

Public Affairs 8780
Logic of Inquiry
Winter 2013

Anand Desai
310 D Page Hall
Telephone: 614.292.0826
Office Hours: by appointment

Day: Thursday
Time: 1:30 am – 4:30 pm
Place: 240 Page Hall
e-mail: desai.1@osu.edu

Course Objectives

The purpose of this course is to explore different research paradigms with an eye towards determining what approach best suits your own values, research interests and objective. Over the course of the quarter we will discuss ontology, epistemology, methodology, axiology, rhetoric and other aspects of a research program in the context of various research paradigms. The end product of this course should be a clarification of what you believe in, as a researcher, should you choose to select one research approach rather than another, or should attempt to combine aspects of multiple approaches.

The class is designed around a policy analysis-as-argument framework where the objective of policy analysis is assumed to be the recommendation of policy action based on claims that are made by arguing about what the data imply. The object is not to learn about methods but about what we consider to be the object of our study, what is our understanding of and approach to gaining knowledge, the moves we make to acquire this knowledge and the language we use in acquiring and disseminating this knowledge. Underlying this structure regarding the nature, acquisition and dissemination of knowledge is a value structure, which may or may not be made explicit. We shall also attempt to understand the implications of these values.

Course Format and Requirements

The class format will be detailed discussions of the readings. The purpose of these discussions will be to elicit the ontological, epistemological, methodological, axiological, praxis, chronological and rhetorical assumptions underlying each approach. The hope is that at the end of the quarter we shall have a clearer understanding of the implications of these assumptions for our approach to research. Each class will begin with a report of the previous week's class discussions.

We will be discussing logical empiricist, interpretive, narrative, critical and action theory approaches to policy research in some detail. For this project to be successful, it is imperative that everyone attends all classes.

Essential readings have been marked by *** and all students will be expected to have read the essential readings. All students will distribute their responses to the readings by **noon on the day before class**. Each week, students will be selected to lead

the class discussion. **Responses from those leading the discussions will be more detailed.**

Students are also expected to add to the readings we use in this class. These may be in the form of book recommendations, book chapters, articles, etc. These contributions should add to our understanding of the materials we will be discussing class or add new insights to our interpretation of the subject matter.

TERM PAPER The final requirement for this class will consist of a paper that (1) outlines a research issue, (2) describes the research approach, and (3) explores one or more methods that might be used to address the proposed research issue.

Deliverables: **Week 3:** Abstract

At a mutually agreed time: Progress report

Week 14: Presentations

Grading

All students in the course will receive an A- as the final grade. At the end of the quarter, I will meet with each student to discuss what he or she did during the course of the quarter to merit the A grade.

Course Materials

The course materials we will use are listed below. Some articles are provided on CARMEN. Journal articles that are readily available from the library have not been posted on CARMEN.

Minimally, we shall be covering the ontological, epistemological and methodological basis of the positivist paradigm and then turn to some post-positivist approaches. I am not prescribing any books for the course this quarter. However, Books that we have read, in some detail, in the past include:

Fisher, Frank (2003) Reframing Public Policy. New York: Oxford University Press.

Forester, John. (1993). Critical Theory, Public Policy, and Planning Practice. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Harmon, Michael (1981) *Action Theory for Public Administration* New York, NY: Longman Publications also available from Burke, VA: Chatelaine Press.

Lundberg, Craig C and Cheri A Young. (2005) Foundations for Inquiry. Stanford, CA: Stanford Business Books.

Parsons, Keith (2006) Copernican Questions: A Concise Invitation to the Philosophy of Science Boston: McGraw Hill

Riccucci, Norma (2010) *Public Administration: Traditions of Inquiry and Philosophies of Knowledge* Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press

Riessman, C.K. (1993). Narrative Analysis, Newbury Park, CA: Sage

White, Jay D. (1999) *Taking Language Seriously: The narrative foundations of public administration research*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press

Yanow, D. (2000). Conducting interpretive policy analysis. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

The following reading materials will be available on CARMEN or directly from the journals through the University's library system.

It is expected that everyone in the class will have read the articles indicated with ***.

Week 1 *January 10*: Introduction

Discussion of class structure, process, roles, and expectations.

Week 2 *January 16*: Problem Formulation

Baer, M., KT Dirks, and JA Nickerson. 2008. A theory of strategic problem formulation. Working Paper, Olin School of Management, University of Washington.

Brewer, J. 2006. *Foundations of Multimethod Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Chapter 3

Hernon, P. and C. Schwartz. 2007. What is a problem statement? *Library & Information Science Research* 29: 307-309

Heylighen F. 1988. Formulating the Problem of Problem-Formulation, in: *Cybernetics and Systems '88*, Trappl R. (ed.), (Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht), p. 949-957.

Week 3 *January 24*: Argumentation

ABSTRACT of final paper due on **January 23** and to be presented in class.

*** You, Min-Bong (1990). An Alternative to Rate-of-Return Regulation: From a Policy-Making-As-Argument Framework, Unpublished Ph.D Dissertation. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University, 16-31.

*** Dryzek, John S. (1993). Policy Analysis and Planning: From Science to Argument. In Fischer, Frank and John Forester (eds.). *The Argumentative Turn in Policy Analysis and Planning*. Durham: Duke University Press.

*** Dunn, William N. (1993). Policy Reforms as Arguments. In Fischer, Frank and John Forester (ed.). *The Argumentative Turn in Policy Analysis and Planning*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Golden, J.L, G.F. Berquist and W.E. Coleman. (1992) *The Rhetoric of Western Thought*, Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Pub. Co. Chapter 13: Stephen Toulmin on the Nature of Argumentation.

Week 4 January 31: Evidence

Readings from the 1958 *Daedalus* issue "On Evidence and Inference."

Aron, Raymond, Suzanne Keller and Judith K. Davison (Fall, 1958) "Evidence and Inference in History" *Daedalus*, Vol. 87, No. 4, pp. 11-39

***Desai, A. and K. Harlow. 2013 (forthcoming) Evidence for Policy Inquiry in K. Desouza and E. Johnston (eds). *Policy Informatics Handbook*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

*** DeLeon, P. (1998) Models of policy discourse: insights versus prediction. (The Evidentiary Basis of Policy Analysis: Empiricist vs. Postpositivist Positions). *Policy Studies Journal* Vol. 26(1): 147(15).

Deutsch, Martin (Fall, 1958). "Evidence and Inference in Nuclear Research" *Daedalus*, Vol. 87, No. 4, pp. 88-98

Erikson, Erik H. (Fall, 1958) "The Nature of Clinical Evidence" *Daedalus*, Vol. 87, No. 4, pp. 65-87.

*** Hart Jr., Henry M. and John T. McNaughton (Fall, 1958) "Evidence and Inference in the Law" *Daedalus*, Vol. 87, No. 4, pp. 40-64

*** Lazarsfeld, Paul F. "Evidence and Inference in Social Research" *Daedalus*, Vol. 87, No. 4, pp. 99-130

*** Lerner, D. (1958) "On Evidence and Inference" *Daedalus*, Vol. 87, No. 4, pp. 3-10

*** Miller, H.T. and C. Fox 2001 The Epistemic Community. *Administration & Society* Vol. 32: 668-685

*** Weimer, David L. (1998). Policy Analysis and Evidence: A Craft Perspective. *Policy Studies Journal*, 26(1): 114-128.

Week 5 February 7: Causation

*** Beebe, H., C. Hitchcock, and P. Menzies (eds.) (2009). *The Oxford handbook of*

causation. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Kincaid, H. Causation in the Social Sciences (Chapter 36)
- Lipton, P. Causation and Explanation (Chapter 29)
- Tooley, M. Causes, Laws and Ontology (Chapter 18)

*** Cartwright, Nancy. (1979). Causal Laws and Effective Strategies *Noûs*, Vol. 13, No. 4, Special Issue on Counterfactuals and Laws (Nov., 1979), pp. 419- 437.

Note that this Cartwright article is the first of a number of articles on causation in this issue of *Noûs*.

*** Cartwright, Nancy. (2003). From Causation to Explanation and Back. Centre for Philosophy of Natural and Social Science Causality: Metaphysics and Methods. Technical Report 09/03

*** Heckman, J. J. (2005). The Scientific Model of Causality *Sociological Methodology*, Vol. 35, pp. 1-97 (With Discussion).

*** Hitchcock, C. (2001). A Tale of Two Effects, *The Philosophical Review*, Vol. 110, No. 3

*** Reiss, J. (2009) Causation in the Social: Sciences Evidence, Inference, and Purpose. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* Vol. 39 No. 1 pp. 20-40

Week 6 February 14: Interpretive Approach

Bevir, M. and R A W Rhodes. 2002. Interpretive Theory in D. Marsh and G. Stoker (eds.), *Theories and Methods in Political Science*. Second edition. London, Macmillan.

*** Jennings, Bruce (1983). Interpretive Social Science and Policy Analysis. In Daniel Callahan and Bruce Jennings (eds.), *Ethics, the Social Sciences, and Policy Analysis*. NY: Plenum.

*** Putnam, Linda L. (1983). The Interpretive Perspective: An Alternative to Functionalism. In Putnam, Linda L. and Michael E. Pacanowsky (eds.). *Communication and Organizations: An Interpretive Approach*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

*** Bredo, Eric and Feinberg, Walter. The Interpretive Approach to Social and Educational Research. In *Conceptual Foundations of Educational Research*. 115-128.

Healy, Paul. (1986) Interpretive policy inquiry: A response to the limitations of the received view. *Policy Sciences* 19(4):381-396

*** Lin, Ann Chin (1998). Bridging Positivist and Interpretivist Approaches to Qualitative Methods. *Policy Studies Journal*, 26(1): 162-180.

*** Paris, David C. and James F. Reynolds. *The logic of policy inquiry*. New York : Longman, 1983 Chapter 6: Interpretive Policy Inquiry, 166-201.

Torgerson, Douglas (1986). Interpretive Policy Inquiry: A Response to Its Limitations. *Policy Sciences*, 19(4): 397-405.

Yanow, D. (1995). Built Space as Story: The Policy Stories that Buildings Tell, *Policy Studies Journal*, 23(3): 407-421

Yanow, D. (2000). *Conducting interpretive policy analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Qualitative research methods series.

*** Yanow, D. (2003). Interpretive Empirical Political Science: What Makes This Not a Subfield of Qualitative Methods. Qualitative Methods Section (APSA) Newsletter 2nd Issue Fall 2003

Week 7 February 21: Narrative Approach

*** Bruner, Jerome (1991). The Narrative Construction of Reality. *Critical Inquiry* 18:1-21

*** Forester, John (1993). Learning from Practice Stories: The Priority of Practical Judgment. In Fischer, Frank and John Forester (eds.). *The Argumentative Turn in Policy Analysis and Planning*. Durham: Duke University Press, 186-209.

Krieger, Martin H. (1986). Big Decisions and a Culture of Decisionmaking. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 5(4): 779-797.

*** Kaplan, Thomas J. (1986). The Narrative Structure of Policy Analysis. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 5(4): 761-778.

Kaplan, Thomas J. "Reading Policy Narratives: Beginnings, Middles, and Ends," pp.167-185.

McCance, T.V., H.P. McKenna and JRP Boore (2001) Exploring caring using narrative methodology: an analysis of the approach. *Journal of Applied Nursing* 33(3): 350-356.

*** Ospina S.M and J. Dodge (2005). It's about time: Catching Method up to Meaning – The usefulness of Narrative Inquiry in Public Administration Research. *Public Administration Review* 65(2): 143-157

*** Ospina S.M, J. Dodge and E.G. Foldy (2005). Integrating Rigor and Relevance in Public Administration Scholarship: The Contribution Narrative Inquiry. *Public Administration Review* 65(3): 286-300.

*** Ospina S.M. and J. Dodge (2005). Narrative Inquiry and the Search for Connectedness: Practitioners and Academics Developing Public Administration Scholarship: The Contribution. *Public Administration Review* 65(4): 409-423.

*** Roe, Emery (1994). *Narrative Policy Analysis*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
 Chapter 2. What are Policy Narratives?
 Chapter 3. Stories, Nonstories, and Their Metanarrative in the 1980-1982 California Medfly Controversy
 Conclusion

Wagenaar, H and R. Hartendorp. (2000) "Oedipus in the Welfare Office: Practice, discourse and identity in public administration" in H. Wagenaar (ed.) *Government Institutions: Effects, Changes and Normative Foundations*, Dordrecht: Kluwer academic Publishers. Pp. 147-177

Week 8 February 28: Critical Approach

*** Bredo, Eric and Walter Feinberg. The Critical Approach to Social and Educational Research. In *Conceptual Foundations of Educational Research*, 271-291.

*** Forester, John. (1993). *Critical Theory, Public Policy, and Planning Practice*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

*** Lather, Patti (1986). Research as Praxis. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56(3): 257-275.

*** Rein, Martin (1983). Value-Critical Policy Analysis. In Daniel Callahan and Bruce Jennings (eds.). *Ethics, the Social Sciences, and Policy Analysis*. NY: Plenum Press, 83-111.

The Critical Theorizing of Jurgen Habermas. 184-212.

Nielsen, Kai (1983). Emancipatory Social Science and Social Critique. In Callahan, Daniel and Bruce Jennings (eds.). *Ethics, the Social Sciences, and Policy Analysis*. NY: Plenum Press, 113-157.

Week 9 March 7: Pragmatism

Barber, B. 1996. Foundationalism and Democracy in S. Benhabib (ed) *Democracy and Difference*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Dewey, J. 1920/1948. *Reconstruction in Philosophy*. Boston: Beacon Press (Dover edition)

Dewey, J. 1929. *Quest for Certainty*. New York, NY: Minton, Balch and Co.

Hildebrand, D.L. 2005. Pragmatism, Neopragmatism, and Public Administration. *Administration & Society* Vol. 37: 345-359.

Miller, H.T. 2004. Why Old Pragmatism Needs an Upgrade. *Administration & Society* Vol. 36: 243.-249

Shields, P.M 1996. Pragmatism: Exploring Public Administration's Policy Imprint. *Administration & Society* Vol. 28: 390-411.

Shields, P.M 2003. The Community of Inquiry: Classical Pragmatism and Public Administration. *Administration & Society* Vol. 35: 510-538.

Shields, P.M 2008. Rediscovering the Taproot: Is Classical Pragmatism the Route to Renew Public Administration? *Public Administration Review* Vol.

March 14: Spring Break

Week 10 March 21: Action Theory

Albert, Gert (2004) Pareto's Sociological Positivism *Journal of Classical Sociology* 4(1): 59-86

Bunge, Mario (1998) The philosophical technologies, *Technology In Society* 20 377-383

Catron, Bayard L. and Michael M. Harmon. Action Theory in Practice: Toward Theory Without Conspiracy. *Public Administration Review*, September/October 1981, 535-541.

Harmon, Michael M. "Decision" and "Action" as Contrasting Perspectives in Organization Theory. *Public Administration Review*, March/April 1989, 144- 150.

*** Harmon, Michael A. (1981). *Action Theory for Public Administration*, Burke, VA: Chatelaine Press.

*** Overview of Action Research

http://www.web.net/~robrien/papers/arfinal.html#_Toc26184651

*** White, Jay D. (1980). Response to Michael Harmon. *Public Administration Review*, March/April 1989, 150-152.

Week 11 March 28: Ethics

*** Bowman, James S., Evan M. Berman and Jonathan P. West (2001) The Profession of Public Administration: An ethics edge in introductory textbooks. *Public Administration Review* 61(2): 194-205

Etzioni A. (1988) *The Moral Dimension*, New York, NY: Free Press. Chapter 5

*** Garofalo, Charles and Dean Geuras (1999). *Ethics in the Public Service*, Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.

- Chapter 1. Ethical Theory in Public Administration
- Chapter 2. The Normative Paradox in Contemporary Public Administration Theory
- Chapter 5. Ethical Unity in Public Administration

Gergen, Kenneth J. (1994) *Realities and Relationships: Soundings in social construction*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hedge, David M. and Jin W. Mok (1989). The Research Values of Policy Analysis. *Knowledge in Society: The International Journal of Knowledge Transfer*, 2(1): 21-41.

*** Hart, David W. (1999). Ethics Education in Public Affairs. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 5(1): 67-76.

Hubin, Donald (1994). The Moral Justification of Benefit/Cost Analysis. *Economics and Philosophy*, 10(2): 169-194.

*** Warwick, Donald P. and Thomas F. Pettigrew. Toward Ethical Guidelines for Social Science Research in Public Policy. In Callahan, Daniel and Bruce Jennings (eds.). *Ethics, the Social Sciences and Policy Analysis*, New York, NY: Plenum. 335-368.

Week 12: April 4 Systems Philosophy

Week 13 April 11: Complexity

*** Bankes. S. (2002). Agent-Based Modeling: A Revolution? *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 99 supplement 3, 435-449.

*** Epstein, J.M Agent Based Computational Models and Generative Social Science, *Complexity*, 4(5) 41-60.

Kim, Y and A. Desai 2008 The rigor and relevance of complexity for policy modeling. Unpublished manuscript, John Glenn School of Public Affairs.

*** Rittel, H. W. J. and M. M. Webber (1973). Dilemmas in a general theory of planning. *Policy Sciences*, 4, 155-169.

Week 14 April 18: Individual Presentations

Week 15 April 23+: Individual Meetings