative” research. Though we endorse problem-driven research, the current state of disciplinary training in research methods requires explicit recognition of the existence of both interpretive and qualitative methodologies and methods.

In the questionnaire that follows we distinguish between techniques of “data access,” (e.g., conversational interviewing, archival and current document analysis, observation) and techniques of “data analysis” (e.g., semiotics, metaphor analysis, category analysis, ethnomethodology, symbolic interactionism, narrative analysis, discourse analysis).

Submitting this information indicates that you are willing to be included in the data base which will be made available as indicated.

Please take fifteen minutes of your time to complete the questionnaire. Thanks!

Contact Information

1. First name. Initial. Last Name.* *(How will this affect sorting?)*
2. University Affiliation*
3. Email address.* *with a CHECK, i.e., double entry?*
4. Mailing address. *(How much space? Separate fields for all the parts?)*
5. Work phone.

On Contact Information, we want to be able to handle out-of-US scholars: mailing address and phone!

Substantive Training and Research Interests

6. Discipline in which received or will receive advanced degree *(drag-down list with other field political science, philosophy, public administration, law, anthropology, etc)*
7. Degree type: MA, Ph.D., DPA, EDD, JD, other *(drag-down list with other field)*
8. Year of degree:
9. Current departmental affiliation *(Even if we have it above, this should improve sorting.)*
10. Primary substantive fields—drag-down list (choose as many as four)
11. Specialty research interests: drag-down list (choose as many as six)

Interpretive Research Methods

12. Interpretive methods of data access—drag-down list including an other(s) field; choose as many as apply to your research
13. Interpretive methods of data analysis—drag-down list including an other(s) field; choose as many as apply to your research

OPEN FIELDS

14. Please identify the tradition, or school of thought, in which you work. For example, a scholar might do deconstruction in the tradition of Foucault or in the tradition of Derrida. A scholar might do semiotics in the tradition of Greimas' squares or in the tradition of Goffman.
15. Citation 1 to own work—allow them just to paste *(IDEALLY in terms of ease)*
16. Citation 2 to own work—allow them just to paste
17. Citation 3 to own work—allow them just to paste
18. Link to personal web site if available *(to help our vetting process)*

Feedback / Commentary from Scholars

19. OPEN FIELD

Question 10 drag-down list (choose as many as four)

American politics
 Comparative politics
 International relations
 Political theory
 Methodology
 Public administration
 Public law
 Public policy
 Political economy
 Other

Question 11 drag-down list (APSA Key Codes to Primary Fields of Interest--choose as many as four)

N = 102!

Questions 12 Access drag-down list

Field research
(Participant-) Observation research
Ethnography
Case study research (single or comparative)
Action research
Participatory action research
In-depth or conversational interviewing
Oral histories
Archival, current document, or other text-based research

Questions 13 Analysis drag-down list

Hermeneutic analysis (sense-making)
Category analysis
Text analysis
Content analysis (word-based)
Semiotics
Deconstruction
Metaphor analysis
Narrative analysis (oral histories, story-telling)
Discourse analysis
Value critical analysis
Frame-reflective analysis
Dramaturgical analysis
Space analysis
Interpretivist analysis
Constructivist analysis
Phenomenological sense-making
Ethnography
Participant-observation
Grounded theory
Case study analysis
Ethnomethodology
Conversation analysis
Ethno-science
(Participatory) Action research
Genealogy
Poststructural analysis

**Workshop:
Interpretive Research Methods in Empirical Political Science**

2003 Western Political Science Association Meetings, Denver, Colorado
Saturday, March 29, 1:30 - 5:00 p.m.

Organizers:

Dvora Yanow
Department of Public Administration
California State University, Hayward
dyanow@haywire.csuhayward.edu

Peregrine Schwartz-Shea
Department of Political Science
University of Utah
psshea@poli-sci.utah.edu

This workshop is designed to introduce researchers to the varieties of interpretive methods available for the empirical study of politics and to their grounding in interpretive philosophies and methodology. These approaches have a long history and are used across the social sciences. Yet in our discipline, they are rarely taught in doctoral programs, so they are typically not part of the standard repertoire of empirical researchers.

The first half of the workshop (Panel 8.04, 1:30-3:15 p.m., sponsored by the Methodology Section of WPSA) will have two parts. The first will provide an overview of the philosophical grounding of interpretive methods. What are their epistemological and ontological presuppositions? How do these differ from the quantitative and qualitative approaches more commonly used in the discipline? What are the standards for assessing interpretive research? Which journals publish such research?

The second part of that session will focus on one technique of “accessing” data, conversational interviewing, in order to explicate the interpretive focus on meaning and to show how such interviewing contrasts with surveying, standard elite interviews, and focus groups. The sorts of research questions appropriate for this method will be explored.

The second session (3:30-5:00 p.m.) will emphasize that “data analysis” need not mean turning “word data” into numbers. Whether word data are accessed through conversational interviewing, (participant-) observation, or in document form, there are a variety of meaning-focused forms of data analysis for exploring content in its context (e.g., metaphor analysis, category analysis, ethnomethodology). This session will introduce several of them, emphasizing the research questions and empirical applications of such approaches for various subfields of the discipline.

Bibliographies will be provided to participants so that they can pursue subjects in greater depth than can be covered in the limited workshop time. Course syllabi may be included in the packet.

Presenters, topics, and other updates will be posted to the WPSA web site:

<http://www.csus.edu/org/wpsa>

Registration:

No fee. There may be a small charge to cover copying expenses (for bibliographies, course syllabi). Pre-registration requested for planning purposes. Email intent to attend to psshea@poli-sci.utah.edu by **MARCH 1, 2003**.

**Short Course 15 @ APSA 2007:
Interpret This!
A Conceptual and Practical Workshop in Interpretive Political Science**

Co-Sponsors:

Qualitative Methods Section and Theory, Policy & Society Conference Related Group

Contact Person:

Peri Schwartz-Shea
University of Utah
Department of Political Science
260 South Central Campus Drive, Room 252
Salt Lake City, UT 84112-9152
psshea@poli-sci.utah.edu
801.581.6300

Registration: \$20/faculty, \$10/graduate students (optional additional \$20 for Second City evening show); checks should be made payable and sent to Peri Schwartz-Shea

Time: 9:30am – 5:00pm

Location: On the premises of the APSA Annual Meeting

Organizers:

Lee Ann Fujii, George Washington University
Kara Heitz, George Washington University
Timothy Pachirat, New School for Social Research
Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, University of Utah
Dorian Warren, Columbia University
Dvora Yanow, Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam

This innovative, full-day workshop explores the place of interpretive research methods in political science. Intended for both graduate students and faculty, the workshop provides an overview of the conceptual and philosophical groundings of interpretivism, locates interpretive approaches in the various subfields of political science, and provides an opportunity for participants to explore the place an interpretive approach might play in their own research.

Additionally, with the help of The Second City Training Center in Chicago (<http://www.secondcity.com/?id=training-education/training/chicago>), the afternoon session provides an opportunity for participants to actively explore the relationship between the skills and sensibilities developed in theatrical improvisation and the conduct of interpretive research in various arenas ranging from field research to interviewing to document analysis. Registration fee covers the costs of lunch, two breaks, and the improvisation part of the workshop (with an optional dinner and Second City show in the evening).

Schedule

9:30-10:45 Situating interpretive methods in political science

Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, University of Utah: Research without variables

Dvora Yanow, Vrije Universiteit (Amsterdam): A brief history of ideas

10:45-11:00 Break

11:00-12:30 Interpretive methods in the subfields

American Politics: Dorian Warren, Columbia University

American Political Development: Victoria Hattam, New School for Social Research

Comparative Politics: Lisa Wedeen, University of Chicago

International Relations: Ido Oren, University of Florida

Political Theory & International Political Economy: Timothy W. Luke, Virginia Tech

Public Law: Julie Novkov, State University of New York, Albany

Public Policy & Administration: Dvora Yanow, Vrije Universiteit (Amsterdam)

12:30-2:00 Lunch in the subfields

2:00-5:00 The 'discipline' of improv as a model for research methods

Exercises in improvisation (2:00-3:30): Second City with the help of
Lee Ann Fujii, George Washington University

Break (3:30-3:45)

Reflection and discussion: All participants (3:45-5:00)

5:00-6:00 Break

6:00-7:30 Dinner (optional; no host, place TBD)

8:00 Second City show (optional; \$20 for group rate ticket)

Proposal for an APSA Conference Group on
Interpretive Methodologies & Methods

Organizing Committee: Mark Bevir, Patrick Thaddeus Jackson, Cecelia Lynch, Julie Novkov, Ido Oren, Timothy Pachirat, Kamal Sadiq, Ed Schatz, Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, Dorian Warren, Dvora Yanow

Contacts:

Dvora Yanow

Strategic Chair in Meaning and Method
Faculty of Social Sciences
Vrije Universiteit
De Boelelaan 1081
1081HV Amsterdam
THE NETHERLANDS

+31 20 598 6765

d.yanow@fsw.vu.nl

Peregrine Schwartz-shea
University of Utah
Political Science Department
260 South Central Campus Drive Rm 252
Salt Lake City, UT 84112-9152
(801) 581-6300
psshea@poli-sci.utah.edu

This Conference-related Group will provide a forum for the discussion of methodologies and methods related to interpretive research, as well as issues arising from their location within contemporary political science.

Interpretive methods are informed, explicitly or implicitly, by presuppositions deriving from phenomenology, hermeneutics, and some critical theory, of European (Continental) background, and pragmatism, symbolic interaction, and ethnomethodology, developed in the US. Their concerns often overlap with such other approaches as feminist theories, critical race theory, and critical legal studies. Although diverse in their modes of accessing and analyzing data, research processes in the interpretive tradition are united by an empirical and normative prioritizing of the lived experience of people in

meaning(s) of acts, events, interactions, language, and physical artifacts to multiple stakeholders, and the potential for plurality in sense-making of those artifacts, leading at times to conflict.

Interpretive scholars:

- i) study human meaning as embodied in action, text, and/or physical artifacts;
- ii) pay particular attention to the ways that meaning(s) is/are shaped and contested within particular contexts of practice, including intersubjective interaction;
- iii) are self-reflexive as to the ways in which their own concepts, concerns, and presence shape the accounts that they produce;
- iv) pursue ends other than the establishment of "laws" or the generation/testing of "empirical" or "positive" theory.

The emphasis on the primacy of context and participants' meaning-making is often neglected by other methodological frameworks commonly employed by political scientists. Where such frameworks often privilege the development of causal inferences that are generalizable across both time and space, interpretive research prioritizes the "lifeworld" of local actors and the discursive, organizational, and material practices that at once constitute and are constituted by these actors. At both the empirical and normative level, then, interpretive research might be distinguished from other methodological approaches in its de-centering of expertise on the part of the researcher.

Within these parameters there is much diversity and debate. Interpretive scholars diverge with respect to the ends they pursue: they may be practical or contemplative, they may seek to educate, they may be concerned with the pursuit of the particular or with a grand sweeping synthesis, and so on. For some, the legitimation of local knowledge constitutes a radically democratic position; for some, the work requires a commitment to individual human agency; and for yet others it serves to challenge the modern constitution of the subject. We look forward to these and other discussions.

An important motivation behind this Conference Group arises out of the need to make space for interpretive methodology as a legitimate approach within US political science. All political scientists share a desire to see, understand, and explain the social world. We contend that the systematic inclusion of interpretive approaches (in graduate curricula, disciplinary journals, research

funding programs, and so on) carries enormous potential to enliven and enrich our discipline's current ways of seeing, understanding, and explaining. It is hoped that the work showcased in this Conference Group will highlight how much political science stands to gain from the wider inclusion of interpretive approaches.

Some of the interesting interpretive work being done today originates outside the field of political science, but there are also longstanding interpretive traditions within it. We look forward to a constructive dialogue among political scientists interested in interpretive work, whether academics or practitioners in policy analysis and other arenas. We envision the discussion as ranging from the practical to the philosophical, including career-related issues (e.g., publishing and/or getting funding for interpretive research, teaching interpretive methods), panels on specific methods and methodological issues, strategies for effectively developing and conducting interpretive work, presentations of interpretive research, and issues in the philosophy of (social) science.

Although the Qualitative and Mixed Methods Research section has provided a forum for such papers and panels since its inception, the growing community of interpretive researchers strongly feels the need for a self-standing group that will be able to give voice to these ideas in panels of its own design. In addition to panels featuring interpretive work, we envision cosponsoring panels with QMMR on topics that are of shared interest – e.g., qualitative and interpretive approaches to research design, concept development, causal mechanisms, etc. – in ways that help clarify the similarities and differences; and we hope that the section will be open to such collaboration. We also anticipate collaborations with political theory sections (e.g., panels on post-structuralist thought and on feminist theories and inquiry) and with other subfield sections, as interpretive approaches cut across the discipline, from IR constructivism/constructionism to Comparative Government's area studies field research to studies of Congress, the Presidency, public law, public policy, and public administration.

Working Group on Interpretivism and Interpretive Methods 2007

Interpretivists share a common interest in understanding the meaning the social world has for individuals and the intersubjective “webs of meaning” in which individual understandings are immersed. Interpretive methods can include ethnography, in-depth (a.k.a. conversational) interviewing, personal narratives, language and textual analyses of various sorts, and more. This working group will consider how well these methods are represented in political science as a whole and in the individual subfields. We will also consider how political science can better engage interpretive methods, and how we as interpretivists can facilitate this engagement. Prior to APSA, we will circulate a list of panels connected to interpretivism and interpretive methods. We encourage working group participants to attend panels of their choosing from this list during the conference. We also encourage participants in the short course “Interpret This!” to participate in this working group, and vice versa.

Interpretivism and Interpretive Methods Working Group 2008

Drawing on a wide range of research methods, interpretivists share a common interest in understanding the meaning the social world has for individuals and the intersubjective “webs of meaning” in which individual understandings are immersed. Interpretive methods can include ethnography, in-depth (a.k.a. conversational) interviewing, personal narratives, language and textual analyses of various sorts (such as metaphor, category, and discourse analytic methods), and more. This working group will consider the presence of these methods in political science as a whole and in its subfields. We will also engage various issues raised by these approaches and methods, including how political science can better engage interpretive methods and how we as interpretivists can facilitate this engagement. Prior to APSA, we will circulate a list of panels connected to interpretivism and interpretive methods. We encourage working group participants to attend panels of their choosing from this list during the conference. We also encourage participants in the APSA Short Course “Writing (Up) Interpretive Research: Preparing ‘Trustworthy’ Manuscripts” to participate in this working group, and vice versa.

Coordinators: Dvora Yanow (Vrije Universiteit) – contact person; Robert Adcock (George Washington University), Mark Bevir (UC Berkeley), Patrick Thaddeus Jackson (American University), Julie Novkov (SUNY Albany), Ido Oren (University of Florida), Timothy Pachirat (New School), Kamal Sadiq (University of California, Irvine), Ed Schatz (University of Toronto), Peregrine Schwartz-Shea (University of Utah)