

# Introduction to Interpretive (-Qualitative) Methodologies and Methods

Dr. Dvora Yanow

Guest Professor  
Communication, Philosophy, and Technology Sub-department  
Wageningen University, The Netherlands

Professor of Organizational Studies  
Keele University  
UK

May 19-21, 2015

9:00am-4:30pm

Interpretive (-qualitative) approaches in the social sciences position *meaning* as a fundamental element of social (inter-) action, reflecting late 20<sup>th</sup> century developments in the philosophy of (social) science. Since the late 1970s, pushing back against the so-called behavioral(ist) revolution, social scientists have increasingly turned, once again, to generating data through one or more of three methods—observing, with whatever degree of participation; talking to people, which includes formal interviews as a subset; and the identification and close ‘reading’, literal and/or figurative, of research-relevant documents and visual materials—retaining the word (or visual) form of those data for analysis, rather than translating them into numbers for statistical analysis. When done in keeping with ideas from phenomenology, hermeneutics, and/or related ways of seeing and knowing, these have become known as interpretive research methods.

In the middle of the last century, it became common to distinguish between two broad classes of social scientific research as “qualitative” and “quantitative.” But the conceptual distinction is mis-named: researchers using “qualitative methods” also count, and those using “quantitative methods” also interpret their data. If anything, those two terms apply to the character of the *data* researchers *generate*, rather than to the ways they analyze those data. What is being signaled through those two phrases are differences in philosophical presuppositions, based on different understandings of the perceived character of human or social reality (ontological presuppositions) and whether and how that reality might be known (epistemological ones).

From this perspective, specific research methods are seen to be grounded in the particular methodological (ontological and epistemological) presuppositions, wagers or arguments which they put into practice. Making this relationship explicit renders “methodology” as, in a sense, applied philosophy—that is, applied ontology and epistemology—and “methods” as the enactment of specific methodologies. But more than that: “qualitative” methods have increasingly come under pressure to conform to the methodological presuppositions informing “quantitative” methods. And so today, we increasingly have a tripartite division among methods (as seen from a presuppositional perspective): *quantitative* (informed by positivist notions of ontology and epistemology); *qualitative* (also following positivist presuppositions); and *interpretive* (informed by ideas explicated in phenomenology, hermeneutics, some critical theory, pragmatism, symbolic interactionism, and ethnomethodology and their ontological and epistemological presuppositions). Examples of interpretive methods include, e.g., metaphor, category, and various kinds of discourse analysis, ethnomethodology (including conversational analysis), and participant observation/ethnography, case studies, and grounded theory when these are done in keeping with

interpretive methodological presuppositions.

This course explores these issues in theory and in practice. We will be more practical than philosophical, in the sense that we will tie the methodological underpinnings of interpretive methods to the doing of research. That practical engagement will focus more on field (contemporary) than archival (historical) research. The course will take up:

- an overview of interpretive approaches in social science – origins and recent developments;
- discussion of the relationships among ontology, epistemology, and methodology in interpretive approaches;
- implications for research practices, including research design, of *doing* interpretive social science; and
- discussions of issues in interpretive research projects, as raised by course participants.

We will talk about different kinds of inquiry employing interpretive methods, although for reasons of time we will focus on the three methods for *generating* data (observing, with whatever degree of participating; talk, including formal interviewing; and the identification and close “reading,” literal and figurative, of research-relevant documents and visual materials). There are some two dozen different interpretive methods for *analyzing* data, depending on the data type (e.g., metaphor analysis for language, ethnomethodology for conversations or acts; see Yanow and Schwartz-Shea 2014: xxiii). Because this subject matter can be very abstract, we will try to ground our discussions in specific “laboratory” exercises, generating our own observational and conversational data for exploration, using the city and university as our “lab.”

TIME	TOPICS	THOUGHT QUESTIONS & 'LABS'	READINGS
<b>Tuesday, 19 May</b>			
9.30-10.45  11.00-12.00	<u>Introductions</u>  <u>Getting going</u> Ontology, epistemology, methodology, methods Communities of meaning/interpretive communities; "local" knowledge Tacit knowledge Symbolic representations of social meaning(s): artifacts (language/objects/acts) $\leftrightarrow$ meanings (values, beliefs, sentiments) Generating versus accessing data Generating (observing/talking/ 'reading') versus analyzing data; varieties of meaning-centered data and methods	Why do we talk about 'quantitative', 'qualitative,' and 'interpretive' methods? What is a symbol, and what is one doing in this course? What is the relationship between symbols and human, or social, meaning? What is the difference between 'collecting' or 'gathering,' 'accessing,' and 'generating' data? (Hint: Focus on the meaning of these terms: with respect to each of them, where are you located, physically, and where are your data relative to where you are?) What are the various ways in which we can generate meaning-centered data? Are these the same as or different from the ways in which we might analyze those data?	Geertz, Clifford. 1973. <i>The interpretation of cultures</i> . NY: Basic Books, Ch. 1. Lincoln, Yvonna S. 2010. "What a long, strange trip it's been...": Twenty-five years of qualitative and new paradigm research. <i>Qualitative Inquiry</i> 16/1: 3-9. SS: Ch. 1 and Epilogue SSY: Introduction (pp. 1-9), Ch. 3, Starting from meaning: Contextuality and its implications, and pp. 79-84 YSS: Book and Part II and IV Introductions Ch. 1 (Yanow) Ch. 24 (Pachirat) Ch. 25 (Yanow and Schwartz-Shea)
<b>12.00-13.30 Lunch</b>		<u>Lab—Observing</u> : to be conducted over lunch break; field notes to be written up in last half hour or so; see assignment	SS: ch. 4, through p. 60 YSS: Ch. 10 (Pader), Ch. 11 (Shehata)
<b>13.30-15.00  15.30-16.30</b>	<u>Generating data through observing</u> observing and interpreting; categories, boundaries; places and objects, people and acts; nonverbal communication  <u>Where do research questions come from?</u> the place of a priori knowledge in interpretive research  <u>Abductive logic of inquiry</u> : surprises and 'dirt'	Does research always start with hypotheses? What is the thing, event, situation, etc. that you are trying to understand in/through your research? How do you know what it is? How would you know if you were 'wrong' (i.e., if your analysis is illogical or inconsistent)? Is there a specifically 'interpretive' logic of inquiry? Linearity versus spiraling in logics of research and research designs	Kunda, Gideon. 2013. Reflections on becoming an ethnographer. <i>Journal of Organizational Ethnography</i> 2/1: 4-22. Agar, Michael. 2010. On the ethnographic part of the mix. <i>Organizational Research Methods</i> 13/2: 286–303. Locke, Karen, Golden-Biddle, Karen, and Feldman, Martha S. 2008. Making doubt generative: Rethinking the role of doubt in the research process. <i>Organization Science</i> 19/6: 907-18. SSY, Ch. 2, Ways of knowing: Research questions and logics of inquiry

**Wednesday, 20 May**

<p><b>9.30-10.45</b></p> <p><b>11.00-12.00</b></p>	<p><u>Methodological roots of interpretive research methods</u></p> <p>Metaphysical explanations of events around us; the dawn of 'science' and its development; natural science laws &gt;&gt; social science laws; the contributions of positivist thought; the development of interpretive thinking; the role/place of prior knowledge (of self, settings, people, events, ...)</p>	<p>Why do we need methods? and where do they come from?</p> <p>What makes 'science' 'scientific'? What kinds of ontological and epistemological presuppositions or claims do interpretive methods rest on? How are these different from positivist presuppositions?</p> <p>What arguments are made for the differences between qualitative and quantitative research? What is it about human social reality that makes (some people think) it require different methods from the natural or physical world? What sorts of understandings do these methods enable vis à vis social realities that positivist-informed methods do not?</p>	<p>Taylor, Charles. 1971. Interpretation and the sciences of man. <i>Review of Metaphysics</i> 25: 3–51. [Reprinted in <i>Understanding and Social Inquiry</i>, eds. Fred R. Dallmayr and Thomas A. McCarthy, 101–31. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press; and <i>Interpretive Social Science: A Reader</i>, ed. Paul Rabinow and William M. Sullivan, 25–71 [in 1979 ed.]. Berkeley: University of California Press.]</p> <p>YSS: Ch. 2 (Hawkesworth) (Optional: Ch. 3, McClure; Ch. 5, Adcock)</p>
<p><b>12:00-13.30</b></p> <p><b>Lunch</b></p>		<p><u>Lab—Participating, including talking:</u> to be conducted over lunch break; see assignment.</p>	<p>YSS: Ch. 8 (Soss), Ch. 9 (Schaffer) SS: pp. 67-71 middle</p>

<p><b>13.30-15.00</b></p>	<p><u>The relational character of interpretive research</u> dual identities in the field and other issues in the researcher-participant relationship; power and research relationships; implications for research ethics</p>	<p>What are the implications of interpretive methodological presuppositions for interacting with research participants and for the presentation of self, and identity management, in doing so? What is entailed in being a researcher at the same time that one is an observer (with whatever degree of participation)?</p>	<p>SSY: Ch. 4, pp. 60-66, 71-74 Gans, Herbert. 1976. Personal journal: B. On the methods used in this study. In <i>The Research Experience</i>, ed. M. Patricia Golden, 49-59. Itasca, IL: F.E. Peacock.</p>
<p><b>15.30-16.30</b></p>	<p><u>Positionality, reflexivity, and knowledge claims</u></p>	<p>Where do power and control lie in interpretive field research? How does researcher power shape the <i>political</i> character of the research?</p>	<p>Cohn, Carol. 2006. Motives and methods. In Brooke Ackerly, Maria Stern, and Jacqui True, eds., <i>Feminist methodologies for international relations</i>, 91-107. NY: Cambridge University Press. Shehata, in YSS, chapter 11 [review] Pachirat, Timophy. 2009. The <i>political</i> in political ethnography. In Edward Schatz, ed., <i>Political Ethnography</i>. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Wilkinson, Claire. 2008. Positioning 'security' and securing one's position. In <i>Field work in difficult environments</i>, eds. Caleb Wall and Peter Mollinga. Berlin: Lit Verlag. Zirakzadeh, Cyrus Ernesto. 2009. When nationalists are not separatists: Discarding and recovering academic theories while doing fieldwork in the Basque region of Spain. In Edward Schatz, ed., <i>Political Ethnography</i>. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.</p>

Thursday, 21 May			
9.30-10.45	<u>On systematicity and trustworthiness</u> Evaluating the truth claims of interpretive research; reflexivity and positionality	Can “rigor” and “objectivity,” “reliability” and “validity” assess the ‘goodness’ of interpretive research? If not, how else can we evaluate it? Is trustworthiness in research important? Why/ not? What makes it trustworthy? What is the role of reflexivity in interpretive research? What do we reflect <i>on</i> ? How does researcher positionality shape the character of the research and of the researcher’s claims to have knowledge of the subject studied?	SSY: Ch. 6, Designing for trustworthiness: Knowledge claims and evaluation of interpretive research YSS: Ch. 6 (Yanow), Ch. 7 (Schwartz-Shea)
11.00-12.00	<u>Reflexivity and trustworthiness in the field</u>		
12.00-13.30 Lunch			
13.30-15.00	<u>Reflexivity and trustworthiness on the page</u>	What might it mean, in writing interpretive research, to “see the world in a grain of sand” [as Pachirat asks, Ch. 24, YSS]? Is this the same thing as “thick description”?	SS: 118-38.
15.30-16.30	‘Thick description’ in fieldwork>> thick description in deskwork and textwork  Rephrasing/reframing rigor, objectivity, reliability, validity; Or, Reading like a reviewer....  Quoting the late journalist David Halberstam: “Solid journalism isn’t about fancy verbiage, [Halberstam] says; rather, ‘it’s about ideas, about narration, about setting things out, about telling the story.’ And what really comes first is legwork, ‘The more the better.’ The more interviews you do, the better. The more anecdotes you get, the better. Because when you’ve got a hundred different angles on a story, Halberstam says, you can write with authority. When you’ve got a hundred different anecdotes, you can leave the lame ones out. “Do both, and your writing will have—and	Are there special characteristics of interpretive writing that distinguish it from other genres of research writing? Do these have any bearing on the trustworthiness of the researcher’s claims? Is there a difference between finding much in a grain of sand—making a complicated picture out of what seems to others a detail—and piling those grains sky-high—making a fine-grained picture with many details? Halberstam apparently also “talked about marshaling a library of facts and interviews about any subject—density, he sometimes called it—before actually winnowing that thick mass to its essence.” <sup>2</sup> How is this, and his descriptions, quoted on the left, of journalism different from interpretive research writing?	Yanow, Dvora. 2009. Reading as method. In Edward Schatz, ed., <i>Political ethnography: What immersion contributes to the study of power</i> . Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Schwartz-Shea, Peregrine and Yanow, Dvora. 2009. Reading and writing as method: In search of trustworthy texts. In Sierk Ybema, Dvora Yanow, Harry Wels, and Frans Kamsteeg, eds., <i>Organizational ethnography: Studying the complexities of everyday life</i> , 56-82. London: Sage. <u>See also:</u> Brower, Ralph S., Abolafia, Mitchell Y., and Carr, J.B. 2000. On improving qualitative methods in public administration research. <i>Administration and Society</i> 32: 363-97. Golden-Biddle, Karen and Locke, Karen. 1993. Appealing work: An investigation in how ethnographic texts convince.

<sup>2</sup> Eleanor Randolph, 2007. “Halberstam on Journalism.” *The New York Times*, op-ed (25 April 2007; accessed 25 April 2007), [nytimes.com/2007/04/25/opinion/25weds4.html?ex=1178164800&en=963e7760c3bce568&ei=5070&emc=eta1](http://nytimes.com/2007/04/25/opinion/25weds4.html?ex=1178164800&en=963e7760c3bce568&ei=5070&emc=eta1).

	<p>this is a key characteristic, Halberstam says—it will have density. ‘I can always tell when a writer is cheating,’ Halberstam says. ‘I can tell when it’s a two phone-call story.’”<sup>1</sup></p>		<p><i>Organization Science</i> 4: 595–616. Other entries in “For further reading,” below, section C.</p>
--	--	--	--

---

<sup>1</sup> Robin Sloan, 2003. “Do the Leg Work.” *The Narrative Journal: Reports from the 2003 Nieman Conference on Narrative Journalism* (December 5). <http://poynter.blogs.com/narrative/sessionskeynote/index.html> (accessed 25 April 2007).

## **Reading materials**

### Primary texts

Course readings will be drawn from the following books, supplemented with additional articles or book chapters as indicated in the syllabus. A list of additional readings follows the daily schedule.

Leonard Schatzman and Anselm L. Strauss, *Field research*. NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1973. [a slightly more traditional rendering; SS in syllabus]

Peregrine Schwartz-Shea and Dvora Yanow, *Interpretive research design: Concepts and processes*. New York: Routledge, 2012. [SSY in syllabus]

Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, eds., *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Armonk, NY: M E Sharpe, 2014. [YSS in syllabus]

### Background reading

Although this is designed as an introductory course, if these ideas are completely new to you, you might want to do some preliminary reading:

Agar, Michael. 2013. *The lively science: Remodeling human social research*. Minneapolis, MN: Mill City Press. [the most engaging and readable work I know on this topic; online edition available]

Jackson, Patrick Thaddeus. 2011. *The conduct of inquiry in international relations: Philosophy of science and its implications for the study of world politics*. NY: Routledge. [more formal than Agar, yet still readable; widely applicable beyond IR]

Cerwonka, Allaine and Malkki, Liisa H. 2007. *Improvising theory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. [for those planning to or advising students who do field research; correspondence between a political science phd student just starting her field research (Cerwonka) in a department not known for that kind of research and the anthropologist on her committee (Malkki), with reflective commentary from both.]



### Observing exercise

Solo or with one (only!) partner: choose a location on campus or in the city, e.g., in or near where you have lunch, where you can observe for 1/2 hour.

Take notes on your observations. Write up these notes.

Be prepared to discuss your observing after lunch.

### Participating exercise

This time, find some way to participate with “natives” of your “research setting” in the events going on there, including speaking to at least one person for some time.

Take notes afterwards on your observations. What, if anything, was different this time? Write up these notes. Be prepared to discuss the exercise after lunch.

### FYI: Listserves that deal with interpretive research methods

<http://listserv.cddc.vt.edu/mailman/listinfo/interpretationandmethods>

[international; created by a group in US political science, including IR and other fields; not heavy traffic— used for announcements and the occasional interesting question]

<http://community.apsanet.org/communities/viewcommunities/groupdetails/?CommunityKey=2d63fe2c-d008-4f65-9e26-99781fb0b047>

APSA Connect page [you need not be a member of APSA to subscribe, unless they have changed the rules since this started]

<http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs/fqs-e/rubriken-e.htm>

[FQS is an open access journal, so all articles are available online free of cost; good archive.

See <http://qualitative-research.net/fqs/boai-e.html> for some short information about open access.]

<http://www.uofaweb.ualberta.ca/iiqm/index.cfm>

[International Institute of Qualitative Methodology, at the U of Alberta, Canada, based in the Nursing School; this is a fantastic resource, dealing with issues much broader than nursing per se; they have an e-newsletter that you can subscribe to from this site]

*QMMR [Qualitative and MultiMethod Research] Newsletter*

[from the APSA Qualitative Methods section; newsletters are available to non-members after 1 year at

<https://www.maxwell.syr.edu/moynihan/cqrm/Newsletters/>]

### For further reading

(selected; there are many, many more for each of these categories)

#### A. Theoretical/methodological/conceptual

- Edelman, Murray. 1964. *The Symbolic Uses of Politics*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Edelman, Murray. 1977. *Political Language*. New York: Academic Press.
- Geertz, Clifford. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. NY: Basic Books. Esp. ch. 1.
- Hawkesworth, M. E. 1988. *Theoretical Issues in Policy Analysis*. Albany: SUNY Press, Part I.
- Hiley, David R., Bohman, James F., and Shusterman, Richard, eds. 1991. *The Interpretive Turn*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Murphy, Jerome T. 1980. *Getting the facts*. Santa Monica: Goodyear. (out of print, but excellent for a short book)
- Polkinghorne, Donald E. 1983. *Methodology for the Human Sciences*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Polkinghorne, Donald E. 1988. *Narrative Knowing and the Human Sciences*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Rabinow, Paul and Sullivan, William M., eds. 1979/1985. *Interpretive social science*, 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> eds. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Stone, Deborah A. 2011 [1988/2007]. *Policy Paradox*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. NY: W. W. Norton.
- Van Maanen, John, Sørensen, Jesper B., and Mitchell, Terence R. 2007. 'The interplay between theory and method.' *Academy of Management Review* 32/4: 1145–1154. [in re. abduction]
- Yanow, Dvora. 2000. *Conducting interpretive policy analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Yanow, Dvora. 2003. Interpretive empirical political science: What makes this not a subfield of qualitative methods. *Qualitative Methods Newsletter* 1/2 (Fall): 9-13.  
[www.maxwell.syr.edu/uploadedFiles/moynihan/cqrm/Newsletter1.2.pdf](http://www.maxwell.syr.edu/uploadedFiles/moynihan/cqrm/Newsletter1.2.pdf).

#### B. Empirical interpretive research

- Goodsell, Charles T. 1988. *The Social Meaning of Civic Space*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.
- Gusfield, Joseph R. 1981. *The Culture of Public Problems: Drinking-Drivering and the Symbolic Order*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hawkesworth, M. E. 1988. *Theoretical issues in policy analysis*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 2<sup>nd</sup> half.
- Kondo, Dorinne K. 1990. *Crafting Selves: Power, Gender, and Discourses of Identity in a Japanese Workplace*. Chicago: University of Chicago 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.
- Mitchell, Timothy. 1991. *Colonising Egypt*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Mitchell, Timothy. 2002. *Rule of Experts*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Orr, Julian. 1996. *Talking About Machines: An Ethnography of a Modern Job*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Pachirat, Timothy. 2011. *Every Twelve Seconds: Industrialized Slaughter and the Politics of Sight*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Pader, Ellen J. 1993. Spatiality and Social Change: Domestic Space Use in Mexico and the United States. *American Ethnologist* 20: 114–37.
- Paley, Julia. 2001. Making Democracy Count. *Cultural Anthropology* 16: 135–64.
- Schatz, Edward, ed. 2009. *Political Ethnography: What Immersion Contributes to the Study of Power*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Schmidt, Ronald, Sr. 2000. *Language Policy and Identity Politics in the United States*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

- Shehata, Samer S. 2009. *Shop Floor Culture and Politics in Egypt*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Singerman, Diane. 1996. *Avenues of Participation: Family, Politics, and Networks in Urban Quarters of Cairo*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Stein, Sandra J. 2004. *The Culture of Education Policy*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- 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.
- Van Maanen, John. 1978. Observations on the Making of a Policeman. *Human Organization* 32: 407–18.
- Walsh, Katherine Cramer. 2004. *Talking About Politics: Informal Groups and Social Identity in American Life*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Yanow, Dvora. *How does a policy mean? Interpreting policy and organizational actions*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1996.
- Yanow, Dvora. 2003. *Constructing "Race" and "Ethnicity" in America: Category-making in Public Policy and Administration*. Armonk, NY: M E Sharpe.
- Ybema, Sierk, Yanow, Dvora, Wels, Harry, Kamsteeg, Frans, eds. 2009. *Organizational Ethnography: Studying the Complexities of Everyday Life*. Sage: London.

Noteworthy for their use of multiple (and unusual) kinds of 'documentary' data:

- Hopf, Ted. 2002. *Social Construction of International Politics: Identities and Foreign Policies, Moscow, 1955 and 1999*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Mitchell, Timothy. 1991. *Colonising Egypt*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Mitchell, Timothy. 2002. *Rule of Experts*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Scott, James C. 1990. *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Scott, James C. 1998. *Seeing like a State*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

C. On writing, representation, and truth claims:

- Brown, Richard Harvey. 1976. Social theory as metaphor: On the logic of discovery for the sciences of conduct. *Theory and Society* 3/2: 169-97.
- Clifford, James and Marcus, George E., eds. 1986. *Writing culture: The poetics and politics of ethnography*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Geertz, Clifford. 1988. *Works and lives: The anthropologist as author*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Golden-Biddle, Karen and Locke, Karen. 1997. *Composing qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gusfield, Joseph. 1976. The literary rhetoric of science. *American Sociological Review* 41/1, 16-34.
- Iser, Wolfgang. 1989. *Prospecting: From reader response to literary anthropology*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Marcus, George E. and Fischer, Michael M.J. 1999. *Anthropology as cultural critique: An experimental moment in the human sciences*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Richardson, Laurel. 1994. Writing: A method of inquiry. In Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln, eds., *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 516–29. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Schwartz-Shea, Peregrine and Yanow, Dvora. 2002. "Reading" "methods" "texts": How research methods texts construct political science. *Political Research Quarterly* 55, 457-86.
- Schwartz-Shea, Peregrine and Yanow, Dvora. 2012. Design in context: From the human side of research to writing research manuscripts (ch. 7); Speaking across epistemic communities (ch. 8). In *Interpretive research design: Concepts and processes*. New York: Routledge.
- Van Maanen, John. 1988. *Tales of the field*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Van Maanen, John. 1995. Style as theory. *Organization Science* 6: 133-43.
- Van Maanen, John. 1996. Commentary: On the matter of voice. *Journal of Management Inquiry* 5: 375-81.

D. Interpretive histories

Davis, Natalie Zemon. *The Return of Martin Guerre* (also a movie!)

Darnton, Robert. 1984. *The Great Cat Massacre and Other Episodes in French Cultural History*. NY: Basic Books.

Darnton, Robert. 1996. *The Forbidden Best-Sellers of Pre-Revolutionary France*. New York: W.W. Norton.

Darnton, Robert. 2003. *George Washington's False Teeth: An Unconventional Guide to the Eighteenth Century*.

E. Visual methods (selected; there are many more)

Van Veeren, Elspeth. 2011. Captured by the camera's eye: Guantánamo and the shifting frame of the Global War on Terror. *Review of International Studies* 37: 1721–49.

Wachtel, Edward A. 1993. The first picture show: Cinematic aspects of cave art. *Leonardo* (Journal of the International Society for the Arts, Sciences and Technology) 26(2): 135-40.

Yanow, Dvora. 2014. Methodological ways of seeing and knowing. In Emma Bell, Samantha Warren, and Jonathan Schroeder, eds., *The Routledge Companion to Visual Organization*, 167-89. NY: Routledge.