International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education

ISSN: 0951-8398 (Print) 1366-5898 (Online) Journal homepage: http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/tqse20

The new paradigm dialogs and qualitative inquiry

Norman K. Denzin

To cite this article: Norman K. Denzin (2008) The new paradigm dialogs and qualitative inquiry, International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 21:4, 315-325, DOI: 10.1080/09518390802136995

To link to this article: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09518390802136995

International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education
Vol. 21, No. 4, July–August 2008, 315–325

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

The new paradigm dialogs and qualitative inquiry

Norman K. Denzin*

Institute of Communications Research, University of Illinois, Urbana–Champaign, USA

This paper re-engages the paradigm wars of the 1980s, discussing their relevance in the current historical moment. It extends Egon Guba's call for dialogue across paradigm communities. Ten theses and three agenda items are advanced.

> Let us engage in the paradigm wars. Let us defend ourselves against those who would impose their modern notions of science on us by exposing the flaws in what they call scientifically based research (SBR). Let us mount a strong offense by generating qualitative studies that are so powerful they cannot be dismissed. (Hatch 2006, 407)

> Society in general is unimpressed with the contributions of social/behavioral inquiry; a pox will soon be called down on all our houses, if there is continuing conflict rather than cooperation among the paradigm adherents. It is to everyone's benefit to cooperate. (Guba 1990b, 374)

I agree with Amos Hatch. Let us re-engage the paradigm disputes of the 1980s (Gage 1989). But after Guba (1990a, 1990b), I call for a paradigm dialog, not a new war. We must find ways to cooperate. We are in a third 'methodological moment' (Teddlie and Tashakkori 2003a, 9). Mixed methodologies and calls for SBR are in the ascendancy. It is time to think through how we got to this place, time to ask where do we go next. Taking my lead from Hatch, I will briefly review the 1980s paradigm conflicts. I quickly shift from the 1980s to the present, taking up multiple forms of paradigm discourse in the third methodological moment. I then re-engage Hatch and his critique of the SBR backlash against interpretive inquiry. I conclude by returning to Guba's (1990b) call for dialog and collaboration across paradigms and interpretive communities.

Clearly the seeds of 'the current upheaval and argument about "scientific" research in the scholarly world of education' (Scheurich and Clark 2006, 401) began before the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and Reading First (Reading.First@ed.gov) Acts. Of course, these acts required a focus on identifying and using SBR in designing and implementing educational programs. While it is too easy to blame NCLB for the mess we are in today, the turmoil did not start here. Indeed, the seeds for current controversies can be traced, as Hatch (2006) and Donmoyer (2006, 12–13) argue, to the paradigm war(s) of the 1980s (Gage 1989), and the call by Guba (1990a, 1990b), and Guba and Lincoln (1994, 2005) and others for a paradigm dialog between positivism, post-positivism, critical theory and constructivism.

A legacy of the 1980s paradigm wars was a ready-made institutional apparatus which privileged a resurgent post-positivism, involving experimentalism, mixed methodologies and 'governmental incursion into the spaces of research methods' (Lather 2006a, 35).

*Email: n-denzin@uiuc.edu

ISSN 0951-8398 print/ISSN 1366-5898 online

DOI: 10.1080/09518390802136995
http://www.informaworld.com

Lather (2004) calls this the alphabet soup of post-positivist acronyms – CC (Cochrane Collaboration), C2 (Campbell Collaboration), AIR (American Institutes for Research), WWC (What Works Clearinghouse), SBR (scientifically based research), IES (Institute of Education Science) and NRC (National Research Council) (see http://w-w-c.org/whoweare/overview.html#ies).

These institutional structures converged when neo-liberalism, post-positivism, and the audit-accountability culture took aim on education and schooling. The interrelationships between these structures are complex and by no means well-understood. Clearly the financial-auditing mechanism has been substantively and technically linked with the methodology of accountability (Biesta 2004; Skrla and Scheurich 2004) Neo-liberals added one more piece to their puzzle when they understood that with a knowledge-based economy there was a need to produce better educated workers for the global economy. IES, NCLB, SBR, CC, C2 and WWC worked hand-in glove, a new age was upon us, we were blind-sided by a New Paradigm dispute, and didn't even know it! The watchwords: audits, efficiency, high stakes assessment, test-based accountability, SBR.

It was only a matter of time before this apparatus would take aim at qualitative research and create protocols for evaluating qualitative research studies (see National CASP Collaboration 2006; Briggs 2006; also AERA 2006; Bell 2006; Morse 2006). In order to confront this situation, the qualitative inquiry community must ask itself how it lost its place at the bargaining table in the first place. We are caught in the middle of a global conversation concerning the evidence-based research movement, and emerging standards and guidelines for conducting and evaluating qualitative inquiry (Denzin and Giardina 2006 in Morse 2006; St. Pierre 2006). This conversation turns on issues surrounding the politics and ethics of evidence, and the value of qualitative work in addressing matters of equity and social justice. In some senses this is like old wine in old bottles, 1980s battles in a new century, the New Paradigm War.

The 1980s paradigm wars

While accepting Hatch's invitation to re-engage the paradigm wars of the 1980s, I seek a non-military metaphor, something more peaceful, less combative.[1] I believe we are in the midst of a complex set of discourses which are moving in several directions at the same time. Central features of the new disputes are embedded in the mixed-methods movement, as that movement re-enacts arguments from the 1980s (see below).

According to Gage (1989) during the 1980s, the paradigm wars (after Thomas Kuhn) resulted in the demise of quantitative research in education, a victim of attacks from anti-naturalists, interpretivists and critical theorists. Ethnographic studies flourished. The cultural appropriateness of schooling, critical pedagogy, and critical theorists and feminists analyses fostered struggles for power and cultural capital for the poor, non-whites, women and gays (Gage 1989). (Gage imagined two alternative paradigms, pragmatism and Popper's piece meal social engineering.)

Guba's (1990a) *Paradigm Dialog* signaled an end to the wars, at least for the constructivists. In the *Paradigm Dialog* post-positivists, constructivists and critical theorists talked to one another, arguing through issues connected to ethics, field studies, praxis, criteria, knowledge accumulation, truth, significance, graduate training, values and politics. We were, for a moment, one big happy family.

The cornerstone of the 1980s Paradigm war turned on two arguments: (1) quantitative and qualitative methods were fundamentally different or incompatible (incommensurable); and (2) interpretive or theoretical paradigms were also incompatible. By the mid-1980s 'qual-

itative research had begun to be widely used and widely accepted' (Donmoyer 2006, 18). It was evident that many 'champions of qualitative methodology did indeed operate from a fundamentally different worldview than the more traditional researchers embraced, and this new worldview could not be simply appropriated into traditional thinking' (23).

By the early 1990s, there was a proliferation of published works on qualitative research, handbooks and new journals appeared. Qualitative inquiry flourished, as did work in critical, feminist, poststructural, performance and queer theory paradigms. This paradigm proliferation seemed to mark a confluence of understandings concerning inquiry, politics and scholarship. Guba and Lincoln could write in 2005 that 'the number of qualitative texts, research papers, workshops, and training materials has exploded. Indeed it would be difficult to miss the distinct turn of the social sciences toward more interpretive, postmodern and criticalist practices and theorizing' (2005, 191). Qualitative researchers were comfortably in charge of their own destiny. Perhaps they became too complacent. They had their own journals and special interest groups. Sage Publications led the way. But all was not quiet on the Western Front.

The third moment and the new paradigm dialogs

Teddlie and Tashakkori (2003a, 9) use the term 'third methodological moment' to describe an epistemological position that evolved out the discussions and controversies associated with the 1980s paradigm wars. The third moment mediates quantitative and qualitative disputes by finding a third, or middle ground. I will argue, extending Teddlie and Tashakkori, that there are in fact two distinct versions of the third moment. There is the mixed-methods version of the moment, and there is a somewhat more radical position. This is the version that endorses paradigm proliferation, a version anchored in the critical interpretive social science traditions (Donmoyer 2006; Lather 2006a).

Mixed-methods discourse

In the first version of the third moment, the two incompatibility or incommensurability theses are rejected. On the surface this seems somewhat akin to mixing apples and oranges, or just re-writing history. When the field went from one to multiple epistemological paradigms, many asserted that there was incompatibility between and across paradigms, not just incompatibility between positivism and its major critic, constructivism. Paradigm proliferation followed. It was only a matter of time before critical theorists, feminists and critical race theorists were fighting. It was no longer just a conflict between positivism and non-positivism. Beneath the surface, another conflict was brewing and it spread to all perspectives. The language of multiple paradigms prevailed. Some called for a truce, let a 1000 different flowers bloom.

Ironically, as this discourse evolved, the complementary strengths thesis emerged, and is now accepted by many in the mixed-methods community. Here is where history starts to be rewritten. That is multiple paradigms can be used in the same mixed-methods inquiry (Teddlie and Tashakkori 2003b, 23). At the same time the mixed or multiple methods approach gained acceptance. This seemed to extend the triangulation arguments of the 1970s (Dixon-Woods et al. 2006). Thus the demise of the single theoretical and/or methodological paradigm was celebrated (Teddlie and Tashakkori 2003b, 24).

For the mixed-methods advocates, the residues of the first paradigm war are positive and negative. The demise of the incompatibility thesis, as it applied to methods and paradigms, was 'a major catalyst in the development of the mixed methods as a distinct third

methodological moment' (Teddlie and Tashakkori 2003b, 24). Regrettably, for the mixed-methods movement, a lingering negative legacy of the 1980s wars is the tendency of students and graduate programs to still consider themselves as QUALS or QUANS. On this, though, there is agreement, 'we need to get rid of that distinction' (Schwandt 2000, 210).

Once this is done, only technical problems remain, that is how do we implement this new paradigm? The mixed-methods discourse introduced complex discussions involving design typologies, logistics, validity, data, standards, inferences and findings that can be generalized from studies which combine quantitative (QUAN) and qualitative (QUAL) methodologies.[2] The new paradigm requires multiple investigators with competencies in more than one method or paradigm. The problem of dual competency can be solved with a team approach, or with a model that presumes minimal competency in both quantitative and qualitative design (Teddlie and Tashakkori 2003b, 44–5). Teddlie and Tashakkori recommend 'methodological bilingualism' (45).

For some it is a short step from methodological bilingualism to SBR, from discussions of design, inference, data quality and transferability, to inquiries which privilege QUAN over QUAL. But it is not this simple.

Phases in the paradigm discourse

In the first phase 1980s paradigm wars, qualitative research took its rightful place in the interpretive community. Qualitative inquiry flourished in this moment, which lasted slightly over two decades (1980–2000). But by the end of the 1990s, SBR emerged as a force, poised to erase the majority of the gains won in phase one. With a wave of the post-positivist wand, the two pivotal assumptions of the interpretive moment were demolished. It was if we were back in the 1980s, fighting that old war all over again. The two incompatibility theses were back on the table; there is science and there is non-science.

As SBR was gaining strength, so too was the mixed-methods movement. Mixed-methods advocates said it that was more complicated then SBR advocates would have us believe. Mixed-methods critics like Morse (2006) contested the basic assumptions of SBR, including the fact that RCT conditions are not replicable in day-to-day clinical care. Morse noted that an exercise of disciplinary power underlies any concept of evidence. SBR had no monopoly over the word evidence. Indeed, there model of evidence is inadequate for critical, qualitative health care research (80).

Regrettably the language and discourse of the mixed-methods group was easily co-opted by for some SBR, CC, C2 and NRC advocates. That is experimental, non-experimental, QUAN and QUAL mixed-methods designs where one answer to the demand for SBR. Soft qualitative research procedures – interviewing, observation – could be folded into Random Control Trial protocols (Bell 2006; Briggs 2006).

Another discursive formation

The field is on the edge of New Paradigm Dialog, a third formation existing alongside SBR and mix-methods discourses. This is the space primarily filled by non-mixed-methods interpretive researchers: critical constructionists, feminists, critical pedagogy and performance studies, oral historians, CRT, interpretive interactionists. These are scholars in a different space. They seldom trouble terms like validity or reliability. For some, a minimalist approach to theory is endorsed. A disruptive politics of representation is the focus, crafting works which move persons and communities to action.

Indeed, is clear scholars are working in three directions at the same time. On the one hand, they are critically engaging and critiquing the SBR movement. They are emphasizing the political and moral consequences of the narrow views of science that are embedded in the movement (Hatch 2006; Preissle 2006; St. Pierre and Roulston 2006). They are asking questions about the politics of evidence, about how work can be done for social justice purposes. They are struggling to advance the causes of qualitative inquiry in a time of global crisis.

A second group of scholars celebrate paradigm proliferation (Donmoyer 2006; Lather 2006a) and the profusion of interpretive communities. They do not necessarily endorse the incompatibility theses that are so important for the mixed-methods community. They understand that each community has differing interpretive criteria (Creswell 2007, 24). This discourse functions as a firewall of sorts against the narrow view of non-positivism held by SBR authors.

Still a third group of scholars are resisting the implementation of narrow, views of ethics, human subject review boards, IRBS, informed consent and bio-medical models of inquiry (see Canella and Lincoln 2004; Ryan and Hood 2004; Christians 2005). Many campus-level IRBs attempt to manage qualitative research. This has the effect shaping its impact, relevance, including its use at the macro-community and/or market levels (Kvale 2008). This can interfere with academic freedom; that is IRB panels not only regulate who gives informed consent, but they also make stipulations concerning SBR research design and researcher–subject relationships.

Kvale (2008) and Brinkmann and Kvale (2008) observe that within the qualitative community there is a tendency to 'portray qualitative inquiry as inherently ethical, or at least more ethical than quantitative research' (Brinkmann and Kvale 2008, 262; Kvale 2008, 10). They call this qualitative ethicism; that is, the inclination to see research within ethical terms and to assert that it is more ethical. The dangers with qualitative ethicism are two-fold. It can lead to an uncritical romanticizing of qualitative research. At the same time, it can direct attention away from the ways in which qualitative inquiry – focus groups, open-ended interviewing, ethnography – are used to sell products in the consumer marketplace (Kvale 2008, 16).

While the turmoil now going on in the third moment seems to repeat 30-year-old arguments, some progress has been made. Moral and epistemological discourses now go on, side-by side. This was not the case 30 years ago. A vastly superior mixed-method discourse now exists. The mid-century multi-methods of arguments of Campbell and Stanley seem naive. Race, ethnicity, sexuality, class, the research rights of indigenous peoples, whiteness and queer studies are taken-for-granted topics today. That was not the case in the 1980s.

Hatch Redeux

The above formations in place, I return to Hatch. His argument moves through four steps: (1) neo-conservatism and postmodernism; (2) postmodern paralysis; (3) fighting back; and (4) re-engaging the paradigm wars.

Neo-conservatism and the postmodern backlash

For Hatch the efforts to redefine educational research are part of a larger 'backlash against what neo-conservatives see as the negative consequences of postmodernity' (2006, 403). SBR is a well-orchestrated attempt to return to modern ways of thinking about 'knowledge, knowing and research methods' (404). In the language of the paradigm wars, this is a return

to positivism. Methodological conservatism blurs into and supports conservative political ideology (Cannella and Lincoln 2004).

The political and methodological right object to postmodernisms challenges to universal truth, as well as its emphasis on context, subjective meaning, process, discovery versus verification, the theory-and value-ladenness of facts, the interactive nature of inquiry and the impossibility of objectivity (see Guba and Lincoln 1994, 106–7).

The convergence that Hatch sees between methodological and political conservatism is nuanced. There are many post-positivists who are not conservative. A sad irony is at work. In this version of the third moment, post-positivists have seen portions of their discourse put to conservative methodological and political purposes. Post-positivism has been placed in the SBR blender, folded into the SBR mix (see Torrance 2006).

The conservative and SBR criticisms of the critical and constructivist (postmodern) paradigms may have created divisions within the qualitative research community. Rather than endorsing many different forms of inquiry, SBR has helped marginalize critical qualitative inquiry. The imposition of experimental criteria on qualitative inquiry has created a rush to produce our own standards. The mixed-methods group (Creswell 2007) has been most helpful, for they have painstakingly cataloged interpretive criteria. We have not made productive use of this discourse. It is as if we were starting in a vacuum, when in fact this not the case at all.

Postmodern paralysis

Hatch places some of the blame on those who speak about the end of ethnography, the crisis of representation, and the postmodern, performance and autoethnographic turn in qualitative inquiry. He fears that many who fought on the front lines of 1980s paradigm wars now feel trapped between 'retrenched positivist forces on the one hand and stinging poststructuralist critiques on the other' (2006, 405). This debate, he fears, creates paralysis. People are writing and theorizing about research but not doing it. Students are not being taught how to do actual qualitative research. Few 'data-based studies' (406) are being conducted. Hatch fears that 'the next generation of … may well have been prepared to theorize, deconstruct, and critique but have no clue how to design a study, collect data and generating findings from a thoughtful analysis' (406).

I disagree. In many North American and European journals, including *Qualitative Studies in Education*, *Qualitative Inquiry*, *Qualitative Health Care*, *Qualitative Social Work*, *International Review of Qualitative Research*, *British Educational Research Journal* and *Qualitative Research*,[3] scholars working across a wide range of paradigms and methodologies are publishing excellent qualitative research. This work is informed by the postmodern turn. At the same time it speaks to issues involved in schooling, health care, immigration, the justice system, the family, childcare, literacy, to name just a few areas of social policy concern.

Monograph series sponsored by such university presses as NYU, Minnesota and Duke, and such commercial publishers as AltaMira, Left Coast Press, Oxford and Routledge are also publishing qualitative work in these newer traditions.

I do not believe we are witnessing a postmodern paralysis.

Fighting back

Hatch wants research done within all the qualitative paradigms to be considered legitimate. He does not want 'knowledge and how it is created to be in the hands of those who happen

to hold political power' (406). He does not want to take a giant step back to the pre-1980s paradigm wars. He wants a strong line of defense in order to re-establish qualitative inquiry as a valuable and 'respected form of inquiry' (406).

He outlines several ways to fight back: (1) publishing well-designed qualitative research in high-quality journals; (2) increased support for new scholars doing qualitative research; (3) lobbying journals and editors to publish more qualitative work; (4) defending our territory by 'exposing the flaws, faulty logic, shaking assumptions, and sheer banality that characterizes many of the arguments in the SBR movement' (406); (5) rejecting SBR criteria for evaluating our work; (6) critiquing SBR studies which are held up as models for the field; and (7) refusing to accept SBR's concepts of science and knowledge and proper inquiry.

Whose science, whose research

We cannot allow the new positivist, SBR camp to claim control over the word science, just as we must reclaim control over what we mean by research. Eisenhart (2006) proposes a model of qualitative science that is interpretive, after Geertz (1973), and practical, after Flyvberg (2001). A development of these alternatives to experimental science could help improve the status of qualitative inquiry in the current political environment. Likewise, queer, feminist, indigenous and postcolonial models of science open up additional spaces for resisting the narrow, hegemonic SBR framework.

I endorse Hatch's conclusions. 'If we do not fight back, qualitative research in education could become self-absorbed, fragmented and ineffectual. And the neo-conservative dream of a return to modernity will have come true' (407). We will have lost.

Forming alliances

We need to find new strategic and tactical ways to work with one another in the new paradigm dialog. This means that dialogs need to be formed between the poststructural, mixed-methods and SBR advocates, as well as spokespersons for the NRC, CC and C2. These three main interpretive communities need to develop ways of communicating with and learning from one another.

This means we must expand the size of our tent, indeed we need a bigger tent! We cannot afford to fight with one another. Mixed-methods scholars have carefully studied the many different braches of the poststructural tree (Creswell 2007). The same cannot be said for the poststructuralists. Nor can we allow the arguments from the SBR community to divide us.

We must learn from the Paradigm conflicts of the 1980s to not over-reach, to not engage in polemics, to not become too self-satisfied. We need to develop and work with our own concepts of science, knowledge and quality inquiry. We need to remind the resurgent post-positivists that their criterion of good work applies only to work within their paradigm, not ours (see Denzin 2007).

Over the course of the last two decades, poststructuralists have fought hard to claim an interpretive space for inquiry which questioned norms of objectivity, emphasized complexity, subjective interpretive processes, performance, textuality, difference, uncertainty, politics, power and inquiry as a moral as well as a scientific process (see Lather 2006a, 48–52). These understandings, like obdurate structures, ought not be compromised. They are knots in our interpretive handkerchief.

Further, we cannot just erase the differences between QUAN and QUAL inquiry, QUAN and QUAL departments and their graduate training programs. Specialization in discourses is still a requirement. Qualitative inquiry is a huge field, not easily mastered by taking one or two over view courses (see Eisenhart and DeHaan 2005). A minimal competency model, methodological bilingualism seems superficial, perhaps even unworkable.

Carrying on the new paradigm dialogs

I want to end by returning to the themes outlined in Guba's 1990 essay, 'Carrying on the Dialog' (1990b). This essay enumerates 10 emergent themes and three agenda items from the 1989 'Alternative Paradigm Conference,' the conference that is recorded in Guba (1990a). I believe these themes and agenda items can guide us today. I phrase them as injunctions, or theses:

Thesis 1: There needs to be a greater openness to alternative paradigm critiques;
Thesis 2: There needs to be decline in confrontationalism by alternative paradigm proponents;
Thesis 3: Paths for fruitful dialog between and across paradigms need to be explored;
Thesis 4: Simplistic representations of the newer (and older) paradigms need to be avoided. This will help address confusion;
Thesis 5: Complexity and interconnectedness, not simplicity are ineluctable (Guba 1990b, 373);
Thesis 6: The commensurability theses, as they apply to paradigms and methods, need to be revisited.What is gained and what is lost with these two theses?
Thesis 7: A change in paradigmatic postures involves a personal odyssey; that is, we each have a personal history with our preferred paradigm and this needs to be honored.
Thesis 8: The three main interpretive communities (poststructural, mix-methods, SBR) must learn to how to cooperate and work with one another. This is so because paradigm dominance involves control over faculty appointments, tenure, training, funding, publication, status and legitimation (Guba 1990b, 374).
Thesis 9: There is a need for conferences which will allow scholars from competing paradigms to see one another face to face and to interact. The Annual International Congress of Qualitative Inquiry is one attempt to address this need (qi.2008.org).
Thesis 10: The complexity of the field of qualitative research needs to be honored. Polarization and elitism need to be avoided. In conferences and congresses multiple language communities need to be represented. Dialog between persons and interpretive communities is critical.

Into the future

Three agenda items emerged from the 1989 Conference. I move them forward, into the present, to 2008. They offer a framework for action and collaboration. It is time to stop fighting. To repeat, we need to form strategic and tactical alliances. We need to form interactive networks across interpretive communities.

The intellectual agenda

The global community of qualitative inquiry needs annual events where it can deal with the problems and issues that they confront at this historical moment. These events should be international, national, regional and local. They can be held in conjunction with 'universities, school systems, health care systems, juvenile justice systems, and the like' (Guba 1990b, 376).[4]

The advocacy agenda

The community needs to develop 'systematic contacts with political figures, the media … the professional press and with practitioners such as teachers, health workers, social workers, [and] government functionaries' (376). Advocacy includes: (1) showing how qualitative work addresses issues of social policy; (2) critiquing federally mandated ethical guidelines for human subject research; and (3) critiquing outdated, positivist modes of science and research.

The operational agenda

Qualitative researchers are encouraged to engage in self-learning, and self-criticism, to re-socialize themselves, if necessary. Their goals should include building productive relationships with professional associations, journals, policymakers and funders (376). Representatives from many different professional associations (AERA, AEA, ASA, APA, AAA) need to be brought together.

Conclusion

Qualitative researchers belong to a global community. The recent SBR disputes and conflicts in the USA are also being felt in Europe, Australia, South America, Africa and elsewhere. The interpretive community needs to draw together into one large community so we can share our problems and experiences with these new discourses. Scholars who share the values of excellence, leadership and advocacy need venues to engage in debate, frame public policy discourse and disseminate research findings. We need a community that honors and celebrates paradigm, and methodological diversity, and showcases scholarship from around world. If we can do this, the rewards will be 'plentiful and the opportunity for professional [and societal] impact unsurpassed' (Guba 1990b, 378).

Acknowledgments

I thank Katherine Ryan and Michael Giardina for their comments on earlier versions of this text.

Notes

1. Less militaristic terms would include dispute, fracas, conflict, engagement. More peaceful terms would focus, as Guba (1990b) did, on dialog, discourse, conversation, collaboration.
2. This is a gloss on a complex discourse. The mixed-methods community is by no means defined by a single set of assumptions, beliefs or practices.
3. Many of these journals are published by Sage.
4. On 7 May 2005, on the last day of the First International Congress of Qualitative Inquiry, the *International Association of Qualitative Inquiry (IAQI)* was founded in Urbana, IL, USA. *IAQI* is the first international association solely dedicated to the scholarly promotion, representation and global development of qualitative research. At present, *IAQI* has 1500 delegates representing 60 nations worldwide. It has established professional affiliations with over 50 collaborating sites in Oceana, Africa, North and South America, the Caribbean, Europe, the Middle East, Japan, Korea and China (see qi2008.org). The IAQI Newsletter appears quarterly, as does a new journal, *the International Review of Qualitative Research*.

Notes on contributor

Norman K. Denzin is College of Communications Scholar, and Distinguished Research Professor, University of Illinois, Urbana–Champaign. He is co-editor of the *Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies* (2008), and founding editor of the *International Review of Qualitative Research*.

References

AERA (American Education Research Association). 2006. *Standards for reporting on empirical social science research in AERA publications.* www.aera.net/opportunities/?id=1480 (accessed February 6, 2007).

Bell, V. 2006. *The Cochrane qualitative methods group.* http://www.lancs.ac.uk/fass/ihr/research/publich/cochrane.htm

Biesta, G.J. 2004. Education, accountability, and the ethical demand: Can the democratic potential of accountability be regained? *Educational Theory* 54, no. 3: 233–50.

Briggs, J. 2006. Cochrane qualitative research methods group. *The Cochrane Collaboration.* http://www.joannabriggs.eduau/cqrmg/role.html

Brinkmann, S. and S. Kvale. 2008. Ethics in qualitative psychological research. In *Handbook of qualitative research in psychology,* ed. C. Willig and W. Stainton-Rogers, 261–79. London: Sage.

Bryman, A, et al. 2006. *Qualitative Research. Special Issue: Mixed Methods Research* 6, no. 1: 5–115.

Cannella, G.S. and Y.S. Lincoln. 2004. Dangerous discourses II: Comprehending and countering the redeployment of discourses (and resources) in the generation of liberatory inquiry. *Qualitative Inquiry* 10, no. 2: 165–74.

Christians, C. 2005. Ethics and politics in qualitative research. In *Handbook of qualitative research,* ed. N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln, 3rd ed., 139–64. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J.W. 2007. *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches.* 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Denzin, N.K. 2007. The secret downing street memo, the one percent doctrine, and the politics of truth: A performance text. *Symbolic Interaction* 30, no. 4: 447–64.

Dixon-Woods, M., B. Shelia, B. Andrew, R.J. David, M. Tina, J.S. Alex, L.S. Rachel, A.S. Jonathan, and Y. Bridget. 2006. How can systematic reviews incorporate qualitative research? A critical perspective. *Qualitative Research* 6, no. 1: 27–44.

Donmoyer, R. 2006. Take my paradigm … please! The legacy of Kuhn's construct in educational research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 19, no. 6: 11–34.

Eisenhart, M. 2006. Qualitative science in experimental time. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 19, no. 6: 697–707.

Eisenhart, M. and R.L. DeHaan. 2005. Doctoral preparation of scientifically based education research. *Educational Researcher* 34, no. 4: 3–14.

Flyvberg, B. 2001. *Making social science matter.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gage, N.L. 1989. The paradigm wars and their aftermath: A 'historical' sketch of research and teaching since 1989. *Educational Researcher* 18, no. 7: 4–10.

Geertz, C. 1973. *The interpretation of cultures.* New York: Basic Books.

Guba, E., ed. 1990a. *The paradigm dialog.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

———. 1990b. Carrying on the dialog. In *The paradigm dialog,* ed. E. Guba, 368–78. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Guba, E. and Y.S. Lincoln. 1994. Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In *Handbook of qualitative research,* ed. N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln, 105–17. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

———. 2005. Paradigmatic controversies, and emerging confluences. In *Handbook of qualitative research,* ed. N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln, 3rd ed., 191–216. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hatch, A. 2006. Qualitative studies in the era of scientifically-based research: Musings of a former QSE editor. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 19, no. 4: 403–9.

Kvale, S. 2008. Qualitative inquiry between scientistic evidendialism, ethical objectivism and the free market. *International Review of Qualitative Research* 1, no. 1: 5–18.

Lather, P. 2004. This is your father's paradigm: Government intrusion and the case of qualitative research in education. *Qualitative Inquiry* 10, no. 1: 15–34.

———. 2006a. Paradigm prolifferation as a good think to think with: Teaching research in education as a wild profusion. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 19, no. 6: 35–57.

———. 2006b. Foucauldian scientificity: Rethinking the nexus of qualitative research and educational policy analysis. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 19, no. 6: 783–92.

Morse, J.M. 2006. The politics of evidence. In *Qualitative inquiry and the conservative challenge,* ed. N.K. Denzin and M. Giardina, 79–92. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

National CASP Collaboration. 2006. 10 questions to help you make sense of qualitative research, Critical Appraisal Skills Program (CASP). *The Cochrane Collaboration.* Milton Keyenes: Primary Care Trust. http://www.joannabriggs.eduau/cqrmg/role.html

Preissle, J. 2006. Envisioning qualitative inquiry: A view across four decades. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 19, no. 6: 685–96.

Ryan, K.E. and L. Hood. 2004. Guarding the castle and opening the gates. *Qualitative Inquiry* 10, no. 1: 79–95.

Scheurich, J.J. and M.C. Clark. 2006. Qualitative studies in education at the beginning of the twenty-first century. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 19, no. 4: 401.

Schwandt, T.A. 2000. Three epistemological stances for qualitative inquiry: Interpretivism, hermeneutics and social constructism. In *Handbook of qualitative research,* ed. N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln, 2nd ed., 189–214. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Skrla, L. and J.J. Scheurich, eds. 2004. *Educational equity and accountability: High schools and high stakes.* New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

St. Pierre, E.A. 2006. Scientifically based research in education: Epistemology and ethics. *Adult Education Quarterly* 56, no. 3: 239–66.

St. Pierre, E.A. and K. Roulston. 2006. The state of qualitative inquiry: A contested science. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 19, no. 6: 673–84.

Teddlie, C. and A. Tashakkori. 2003a. Preface. In *Handbook of mixed-methods in social and behavioral research,* ed. A. Tashakkori and C. Teddlie, 9–15. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

———. 2003b. Major issues and controversies in the use of mixed methods in the social and behavioral sciences. In *Handbook of mixed-methods in social and behavioral research,* ed. A. Tashakkori and C. Teddlie, 3–50. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Torrance, H. 2006. Research quality and research governance in the United Kingdom: From methodology to management. In *Qualitative inquiry and the conservative challenge,* ed. N.K. Denzin and M.D. Giardina, 127–48. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.