

Contents

<i>List of Illustrations</i>	vii
<i>Notes on Contributors</i>	viii
Introduction: Expert Interviews – An Introduction to a New Methodological Debate <i>Alexander Bogner, Beate Littig and Wolfgang Menz</i>	1
Part I Theoretical Concepts: Methodology of Expert Interviews	
1 The Expert Interview and Changes in Knowledge Production <i>Michael Meuser and Ulrike Nagel</i>	17
2 The Theory-Generating Expert Interview: Epistemological Interest, Forms of Knowledge, Interaction <i>Alexander Bogner and Wolfgang Menz</i>	43
3 At Eye Level: The Expert Interview – a Talk between Expert and Quasi-expert <i>Michaela Pfadenhauer</i>	81
4 Interviewing the Elite – Interviewing Experts: Is There a Difference? <i>Beate Littig</i>	98
Part II Methodological Practice: Generating Data	
5 On Interviewing “Good” and “Bad” Experts <i>Jochen Gläser and Grit Laudel</i>	117
6 Interviewing Experts in Political Science: A Reflection on Gender and Policy Effects Based on Secondary Analysis <i>Gabriele Abels and Maria Behrens</i>	138
7 Expert Interviews on the Telephone: A Difficult Undertaking <i>Gabriela B. Christmann</i>	157
8 Expert versus Researcher: Ethical Considerations in the Process of Bargaining a Study <i>Vaida Obelené</i>	184

**Part III Fields of Application:
Applications of Expert Interviews in
Different Fields of Research**

9	How to Interview Managers? Methodical and Methodological Aspects of Expert Interviews as a Qualitative Method in Empirical Social Research <i>Rainer Trinczek</i>	203
10	Expert Interviews in Interpretive Organizational Research <i>Ulrike Froschauer and Manfred Lueger</i>	217
11	Between Scientific Standards and Claims to Efficiency: Expert Interviews in Programme Evaluation <i>Angela Wroblewski and Andrea Leitner</i>	235
12	The Delphi Method: Eliciting Experts' Knowledge in Technology Foresight <i>Georg Aichholzer</i>	252
	<i>Index</i>	275

Introduction: Expert Interviews – An Introduction to a New Methodological Debate

Alexander Bogner, Beate Littig and Wolfgang Menz

Before we go any further, we would like to begin by providing the reader with a step-by-step introduction to the methodological debate surrounding expert interviews. In doing so, we will start with a brief discussion of the generally accepted advantages and risks of expert interviews in research practice (1). We will follow this by outlining current trends in the sociological debate regarding experts and expertise, since expert interviews are – at least on the surface – defined by their object, namely the expert (2). We will then conclude with a look at the current methodological debate regarding expert interviews, an overview of the layout and structure of this book, as well as summaries of the 12 articles it contains (3).

I.1 Expert interviews: easy to manage?

The debate surrounding expert interviews is a recent one. The article published in 1991 by Meuser and Nagel was instrumental in launching an initial systematic debate on expert interviews in Germany. But it would be another ten years before the debate actually gained significant momentum, in an upward trend that is also reflected in current methodology handbooks (for example Flick, 2006, Przyborski and Wohlrab-Sahr, 2008).¹ The focus of this interest lies primarily on issues of what constitutes an expert, the differences between the various forms of expert interviews and their role in research design, as well as the specifics of interviewing and interaction in comparison to other qualitative interview forms.

The use of expert interviews has long been popular in social research. The actual role of the expert interviews in individual research design, their form and the methods used to analyse the results might vary from case to case, but there are still a number of common, practical reasons for their popularity in research.

Firstly, in relative terms, talking to experts in the exploratory phase of a project is a more efficient and concentrated method of gathering data than, for instance, participatory observation or systematic quantitative surveys. Conducting expert interviews can serve to shorten time-consuming data gathering processes, particularly if the experts are seen as “crystallization points” for practical insider knowledge and are interviewed as surrogates for a wider circle of players. Expert interviews also lend themselves to those kinds of situations in which it might prove difficult or impossible to gain access to a particular social field (as is the case, for instance, with taboo subjects).

The economic aspect also extends to the broad, practical matter of initiating and conducting such interviews. The organizational structures behind the experts in institutions (for example their secretaries or press offices) can often serve as an easy point of entry to the field of research. Furthermore, if the targeted expert is not only willing to participate, but also holds a key position in the organization, opportunities for expanding the researcher’s access to the field may well also be unearthed in the interview. Sometimes, the expert will even indicate additional potential interviewees with expertise in a particular field during the interview itself. Equipped with the added bonus of the support of an expert in a key position, the researcher may then often find it easier to gain access to an extended circle of experts.

Beyond the direct benefits, it is also evident that expert interviews offer researchers an effective means of quickly obtaining results and, indeed, of quickly obtaining good results. Frequently, the fact that the interviewer and the interviewee share a common scientific background or relevance system can increase the level of motivation on the part of the expert to participate in an interview. A shared understanding of the social relevance of the research can then often be assumed, largely eliminating the need for further justification. A number of secondary motivating factors also make it comparatively easy to encourage and motivate experts to participate in such interviews: the professionalism of people familiar with being in the public eye; silent awareness of the scientific and/or political relevance of their field of activity or personal achievements; the desire to help “make a difference” – no matter how small; professional curiosity about the topic and field of research; an interest in sharing one’s thoughts and ideas with an external expert.

Regardless of what might be myth and what is reality, the anticipated promise of rapid and unproblematic access to objective data makes expert interviews an extremely appealing option for empirical social researchers. But is the expert interview method really quite so simple and uncomplicated? If so, does this then render methodological considerations superfluous? Or are expert interviews in some ways just too tempting? Do they not – in their naïve belief in the totality of expert knowledge – harbour the danger of advocating a pre-reflexive definition of what constitutes an expert? Or the risk of granting the undisputed relevance of expert knowledge a standing that would ultimately constitute the non-validated confirmation and, thus, the

legitimization of social hierarchies? A critical look at the current social science debate on experts and expertise could have a corrective effect here, and we will examine these questions in more detail in the following section.

I.2 Trends in social science research into expertise

As far as the expert and expertise are concerned, recent social science research trends have proved relatively stable. The “expert” has edged into the centre of theoretical interest from both a theory of society and a democratic theory perspective as well as from the sociology of knowledge, scientific or technical research standpoints (cf. Jasanoff and others, 1995, Bogner and Torgersen, 2005). Yet the literature on expert interview methods remains largely unmoved by this trend.

In scientific and technical circles, researchers are currently rethinking what really constitutes an expert and where the “relevant” knowledge for political decisions actually lies. In this context, Collins and Evans (2002) maintain that the sociology of expertise is currently entering a third wave. Based on their timeline, the first wave is embodied in the golden age of the expert with its clear and recognized horizontal division between experts and lay people. The expert as agent of truth and authority encounters a political system that uses its power to enforce expertise (“truth speaks to power”). The second wave is characterized by social constructivism in its prime, with its focus on demystifying science: knowledge is deciphered as a social activity and the validity of expert knowledge as a construction process is decoded. Likewise, challenging the boundary between experts and lay people accelerates the debate on the democratization of expertise (cf. Maasen and Weingart, 2005). To counter the constructivist breaking of the expert’s spell – which it is ultimately claimed would lead to epistemic anarchy – Collins and Evans (2007) propose a “realist approach” as the third wave. “The realist approach (...) starts from the view that expertise is the real and substantive possession of groups of experts and that individuals acquire real and substantive expertise through their membership of those groups” (Collins and Evans, 2007, p. 3). If some form of institutionalized and autonomous area of science is to remain, Collins and Evans maintain that there is a need for genuine expertise based on expert knowledge and, thus, participation limits. The fact that they only consider “technical expertise” contributes to the suggestiveness of their ideas and, at the same time, reveals the cognitivistic constraints of their analysis of expertise. Specific problem framing is used to tailor questions in a way that makes this “technical expertise,” that is the expert’s factual knowledge (and not some form of lay practical knowledge), relevant. Expertise is relevant not (solely) by virtue of its own intrinsic quality, but also as a result of external conditions.

From the political science and democratic theory perspectives, expertise is viewed primarily as a challenge for democracy. Is it not the case – as is

commonly feared – that the worldviews of experts and the things they see as relevant preform parliamentary decisions because they are – by virtue of their authority – considered to be the factual basis behind the political debate? The tension between expertise as necessary basis and ideological preformation of political decisions was already a point of discussion in the technocratic debate of the 1960s. Stephen Turner (2002) was the latest to question whether expertise represents a fundamental threat to liberal democracy. He bases his own trust in the democratic compatibility of expertise on the basic dubitability of the latter, realized not least in public protests and scientific self-criticism – effectively turning scientific criticism into an empirical sign of a functioning democracy.

Similar positions regarding the democratizing side effects of the expertise boom can also be found in the theory of society debate. For example, in the “reflexive modernization” debate – with its explicit socio-critical emphasis – expert knowledge is seen as the driving force and crystallization point for social conflict and as the stimulus and medium for an emancipated battle for the conditions of definition. Seen from this perspective, the side effects of the modernization process (for example global warming, ecological devastation, genetic manipulation) turn enforcement of the Enlightenment ideal of perfect control over society through expert knowledge into a moment of social self-enlightenment (cf. Beck, 1992). Since these risks and dangers are abstract in nature, scientific knowledge (that is critical experts) is required to turn them into social fact. In this regard, the expert is becoming more diversified. A new actor is taking to the stage in the battle for rationality – in the form of the counter- or anti-expert who advises critical NGOs in risk controversies. However, experts as agents of different rationality models will only be effective insofar as they actually succeed in influencing public awareness through the media. Consequently, an ability to put specific knowledge to use for political gain is a constitutive characteristic of this type of “post-traditional” expert. The key from this perspective is to interpret the world in a high-profile and influential (but not necessarily new) manner and thus – as (counter-)expert – become a powerful voice in the battle for the conditions of definition.

Expert knowledge is also accorded a central role in Giddens’ modernization theory. He discusses the changes in the modern world from the point of view of knowledge dynamics (not the side effects). Expert knowledge is part of the “institutional reflexivity” (Giddens, 1991, p. 20) which supposes that all premises of individual and organizational activity will be routinely examined in the light of new information about such practices. Furthermore, experts become important when people find themselves having to deal with abstract systems (whose internal workings they do not understand). It is up to the expert here to convince them to trust such (primarily technical) abstract systems, for example by means of appropriate self-staging strategies (Giddens, 1990). This is by no means an easy task, because in late modernity

the growth in relevance of expert knowledge is paradoxically accompanied by a crisis of recognition on the part of the experts. Even though progressive detraditionalization in many areas pushes us to base our decisions on expert knowledge, we are nonetheless also experts at always getting a “second opinion.” Particularly in cases where problems are categorized and handled as issues of values not knowledge (for example in genetic counselling), the previously rigid hierarchy between experts and lay people tends to give way to more flexible and situative structures of interaction (Bogner, 2005).

Giddens does not, however, relate this trend to the problem framing aspect; instead he puts it in the context of an ambivalent attitude to specialization: specialization might well safeguard the continued existence of the expert and the development of new forms of expertise, but it also reduces experts to mere representatives of specialized knowledge, knowledge they find increasingly difficult to keep abreast of. The expert becomes, in many aspects, increasingly the lay person. This “laicization” of the expert changes the relationship of trust between lay people and experts: expertise must be increasingly stage-managed to gain acceptance. Beck places greater emphasis on the aspect of the acceptance or validity of knowledge claims than Giddens, because his focus on risk controversies (which are characterized by expert dissent and rivalry between kindred forms of knowledge), causes him to think more in terms of the expert/counter-expert distinction than that of the expert/lay person. This sensitizes us to the fact that something must come into play as far as the acceptance of expert knowledge is concerned, a point that will be discussed later in the context of political efficacy and practical effectiveness (cf. Bogner and Menz, in this volume).

I.3 The articles in this book: methodology and method in expert interviews

What lessons can we draw from this brief foray into social science research into expertise for our own methodological debate? First and foremost the realization that the naïve image of the expert as source of objective information – on which one or the other simplified notion of successful expert interviews is based – has long become problematic. In our context, this confirms a need for increased reflection on expert interviews and on methodology behind them. Expert interviews are by no means simply just “information gathering meetings” used primarily for collecting facts and knowledge. To clarify any misunderstandings here: expert interviews are, of course, not only a popular way of gathering information, they are also a totally legitimate method for some forms of research. But as Gläser and Laudel’s article in this book clearly shows, some basic methodological rules still apply when conducting and evaluating such information gathering expert interviews. However, the level of consideration that must be given to the methodology increases proportionally when such interviews are not

intended primarily to establish a sound factual basis, but instead follow the goal that lies at the heart of qualitative research: the reconstruction of latent content of meaning. Expert interviews intended for this purpose – like all other accepted methods of gathering data – require careful validation and a solid theoretical basis. By now it should be quite clear that there is no such thing as *the* expert interview. The spectrum ranges from quantitative measures through to the use of experts as a form of information source (for example as in Schmid, 1995; frequently also encountered in text books, for example Lamnek, 2005) and the theoretically demanding, resolutely qualitative approach taken by Michael Meuser and Ulrike Nagel (1991, also in this volume).

So it is with good reason that the contributing authors in this book also seek plausible answers in their own specific contexts to the basic questions that offer justification for the existence of expert interviews as an independent research method: What constitutes an expert? What distinguishes expert knowledge from other forms of knowledge? What are the different types of expert knowledge? Which type of interview is best (for the actual goal of the research and purpose of the expert interview)? What strategies are available for analyzing the results (again in light of the form and function of the expert interview in the actual research design)?

All these questions have arisen since the dawn of the debate on the methodology of expert interviews (cf. the article by Bogner and Menz, in this volume), and we view the collection of articles included in this book as a study and continuation of this methodological debate.

The book itself is divided into three parts. The theoretical or conceptual articles in the first part examine what lies behind the methodology of expert interviews. Our aim with these articles is to offer a more precise outline of the purpose and form of such interviews and examine what actually constitutes an expert interview. The key question that must first be answered here is: What special characteristics does a person have to have to constitute an “expert?” How is “expert knowledge” obtained? What types of information and knowledge should be gathered? Can the expert interview be justifiably singled out as a separate form of interview and clearly differentiated from other forms of qualitative and quantitative interviews? What is the difference between expert interviews and the elite interviews encountered in English-speaking countries? And finally: What effect do such considerations have on data gathering methods, interaction strategies and the analysis of results?

Michael Meuser and *Ulrike Nagel's* methodological concept of the expert interview goes far beyond their earlier groundbreaking articles in the expert interview debate (cf. Meuser and Nagel, 1991). This can be attributed not least to their reformulation of the definition of the expert, which draws on the reception of both sociology of knowledge and modernization theory approaches. In this regard, Meuser and Nagel incorporate, in particular,

current thinking on the changes in knowledge production, which can, in part, be seen as an indication of a new relationship between science, politics and the general public. This refers, in essence, to the emergence of a new type of research that is characterized by its practical relevance, project-like nature and transdisciplinarity, that is the inclusion of the knowledge spread across a range of very different actors ("Mode 2"). These considerations prompted Meuser and Nagel to extend their definition of the expert. Whereas their previous publications restricted the circle of experts to members of the professional functional elite, they now extend it in light of new (global) network-like negotiation processes of knowledge production to include the people actively involved in shaping public affairs. These include, for example, NGO representatives who have (often) acquired their expertise outside their professional role. In the course of their voluntary or professional activities, these people have acquired specialized problem-solving and analytical knowledge that is of relevance in expert interviews. As far as the analysis of expert interviews is concerned, Meuser and Nagel advocate a six-step process that (in contrast to earlier concepts) should also examine the possible influence of experience gained outside the professional realm.

In their article, *Alexander Bogner* and *Wolfgang Menz* contribute to shaping the debate by differentiating between various forms of expert interview. Their typology identifies three different types of expert interview each intended for a different purpose: the exploratory expert interview used primarily to provide orientation, the systematizing expert interview targeted at the systematic retrieval of information and the theory-generating expert interview aimed – in the spirit of qualitative social research – at reconstructing social interpretative patterns and subjective action orientation criteria. They follow this by presenting a detailed definition of what constitutes an expert. Based on a classification of various dimensions of expert knowledge (technical knowledge, process knowledge, interpretive knowledge/"know-why"), they propose a reformulation of the sociology of knowledge based definition of the expert. This redefinition sees expert knowledge as an "analytical construction" and, at the same time, incorporates the expert's "formative power": expert interviews are neither characterized by an interest in limited special or specialized knowledge (as suggested in the sociology of knowledge debate), nor can they be adequately defined by separating the private sphere from the (generally occupational) functional context. Experts are generally of research interest above all because they are in a position to actually put their own interpretations into practice. Drawing on this, Bogner and Menz call for an expert interview "interaction model" in which the so-called interaction effects (normally considered as interfering variables) are seen as constitutive and productive elements in the data production process.

Michaela Pfadenhauer presents her theoretical support for the expert interview as independent qualitative method from an ethnographic design

perspective. In her opinion, expert interviews are a particularly appropriate method in research aimed at reconstructing explicit expert knowledge. She also points out that an extraordinary level of prior knowledge of the subject matter – obtained essentially through an ethnographic “inventory” of the field of research – is required to guarantee their productiveness. Since the expert’s impression of the interviewer influences the type of knowledge he/she will communicate in the interview, relevant expert knowledge can only be obtained through professional reference to the expert’s actual relevance system. Pfadenhauer considers this specificity of the interaction, which requires that the interviewer become a “quasi expert” to successfully carry out an expert interview, as a central constitutive element of such interviews. She also advises strongly against mistaking expert interviews to be a comparatively unproblematic and “economic” way of obtaining data or “short-cut strategy.”

If we compare the predominantly German-language literature on expert interviews with international articles on interviewing the elite as *Beate Littig* does in her first article in this book, more commonalities than differences are revealed. Similar issues are discussed in both, such as the problems of gaining access to these groups and the specifics of interaction and interviewing. Although not identical, even the respective target group definitions (experts and the elite) for such interviews overlap. This article discusses the commonalities and differences in these two methodological approaches, thereby contributing to a more detailed specification of the methodology of expert interviews. It concludes with a sociology of knowledge based appeal that the (professional) functional elite – given their positions of power – be considered as a specific group of experts. From a methodological perspective and as a result of their specific interpretive knowledge (“know-why”) and procedural knowledge (“know-how”), experts (and thus also the elite) are of interest to social and political sciences research. Consequently, interviews with the elite aimed at generating explicit, tacit, professional or occupational knowledge should be seen as expert interviews.

The second part of the book focuses on methodological practices and the considerations that accompany them. What kind of data can be gathered from expert interviews above and beyond that obtained from the customary qualitative, guideline based individual interviews? How can the quality of the data be guaranteed? What determines and characterizes communication in expert interviews? Which personal skills, competences and attributes are beneficial in this form of interaction? What role does “gender” play here? How can the particular interaction structures be used to benefit the data gathering process? And, last but not least: Which research ethics issues have to be considered?

Jochen Gläser and *Grit Laudel* examine an issue hitherto largely ignored in the expert interview debate, namely the “quality” of the interview partner and the information and knowledge he/she provides in the course of the

interview. In their opinion, neither the methodological debate nor, indeed, sociological studies take into consideration the fact that different experts with different levels of knowledge and different quality requirements in their work can be expected to provide correspondingly different information. Using their own research into the influence of institutional research conditions on the production of scientific knowledge as an example, they illustrate that, depending on the “quality” of the expert, not only can the same social phenomena be described in the interview in different ways, but it is also possible for diverging descriptions to conceal similar phenomena. To reconstruct this information and draw benefit from it in the data gathering and analysis processes, additional information above and beyond the factual information provided in the interviews must be gathered on the interview subjects. Gläser and Laudel advocate the systematic inclusion of the “expert quality” issue in the individual research steps – from the selection of the experts through to the interviewing method and the analysis of the results. In this respect, Gläser and Laudel’s article can be seen as an impulse for an (overdue) debate on the validation criteria of expert interviews in general.

In their article, *Gabriele Abels* and *Maria Behrens* demonstrate the advantages of analyzing gender-specific interaction effects in expert interviews and putting them to productive use in the interview setting for the collection of practical and factual knowledge. In doing so, they make the assumption that the person of both the expert and the researcher (in their case, a female researcher) are also always present in the interview. Correspondingly, the interaction is influenced by various non-circumventable subject-related factors of influence. Abels and Behrens single out the category “gender” and analyze its implications for interviewing experts and for the success of expert interviews. They draw on their own empirical research to demonstrate that different “interaction effects” in the interview can be attributed to gender-related assumptions and prejudices. The results show – and this is their central hypothesis – that, for all intents and purposes, both positive and discriminating effects can serve to generate productive data. At the same time, the authors add two constraints: firstly that not all interaction effects are of the same use in producing relevant data and, secondly that certain interaction effects can significantly impair the validity of the data. In a second step, they verify their gender-related conclusions by means of a secondary analysis of their own interview notes from the associated research projects. This analysis reveals that subjective postscripts relating to interview situations can provide insightful material for a subsequent reflection on one’s own self-reflexivity in the data production phase.

Gabriela B. Christmann discusses telephone-based interviews, a variation on the expert interview theme in which the possibilities and limitations are determined by technology. Although telephone interviews with experts have long become established research practice (not least for economic

reasons), little reflection has been given to the methodology behind them. Christmann refers in her methodological considerations to experience drawn from a methodologically diverse German university project. Fourteen of the interviewed experts in leading university positions were interviewed in a face-to-face setting, while eight were interviewed by telephone for economic reasons. Based on a comparison of the two approaches and a review of the relevant methodological literature, Christmann's assessment of telephone-based expert interviews is sceptical. Even if the telephone interviews in her example research project did produce important information, methodological concerns prevail. Telephone interviews are neither easier to organize, nor is there any guarantee that the expert will be able to devote his/her full attention to the interview: since there is no face-to-face contact, the interviewer cannot predict or control distractions, lapses in concentration or interruptions by third parties. Reducing the interaction to a purely linguistic level makes it more difficult to interpret, and the interviewee has far less room for development – an aspect that perhaps carries less weight in information gathering expert interviews than in those intended for reconstructive social research theory building purposes. All in all, telephone-based expert interviews prove a difficult and taxing undertaking – both for the interviewee and for the interviewer.

Vaida Obelené addresses the question of research ethics in the context of the expert interview. In this context she discusses the extent to which the propositions of the literature on democratic research practices are relevant for an expert researcher. By drawing on her research experiences of studying former communist functionaries, who established themselves in relation to new forms of knowledge and power in a post-communist society, Obelené reflects such practices in terms of choices that may undermine the researcher's purposes including his/her commitment to the ethicalness of the study. Furthermore, this chapter aims to explore the tension between, on the one hand, the need of assertiveness on the part of the researcher in defending the study's purpose vis-à-vis the powerful expert, and the need of the researcher's sensitivity to the interests and vulnerabilities of the expert on the other. Against this background expert interviews can be understood as a form of 'bargained research' where the interests of both parties have to be considered.

The third part of the book contains a selection of articles that deal with the importance of expert interviews, the way they are conducted and the particular specifics of interaction in such interviews in concrete fields of application and social science sub-disciplines (industrial sociology, interpretative organizational research, labour market research and technology foresight). One particular question comes to the fore here, namely the methodological consequences that result from the structures peculiar to each respective field of research and their consequences for the success of the interviewing techniques used in an expert interview setting.

Rainer Trinczek uses an industrial sociology case study to illustrate that such interviews must by no means generally – as is a common preconception in qualitative research – adhere to the principles of neutrality and restraint. Although appropriate interviewing strategies can be found in methodological suppositions, the actual structure of such an interview has to follow the rules of normal communication, interpreting these everyday communication rules in line with the actual situation and the purpose of the interview. In the case study analysed by Trinczek (interviews with managers), the rules of communication and, thus, the expectations of the interviewees, are based on their everyday work situation; in general, the interviewees expect the interview to follow the question and answer structure predominantly encountered in everyday work situations. However, the researcher also has to take the actual subject matter into consideration when deciding whether to orient the entire interview on these expectations. Trinczek illustrates this using two thematically heterogeneous research projects as examples. An argumentative/discursive interview approach is suitable if the subject matter addresses a work-related topic. But the situation is different in research projects that deal with the “private world,” where (and in line with the various communication structures encountered in everyday life) a narrative-based interview structure is appropriate.

In their article, *Manfred Lueger* and *Ulrike Froschauer* illustrate the importance of expert interviews in interpretative social research based organizational analysis. By distinguishing different levels of observation (first and second order), they propose the reconstruction of analytically different types of knowledge based on a heuristic of distinct arenas and expertise reflection levels. The interviewees (as experts in the organizational lifeworld) have internal organizational experience and know-how. From an expanded observation perspective, they are in a position to provide qualified information on internal knowledge structures and constructions. To ensure the different knowledge forms are contrasted with appropriate complexity, those persons whose professional profile qualifies them as relevant internal or external from the point of view of the actual research should ultimately be integrated into the research. Pursuant to their analytical perspective, Froschauer and Lueger illustrate the specific individual data gathering and interpretation requirements raised by the different types of contrasting expertise in organizational action.

Andrea Leitner and *Angela Wroblewski* deal in their article with the standing and specifics of expert interviews in an evaluation research context. They begin by providing an overview of the development of this branch of research and then go on to examine the possibilities and prerequisites of the use of expert interviews in a “responsive evaluation” approach. They consider the role of experts as “stakeholders” with a specific interest in the results of the evaluation to be a central characteristic of expert interviews aimed at evaluating socio-political measures. According to Leitner and

Wroblewski, this “stakeholder” problem needs to be assessed from a methodology perspective. In the approach they describe, this validity problem is counteracted by references to information from other data sources during the interview. Examples from labour market policy evaluation research are used to present the determining factors in the expert interview interaction process and discuss the possibilities available for dealing with this bias.

The Expert Delphi method presented by *Georg Aichholzer* plays an important role in the rapidly growing field of technology foresight. Against the background of some serious uncertainties in modern societies, this relatively tightly structured group communication process basically aims to “rationalize the future” through a methodologically controlled generation of expert knowledge. In many cases, foresight processes also aspire to offer social networking, voting and consensus building functions that improve the performance of innovation systems. Aichholzer’s article looks at the methodology modifications and combinations that have accompanied the growing use of the Expert Delphi and illustrates them using international examples. Following an introduction to the basic elements of the Delphi method, Aichholzer explains its use in the innovative Austrian Technology Delphi, which incorporates a number of modifications to the classic Delphi. The different strategies used to capture expert knowledge in a further example – an international foresight process on the future of European transport systems – allows an interesting comparison between the Expert Delphi and cross-impact analysis. The subsequent applications discussed in the article, such as a Finnish approach geared towards balancing consensus and diversity and the use of internet assistant Expert Delphis, demonstrate other application-specific adaptations to and combinations of this method.

This book should not, of course, be seen as an exclusive compendium and the final word on a fully sanctioned research method. Far more, it is an invitation to others to reflect on and examine the different forms of expert interview in more detail. Indeed, we expect and hope that an intensified, critical debate on this topic will further increase the practical benefits of this method. The internationalization of the debate is an important step in this direction. Consequently, our intention with this book is to build a stable platform on which “experts” from different research traditions, scientific and language cultures can participate in an intensified and fertile debate on expert interviews. This would ultimately benefit not only a small community of expert researchers, but also qualitative social research as a whole.

Note

1. For a long time even representatives of the qualitative paradigm were undecided as to whether expert interviews actually did represent a discrete method of data collection that could be differentiated from other interview forms. No reference is

made, for example, to expert interviews in “A Companion to Qualitative Research” (Flick and others, 2004), the English edition of a key German handbook.

References

- Beck, U. (1992) *Risk Society. Towards a New Modernity*. (London: Sage Publications).
- Bogner, A. (2005) “How Experts Draw Boundaries. Dealing with Non-Knowledge and Uncertainty in Prenatal Testing” in *Science, Technology and Innovation Studies 1*, pp. 17–37, <www.sti-studies.de/articles/2005-01/bogner.htm>
- Bogner, A., Torgersen, H. (eds) (2005) *Wozu Experten? Ambivalenzen der Beziehung von Wissenschaft und Politik*. (Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften).
- Collins, H. M., Evans, R. (2002) “The Third Wave of Science Studies: Studies of Expertise and Experience” in *Social Studies of Science 32*, pp. 235–96.
- Collins, H. M., Evans, R. (2007) *Rethinking Expertise* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press).
- Flick, U. (2006) *Introduction to Qualitative Research*, 3rd edn (London: Sage Publications).
- Flick, U., Kardorff, E. von and Steinke, I. (eds) (2004) *A Companion to Qualitative Research* (London and Thousand Oaks/CA: Sage Publications).
- Giddens, A. (1990) *The Consequences of Modernity* (Cambridge: Polity Press).
- Giddens, A. (1991) *Modernity and Self-Identity – Self and Society in the Late Modern Age* (Stanford/CA: Stanford University Press).
- Jasanoff, S., Markle, G. E., Petersen, J. C. and Pinch, T. (eds) (1995) *Handbook of Science and Technology Studies* (Thousand Oaks/CA: Sage Publications).
- Lamnek, S. (2005) *Qualitative Sozialforschung: Lehrbuch*, 4th edn (Weinheim: Beltz).
- Maasen, S. and Weingart, P. (eds) (2005) *Democratization of Expertise? Exploring Novel Forms of Scientific Advice in Political Decision-Making* (Dordrecht: Springer).
- Meuser, M. and Nagel, U. (1991) “ExpertInneninterviews – vielfach erprobt, wenig bedacht. Ein Beitrag zur qualitativen Methodendiskussion” in Garz, D. and Kraimer, K. (eds) *Qualitativ-empirische Sozialforschung. Konzepte, Methoden, Analysen* (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag), pp. 441–71.
- Przyborski, A. and Wohlrab-Sahr, M. (2008) *Qualitative Sozialforschung. Ein Arbeitsbuch* (München: Oldenbourg).
- Schmid, J. (1995) “Expertenbefragung und Informationsgespräch in der Parteienforschung: Wie föderalistisch ist die CDU?” in Alemann, U. v. (ed.) *Politikwissenschaftliche Methoden. Grundriss für Studium und Forschung* (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag), pp. 293–325.
- Turner, S. (2002) “What is the Problem with Experts?” in *Social Studies of Science 31*, pp. 123–49.

Index

- Abels, Garbiele, 9, 138
- access problems, 104–5
- accomplice, interviewer as, 67, 68–9
- accuracy standards, 248n7
- active participants, 24–5, 38n12
- Aichholzer, Georg, 12, 252
- analysis, 35–6
- data, 35–6, 132–5, 245–7
 - effect, 240
 - secondary, 143–9
- anonymity, 110n9, 252–3
- archaeological model, 55–8, 73, 75n10
- argumentative/discursive interview
- approach, 11, 210–12
- assessment, of experts, 129–31
- asynchronous interaction, 166
- Austrian Technology Delphi, 12, 252, 256–68
- authority, interviewer as, 64–5, 68–9
- balloon effect, 237
- bargaining, process of, 187–91, 199
- Bauman, Zygmunt, 88
- Behrens, Maria, 9, 138
- benefit motivation, 192–4
- Berger, Peter L., 88
- biographical interviews, 32
- biographical structures, 26–7
- Bogner, Alexander, 1, 7, 43
- Bourdieu, P., 221
- Burke, L. A., 165
- Busse, G., 163–4
- canonical documents, 90
- case studies, 54
- catharsis effect, 144, 146, 209, 243
- certification, 88, 89
- Christmann, Gabriela B., 9–10, 157
- Cicourel, A.V., 204
- classical Delphi, 259
- closed questions, 165–6
- coding, 36
- co-experts, 58–60, 68–9, 162
- common ground, 76n21
- communication
- everyday, 205
 - practices, 27–8
 - rules of, 11
 - as sensemaking process, 218–19
- communicative validity, 186
- competence, 83–5, 195–7
- competence ascriptions, 58–69
- Complex Societies, 23
- conditions of work, 127
- confidentiality, 110n9
- constructionism, 217
- constructionist discourse, 21
- constructivist definition, 49–50
- contemporary society, 20–1
- content of work, 127
- contextual knowledge, 46
- conversational form, 87
- conversational interactions, 142–50
- cost-benefit analysis, 240
- counter-expert systems, 21, 38n11
- critic, interviewer as potential, 65–7, 68–9
- Cross-Impact Analysis, 255, 268–70
- data, dependence of, on performance
- levels of researchers, 121–9
- data analysis, 35–6, 245–7
- quality of experts and, 132–5
 - secondary, 143–4, 145–9
- data collection, 31–5, 204
- decision Delphi, 252, 257, 259–60
- decision-making, questions on, 33–4
- Delphi method, 157, 238, 252–71
- basic features of, 252–3
 - combination of methods, 268–70
 - development of statements and questionnaires, 262–4
 - evaluation results, 253–4
 - Expert Delphi, 12, 252, 256, 268–70
 - motivation and, 264–6
 - online, 270–1
 - Real Time, 270–1
 - selection of experts, 260–2

- Delphi method – *continued*
 Technology Delphi Austria, 256–68
 technology foresight and, 254–6
- democratic theory, 3–4, 51
- democratic research, 185–91, 198–9
- Dexter, L.A., 139, 140
- diachronic secondary analysis, 143
- disciplinarity, 22
- discursive consciousness, 29–30, 31, 38n16
- discursive interview structure, 11, 210–12
- distortion effects, 241, 248n11
- doctors, 87–8, 118
- dual career couples, 27
- effect analysis, 240
- Eliade, Mircea, 88
- elite interviews, 98–103, 105–9
- elites
 access problems with, 104–5
 definition of, 99, 110n3
 vs. experts, 107–9
 functional, 34, 50, 83
 global, 84
 local, 83–4
 sampling, 103–4
- empirical research, 37n2, 203–13
- enactment, 218
- epistemic cultures, 23, 27–8
- ethics, research, 10, 184–99
- ethnographic research, 28
- evaluation research, 11–12
 application-oriented dimension, 237
 development of approaches to, 236–8
 expert interviews in, 235–47
 methodological dimension, 237
 methodological variation in, 236–40
- evaluator, interviewer as, 64–5
- everyday communication, 205
- everyday knowledge, 220
- exam situation, 241, 245
- executives, private lives of, 205
- expectations, 57–8, 206
- expert/counter-expert distinction, 5, 21, 38n11
- Expert Delphi method, 12, 252, 256, 268–70
- expert interviews
 advantages of, 2–3
 analysis of, 35–6, 245–7
 application of, 37n2
 archaeological model of, 55–8, 73, 75n10
 concepts of, 117–19, 139–42
 conducting, 243–5
 data collection, 31–5
 debate over, 1, 43–5, 98–9
 vs. elite interviews, 99–103, 107–9
 epistemological interest of, 81–4
 ethical considerations, 184–99
 ethnographic embedding of, 87–91
 exploratory, 7, 46, 101, 160–2
 gender-specific interaction effects in, 9, 142, 145–6, 149–52
 guided, 203–7, 226
 interaction effects in, 7, 45, 56, 57, 141–2, 144–50, 243
 interaction model of, 55–8, 73, 105–6
 interaction structures in, 55–72
 in interpretive organizational research, 217–32
 introduction to, 17–18
 with managers, 203–13
 methodological ambiguity of, 43–8
 methodological pluralism in, 72–3
 methodology in, 5–12
 neutrality in, 70–2
 open, 225–6
 in political science, 138–52
 practical aspects of, 240–7
 pre-knowledge for, 162
 preparing, 241–3
 procedural consequences of, 223–6
 in programme evaluation, 235–47
 quality differences and, 129–35
 systematizing, 46–7, 101, 160–2
 techniques for, 84–7, 105–7
 telephone-based, 9–10, 157–78
 theory-generating, 7, 47–8, 50, 53–5, 74n9, 101
 types of, 7, 46–8, 101
 uses of, 1, 230–1
- expertise
 external, 222, 223, 224, 230
 reflective subject matter, 222, 224
 research, 223
 social science research on, 3–5
 technical, 3
 types of, 220–3

- expert knowledge, 3, 4–5, 82–3, 220–3
 as analytic construction, 28–9, 52–3, 72–3, 102
 defined, 7, 18–19
 explicitness of, 29–30
 negotiating, 27–8
 relevances of, 23–31, 53–5
 societal change and, 21–3
 socio-cultural conditions of the
 production of, 25–7
- experts
 access problems with, 104–5
 as active participants, 24–5, 38n12
 assessment of, 129–31
 bargaining with, 187–91, 199
 competence of, 83–5, 195–7
 constructivist definition of, 49–50
 definition of, 7, 18–19, 24–5, 48–52, 54–5, 99–100, 107, 220–1
 vs. elites, 107–9
 “good” and “bad”, 119–21
 identification of, 87–90
 laicization of, 5
 vs. laypersons, 19, 20
 male, 34–5
 motivations of, 191–8
 perceptions of, about interviewer, 57–69, 106
 post-traditional, 4
 quality of, 8–9, 117–19, 121–9, 132–6
 reformulation of concept of, 48–55
 relational concept of, 44
 relationship management with, 191–8
 relevances of, 26
 researchers and, 185–7
 selection of, 229–30, 260–2
 sensitive, 194–5
 social embeddedness of, 197–8
 social science research, 3–5
 as stakeholders, 11–12, 236, 240–1, 244–5
 status of, 18, 23, 139–40
 trained, 118
 voluntaristic concept of, 49
- expert systems, 21
 explicitness, 51
 exploratory expert interview, 7, 46, 101, 160–2
 external expertise, 222, 223, 224, 230
 eye contact, 173
- face-to-face interviews, 166–7, 169
 feasibility standards, 248n7
 feedback, 252–3
 feedback effect, 144, 148–9, 243
 female researchers, 34–5
see also gender-specific interaction effects
 focused interviews, 74n5
 follow-up questions, 34
 foresight activities, 255
see also technology foresight
 formative power, 107–8
 Foucault, M., 28
 Froschauer, Ulrike, 11, 217
 functional elites, 34, 50, 83
- gender relations, 34–5, 140–1
 gender-specific interaction effects, 9, 142, 145–6, 149–52
 Gläser, Jochen, 8–9, 117
 global elites, 84
 Global Risk Society, 23
 Greenpeace, 38n10
 guided expert interviews, 203–7, 226
 guidelines, 87
- habitus, 221
 Häder, Michael, 254
 Häder, Sabine, 254
 harm motivation, 194–8
 harm reduction, 185
 Honer, Anne, 84, 87
- iceberg effect, 76n25, 144, 146–7, 243
 implementation evaluation, 239–40
 implicit knowledge, 51, 81–2
 indexical language, 85
 informational conversations, 139
 informed consent, 186
 insider knowledge, 38n12
 Institute of Technology Assessment (ITA), 257
 institutionalization, 38n10
 institutional-organizational context, 35
 institutional reflexivity, 4
 institutions, life-worlds of, 28
 intellectuals, 88
 interaction effects, 7, 45, 56, 57, 141–2, 150–2
 catharsis effect, 144, 146, 209, 243

- interaction effects – *continued*
 in expert interviews, 144–50
 feedback effect, 144, 148–9, 243
 gender-specific, 9, 142, 145–6, 149–52
 iceberg effect, 144, 146–7, 243
 paternalism, 63, 66, 86, 144, 145–6, 243
 profile effect, 144, 149–50
- interaction model, 55–8, 73, 105–6
- interaction structures, 55–72
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 28–9
- interpretation method, 226
- interpretive knowledge, 8, 38n17, 52–3, 54, 72, 99, 107
- interpretive organizational research, 217–32
- interpretive paradigm, 45
- interpretive power, 107–8
- interviewee
see experts
- interviewer
 as accomplice, 67, 68–9
 as authority, 64–5, 68–9
 as co-expert, 58–60, 68–9, 162
 as expert from different knowledge culture, 60–2
 female, 34–5
 as layperson, 62–4, 68–9
 neutrality of, 56, 70–2, 141–2
 perceptions about, 57–69, 106
 personal qualities of, 34
 as potential critic, 65–9
 preparation by, 31–2, 241–3
 qualifications of, 90–1
 as quasi expert, 8, 90
 role of, 141
 status of, 86–7
- interview guidelines, 161–2, 164
- interview memos, 143
- interview protocols, 143
- interview setting, 84–6
- interview techniques, 84–7, 105–6, 164, 165
- interview topics, preparation of, 31–2
- IT industry, 89
- Kern, B., 209
- knowledge
 contextual, 46
see also expert knowledge
- everyday, 220
- implicit, 51, 81–2
- insider, 38n12
- interpretive, 8, 38n17, 52–4, 72, 99, 107
- local, 25
- non-explicit, 30
- operational, 86
- outsider, 38n12
- procedural, 8, 99, 107
- process, 38n17, 52
- scientific, 4, 21, 223
- social construction of, 120
- social relevance of, 52
- sociology of, 18–19, 23–4, 30, 45, 49, 50–1, 53, 151
- specialist, 51, 52, 222
- specialized, 5, 47, 82–3, 88, 223
- subject matter, 221–4
- technical, 38n17, 52
- theoretical, 90
- types of, 19
- knowledge-power relationship, 28
- knowledge production, 7, 25
 new forms of, 20–3, 30–1
 as open-ended process, 28–9
 quality of researchers and, 121–3
 socio-cultural conditions of, 25–7
 transdisciplinary, 29
- Knowledge Societies, 23, 27–8
- knowledge workers, 108
- latent content, 6
- Laudel, Grit, 8–9, 117
- lay persons, 5, 19, 20, 51
 interviewer as, 62–4, 68–9
- lay specialists, 107
- Leitner, Andrea, 11–12, 235
- linguistic irregularities, 172–3
- Littig, Beate, 1, 8, 98
- local elites, 83–4
- local knowledge, 25
- Luckmann, Thomas, 88
- Lueger, Manfred, 11, 217
- male-dominated fields, 34–5
- managers, interviews with, 203–13
- maximum structural variation, 225
- meaning, 218–19
- meaning collectives, 218

- Menz, Wolfgang, 1, 7, 43
 methodical-systematic contributions, 163
 methodology
 analysis, 35–6
 data collection, 31–5
 in evaluation research, 236–40
 in expert interviews, 5–12
 lack of standardization in, 43–4
 for manager interviews, 203–13
 pluralism in, 72–3
 qualitative, 204–5
 sampling, 103–4
 standardized, 204
 for telephone-based interviews, 164–6
 method-relational approach, 49–50
 Meuser, Michael, 6–7, 17
 Miller, M. K., 165
 minimization of differences, 225
 Mode 1 knowledge production, 20, 21, 22
 Mode 2 knowledge production, 20, 22, 25
 modernity
 ambivalences of, 20–1
 expertocrization of, 21
 second, 54
 modernization theory, 4–5, 20
 motivated research subjects, 191–8
 motivation, 191–8
 benefit, 192–4
 Delphi method and, 264–6
 harm, 194–8
- Nagel, Ulrike, 6–7, 17
 narrative-based interview structure, 11
 narrative interviews, 203
 narratives, 32–3
 negotiation, 27–8, 227–9
 networking, 27–8
 neutrality, 70–2, 141–2
 NGO representatives, 7
 non-elites, 110n10
 non-explicit knowledge, 30
 non-verbal signals, 167–8, 173–74
- Obelene, Vaida, 10, 184
 objective hermeneutics, 203
 Oblené, Vaida, 10
 observation, levels of, 11
 Opdenakker, R., 166–7
 open-ended questions, 165–6
 open interviews, 31, 225–6
- operational knowledge, 86
 organizational dynamics, 228
 organizational research, expert
 interviews in, 217–32
 outsider knowledge, 38n12
- paraphrase, 35
 participatory observation, 2
 paternalism effect, 63, 66, 86,
 144–6, 243
 Pfadenhauer, Michaela, 7–8, 81
 phenomena
 different descriptions of identical,
 125–7
 identical descriptions of different,
 123–5
 plurality, 29
 policy Delphi, 259
 policy evaluation, 239
 political science interviews, 138–52
 political science theory, 3–4
 postmodern discourse, 21, 29, 38n12
 post-traditional experts, 4
 power, 107–8
 power dynamics, 186–7, 188
 practical consciousness, 38n16
 pre-knowledge, 162
 preparation, 241–3
 private persons, 26–7, 52, 53
 problem-centered interviews, 74n5
 problem framing, 5
 procedural knowledge, 8, 99, 107
 process knowledge, 38n17, 52
 professional organizations, 89
 professionals, 87–8
 see also experts
 professional terminology, 85, 245
 professions, 118
 profile effect, 144, 149–50
 programme evaluation, expert
 interviews in, 235–47
 propriety standards, 248n7
- qualitative analysis, 138
 qualitative interviews
 methodical aspects, 203–13
 openness of, 204–5
 telephone-based, 162–8
 qualitative social research, 6, 86–7
 qualitative theory, 48

- quality, of experts, 8–9, 117–19, 121–9, 132–6
- quality assurance strategies, 226
- quasi-experts, 86, 90
- questionnaires, 31, 160, 263, 265
- questions, 33–4
- closed, 165–6
 - open-ended, 165–6
 - standardized, 204
- Rammert, W., 23
- rationality, 4
- realist approach, to expertise, 3
- reality, construction of social, 217–18
- Real-Time Delphi (RT Delphi), 270–1
- reflective subject matter expertise, 222, 224
- reflexivity, 51
- relational space, 140
- relationship management, 191–8
- research
- democratic, 185–91, 198–9
 - empirical, 37n2, 203–13
 - ethnographic, 28
 - evaluation, 11–12, 235–47
 - qualitative, 6, 86–7
 - social science, 3–5
- researchers
- assessment of, 129–31
 - dependence of data on performance levels of, 121–9
 - female, 34–6
 - “good” and “bad”, 119–29, 134–5
 - as information sources of science studies, 119–21
 - interpretive organizational, 217–32
- research ethics, 10, 184–99
- research expertise, 223
- responsive evaluation, 238
- rhetorical interviews, 71
- risk controversies, 5
- role expectations, 57–72, 76n23, 106, 206, 207
- routine activities, breaches of, 33
- RPM Screening, 269–70
- sampling, 103–4, 225, 229–30
- Schütz, Alfred, 19, 20, 51
- Science Citation Index*, 120–1
- science studies, 119–21, 122
- scientific criticism, 4
- scientific knowledge, 4, 21, 223
- secondary analysis, 143–9
- second modernity, 54
- second opinions, 5
- sensemaking, 218–19
- sensitive experts, 194–5
- shamans, 88–9
- shared agenda, 192–3
- SMIC methods, 268–70
- social constructivism, 3, 45, 102, 120, 217–18
- social cues, 166–7
- social embeddedness, 197–8
- social movements, 38n10, 51
- social relevance, 52, 53–5
- social-representational approach, 49–50
- social science research, trends in, 3–5
- societal change, 19–23
- society, functional elites of, 34
- socio-cultural conditions, 25–7
- sociological conceptualization, 36
- sociology of knowledge, 18–19, 23–4, 30, 45, 49–51, 53, 151
- specialist knowledge, 222
- specialists, 82–3, 107
- specialization, 5, 223
- specialized knowledge, 5, 47, 82–3, 88
- special knowledge, 51, 52
- Sprondel, W. M., 19, 51
- stakeholder problem, 240–1, 244–5
- stakeholders, 11–12, 236
- standardized interviews, 168, 204
- standardized surveys, 47
- Standards of the Joint Committee*, 237–8, 248n7
- status relation, 34
- structuring, 219
- studying down, 186
- studying up, 186
- subjective interpretation, 204, 246
- subject matter know-how, 221–4
- surveys, 47
- synchronic secondary analysis, 143
- synchronous interaction, 166
- systematic quantitative surveys, 2
- systematizing expert interview, 7, 46–7, 101, 160–2
- technical expertise, 3
- technical knowledge, 38n17, 52
- technocratic debate, 4

- technological determinism, 256
- Technology Delphi Austria, 256–68
 - development of Delphi statements and questionnaires, 262–4
 - feedback and analysis, 266–7
 - motivation to participate in, 264–6
 - objectives and project design, 256–9
 - organization as decision Delphi, 259–60
 - results and implementation, 267–8
 - selection of experts, 260–2
- technology foresight, 12, 253, 254–6
- Technology Roadmapping, 255
- telephone-based interviews, 9–10, 157–78
 - compared with face-to-face interviews, 166–7, 169
 - disadvantages of, 164
 - duration of, 166, 169
 - interview guidelines for, 161–2, 164
 - problems with, 169–77
 - qualitative-oriented, 162–8
 - standardized, 168
 - techniques for, 164, 165–6
- terminology, 85, 245
- thematic comparison, 36
- thematic competence, 86
- thematic focusing, 85
- thematic units, 35
- theoretical generalization, 36
- theoretical knowledge, 90
- theoretical sampling, 225, 229–30
- theory-generating expert interviews, 7, 47–8, 50, 53–5, 74n9, 101
- theory of errors, 253
- theory of society, 4
- topic guide, 31–2, 47, 87, 242
- Total Design Method (TDM), 265–6
- trade secrets, 86
- trained experts, 118
- transcription, 35
- transdisciplinarity, 22
- Trinczek, Rainer, 11, 203
- Turner, Stephen, 4
- universities, 22
- university planning, 158–9
- utility standards, 248n7
- validation criteria, 9
- voluntaristic concept of expert, 49
- Weber, Max, 50
- workplace studies, 94n23
- Wroblewski, Angela, 11–12, 235
- Zuckerman, H., 120

