## **READY – Header : Special Issue**



## Turning Talk into "Rationales": Using the Extended Case Method for the Coding and Analysis of Semi-Structured Interview Data in ATLAS.ti

#### Luis Antonio Vila-Henninger

Institut de Sciences politiques Louvain-Europe (ISPOLE) Université catholique de Louvain

#### **Corresponding Author**

SPLE Place Montesquieu 1/L2.08.07 1348 Louvain-la-Neuve Belgium

### Résumé

**Transformer la parole en « arguments » : usage de l'étude de cas étendue pour coder et analyser des entretiens semi-directifs avec Atlas.ti.** Cet article traite de l'analyse outillée de données qualitatives à l'aide du logiciel ATLAS.ti dans le cas d'une enquête empirique sur la façon dont les électeurs américains justifient les positions adoptées lors de questions posées par référendum sur des sujets économiques. Pour mener à bien cette recherche, des entretiens semi-directifs ont été réalisés en Arizona de 2013 à 2015 auprès de 120 personnes. Ces dernières étaient interrogées sur les choix qu'elles ont fait à l'occasion de quatre votes en matière de politique économique organisées dans l'Etat d'Arizona entre 2008 et 2012 sur les sujets suivants: dépénalisation des narcotiques et médicalisation, financement du système éducatif, immigration et marché du travail, et protection des consommateurs/trices. Le principe de "reconstruction " formalisé dans les travaux de Michal Burawoy dans le cadre de l'étude de cas élargie a été ici appliqué au moment du codage et de l'analyse de nos données *via* ATLAS.ti : la reconstruction part de la théorie afin d'identifier les cas contradictoires de manière à la refabriquer. A partir de nos questions de recherche, les théories de l'électeur raisonnant, en fonction respectivement de ses intérêts et de son appartenance partisane, ont

été mobilisées pour produire une grille de codage initiale, déductive et thématique, s'appuyant sur les travaux théoriques et empiriques existant sur le sujet de chacune des quatre élections étudiées. Après quoi un codage ouvert (*open coding*) a permis de reconstruire la théorie par l'ajout de nouveaux codes à la grille initiale et la modification d'autres codes. Ces codes thématiques spécifiques à chacun des cas étudiés sont désignés comme des « arguments » (*rationales*). Au travers de ce processus de codage, l'auteur contribue aux théories relatives aux idéologies politiques américaines et à la légitimation du vote en identifiant dans les données des arguments inattendus et en les utilisant pour prolonger les théories mobilisées dans l'élaboration de la grille de départ.

#### Abstract

This article focuses on the tool-driven analysis of qualitative data in ATLAS.ti collected as part of an empirical investigation into how American voters legitimate their positions on direct democratic economic policy. To carry out this research, semi-structured interviews were conducted from 2013 to 2015 with 120 Arizonan respondents. Participants were interviewed about why they voted the way they did on four economic policy ballot measures that appeared on the Arizona state ballot from 2008-2012 related to narcotic decriminalization and medicalization, education funding, immigration and labor markets, and consumer protection. The principle of "reconstruction" from Michael Burawoy's "Extended Case Method" (ECM) was applied in the coding and analysis of these data in ATLAS.ti. Reconstruction starts with theory and then looks for anomalous cases as a way to build theory. Using the project's research questions, voter reasoning theories of self-interest and partisanship, respectively, were used to generate an initial deductive thematic codebook based on a synthesis of theory and empirical literature specific to each ballot measure. Open coding later allowed for "reconstructed" theory by adding new codes to the initial codebook and modifying others. These issue-specific thematic codes are referred to as "rationales". Through this process of coding, the author contributed to theories of American political ideology and voter legitimation by identifying theoretically anomalous "rationales" in the data and then using these rationales to expand the theories that were used to generate the initial thematic codebook.

#### **Mots-clés**

ATLAS.ti, Etude de cas élargie, Entretiens semi-directifs, analyse inductive, analyse déductive

#### Keywords

ATLAS.ti, Extended Case Method, Semi-Structured Interviews, Inductive Analysis, Deductive Analysis

### Introduction

This article focuses on the tool-driven analysis of data I collected as part of an empirical investigation into how US voters legitimate their stances on direct democratic economic policy. To carry out this research, I conducted semi-structured interviews from 2013 to 2015 with 120 Arizonan respondents about why they voted the way they did on four economic policy ballot measures. These ballot measures appeared on the Arizona state ballot from 2008-2012 and covered narcotic decriminalization and medicalization, taxation and education funding, immigration and labor market closure, and consumer protection for new home buyers – respectively. My coding and analysis of these data is based on the "Reconstruction" component of Michael Burawoy's "Extended Case Method" (ECM; 1998; 2009). "Reconstruction" starts with theory and then looks for anomalous cases in order to theory build. Using the project's research question and voting theories of self-interest and partisanship, respectively, this approach allowed me to identify thematic codes of interest and create

an initial codebook<sup>1</sup> based on a synthesis of theory with empirical findings specific to each ballot measure. Open coding<sup>2</sup> later allowed for "reconstructed" theory inductively by adding new codes to the initial codebook and modifying others. This approach makes it possible to analyze how descriptive codes align with issue-specific level two thematic codes – or "rationales"<sup>34</sup>.

The aforementioned process balances deductive thematic coding with open coding *via* a Computer-Assisted Qualitative Data Analysis Software (CAQDAS) – in my case ATLAS.ti. Although my coding is fundamentally deductive, it is – more importantly – the product of an analytic interplay between deductive and inductive coding processes. Given my approach to analysis, my use of ATLAS.ti was driven by my deductive coding schema, but involved a dialogue between ATLAS.ti coding tools, theory, and data. This approach takes advantage of the flexibility of ATLAS.ti (Bandeira-De-Mello and Garreau, 2011: 178) to develop an analytical approach to qualitative research that extends the Extended Case Method.

For this article, I demonstrate my coding strategy and use of ATLAS.ti *via* an analysis of voter reasoning on the "Homeowners' Bill of Rights" Proposition 201 (2008) – a measure that sought to protect new home purchasers by extending new home warranties and increasing transparency in the relationship between new home vendors and financial institutions. To proceed with this demonstration, I provide a background of the social and economic context of housing in Arizona. Next, I describe the ballot measure. I then provide an overview using empirical examples of how to apply my analytic approach. As an empirical note, my rationales are evidence of legitimations. However, it is important to note that these legitimations are a part of voter reasoning in a broader sense – thus my reference to the literature on "voter reasoning" rather than "voter decision-making."

## Theory: Applying the Extended Case Model to Semi-Structured Interview Data

Building on the work of sociologists who have emphasized the importance of "reflexivity" – or the "self-monitoring of behavior" (Burawoy, 2009: 38) – ethnographer Michael Burawoy developed a method of qualitative inquiry that seeks to balance positivistic and reflexive social science. The logic here is that these two modes of knowledge production are complementary (Burawoy, 2009: 39). Reflexive investigation and analysis, then, embraces and builds upon the reflexive elements of qualitative investigation that involve "intersubjectivity between participant and observer" (Burawoy, 2009; see also Burawoy, 1998; Sallaz, 2009). Burawoy proceeds by developing tools for reflexive observation and analysis that are obstacles for "positive" social science but serve as strengths for qualitative research – and ethnography in particular – and dubs his approach "The Extended Case Method" (ECM). ECM consists of four "reflexive" principles: 1) Intervention, 2) Process, 3) Structuration, and 4) Reconstruction. A reflexive epistemology and full application of ECM to semi-structured, non-clinical interview data is beyond the scope of this article. Instead, this article will

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> I use the term "codebook" in the sense that it is used in Content Analysis and qualitative sociology.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> I use the term "open coding" in the sense that it has been developed in ATLAS.ti as an application of Grounded Theory.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> I use the terms "descriptive coding" and "thematic coding" in the manner they are used in many areas of qualitative sociology and qualitative political science. Later in the article, I provide a definition of each term. "Descriptive codes" take the place of "variables".

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> I use terms that span different methodological and traditional perspectives because my application of the Extended Case Method seeks to contribute by providing an analytical approach that synthesizes aspects of these different traditions that are relevant to my analytical process.

focus on the application of the principle of "Reconstruction" to the coding and analysis of semistructured interview data.

Semi-structured interview data can be seen as "reflexive" through the principle of "Intervention". The researcher often "extracts" the respondent "from her own space and time and subjects her to the space and time of the interviewer" (Burawoy, 2009: 40). Burawoy argues that this mode of data generation is a strength because "it is by mutual reaction that we discover the properties of the social order. Interventions create perturbations that are not noise to be expurgated but music to be appreciated, transmitting the hidden secrets of the participant's world" (Burawoy, 2009: 40). While the epistemology can be debated here, the important point is that through this qualitative "intervention", the intersubjectivity of the social scientist and respondent "reveals" the "social order" by investigating "the way it responds to pressure" (Burawoy, 2009: 44). It is important to note here that Burawoy sees reflexive methods as complementary to positivism, such that they form a "methodological duality" – entailing "the coexistence and codependence of two models of science – positive and reflexive" (Burawoy, 2009: 39).

In ECM, a key part of the analytic response is the principle of "Reconstruction". This principle recognizes that representation – in the positivistic sense – is not possible with this type of subjective and local qualitative data. Thus, rather than making generalizations based on the data itself, the researcher should use these data to build theory. In ECM, this is done by starting with a "theoretical point of departure" and then using the data to engage in "dialogue" with theory (Burawoy, 2009: 43). The advantage here is that by using theory, the analyst produces thematic codes that (s)he should observe in his/her data. When the researcher finds that the data present anomalies or stretch beyond the scope of extant theory, (s)he then uses these data to expand the theory at hand to explain these surprising or novel findings. This approach is based on the epistemological principle that "science offers no final truth… but exists in a state of continual revision" (Burawoy, 2009: 44). Through this lens, then, reflexive data are used to revise and "reconstruct" theory empirically.

The key here, as Burawoy explains, is that "instead of discovering grounded theory, we elaborate existing theory" (Burawoy, 2009: 43). In other words, reconstructed theory building is the result of "dialogue" between the initial theory and empirical anomalies. In the subsequent section, I will discuss how the inherent flexibility of ATLAS.ti (Bandeira-De-Mello and Garreau, 2011: 178) enables the analytical processes necessary for my application of ECM. Specifically, it allows for deductive coding that is then used by the analyst to identify theoretically anomalous cases in the data. The resulting process of "reconstruction" is similar to abduction in its ability to theory build through the identification of anomalies (Timmermans and Tavory, 2012: 171; Tavory and Timmermans, 2014), but differs through the use of a core theory – or set of theories – to classify anomalous findings as such (Timmermans and Tavory, 2012: 181).

## **Turning Talk into 'Rationales'**

In what follows, I describe my application of the principle of "Reconstruction" to my data through an iterative process in which I used theory and empirical findings to generate deductive thematic codes in an initial round of coding. I then contribute to the application of the "Reconstruction" principle by developing inductive codes that accounted for any theoretically relevant anomalies or observations that extended the scope of my initial theories. I used these inductive codes to engage in a broader literature review in an attempt to find additional theories and empirical literature that explain my inductive coding. Subsequently, I developed deductive codes from this broader literature review that allowed me to construct a strategically expanded coding scheme that – by nature – allowed for theory building and synthesis by incorporating multiple empirical and theoretical perspectives. I concluded

by using this expanded coding scheme to reclassify my inductive codes and verify my coding. Thus, cases that were anomalous to my initial theories led to synthesis with other theories that provided explanations. In the event that there were no available scientific explanations of a given rationale, I then used this rationale to extend theory.

#### **Outline of Code Generation Process**

For my analyses, I began with the research question of my dissertation: "When given the opportunity to vote directly on economic policy, how do voters navigate the intersection between democracy and capitalism in their political reasoning?" Based on the research question, I used theories of voter reasoning to identify expected relationships between "descriptive" and "thematic" codes. Here, I drew upon Bernard and Ryan's (2010) discussion of code distinctions. My use of the term "Descriptive code" refers "structural codes", or codes that "describe things like...features of the respondent" (Bernard and Ryan's, 2010: 76). These descriptive codes then allowed me to identify the presence or absence of a given rationale across respondents for a given descriptive code. Next, I use the term "thematic code" to refer to what Bernard and Ryan (2010) call "Theme codes", which "show where the themes we've identified actually occur in a text" (Bernard and Ryan's, 2010: 76). The important distinction here is that while both thematic and descriptive codes are theory-driven in my analysis, descriptive codes refer to theoretically relevant characteristics of the respondents while thematic codes refer to theoretically relevant characteristics of the respondents while thematic codes refer to theoretically relevant characteristics of the respondents while thematic codes refer to theoretically relevant characteristics of the respondents while thematic codes refer to theoretically relevant characteristics of the respondents while thematic codes refer to theoretically relevant characteristics of the respondents while thematic codes refer to theoretically relevant characteristics of the respondents while thematic codes refer to theoretically relevant characteristics of the respondents while thematic codes refer to theoretically relevant characteristics of the respondents while thematic codes refer to theoretically relevant characteristics of the respondents while thematic codes refer to theoretically relevant characteristics codes refe

Using my research question and theories of voter reasoning, I selected two factors that I expected to correspond to distinct themes in voter reasoning: "partisan affiliation" and "economic position". I then created a simple two-dimensional hierarchy in my coding scheme (for a discussion see Bernard and Ryan, 2010: 86) in which each descriptive code corresponded to two different sub-codes. It is important to note that for both thematic and descriptive coding, I refer to the most general code as "level one" and the subsequent sub-codes as "level two". For the descriptive level one code of "partisan affiliation", I created two sub-codes – or level two codes – that corresponded with the main dimensions of partisan voter reasoning identified in the literature for the American political system: 1) Democratic party affiliation and 2) Republican party affiliation. For the descriptive level one code of "economic position", I used the relevant literature to create two sub-codes – or level two codes: 1) low-income and 2) high-income (see Figure 1).

#### [Figure 1 here]

Next, I used voter reasoning theories of self-interest and partisanship to define level one thematic codes. In order to study the forms of legitimation hat aligned with each level two descriptive code, I analyzed respondent justifications of reported vote choice for each ballot measure. To refine the operationalization of voter reasoning via justification of respondents' reported ballot measure vote choice, I used what I call a "rationale". I define a "rationale" as any application of a broader principle in a way that justifies the respondents' stance on an issue or topic in terms that are relevant to said issue or topic. In the case of my analysis, an "issue" is defined as the policy domain that each ballot measure seeks to regulate. An important scope condition is that for this usage of the term "rationale", an "issue" or "topic" should be seen as a certain type of concrete action or range of actions. Thus, an "issue" may combine multiple "broader principles". As applied in this analysis. I use the term "broader principles" to refer to theoretically relevant themes that should characterize an aspect of respondents' rationalizations. The advantage of this definition of a "rationale" is that it enables reconstruction. Using our initial theories, we generate descriptive codes and broader principles. We

then use the empirical literature to identify ways in which these broader principles would apply to a given issue – or in the case of this analysis, policy domain. The process of reconstruction then allows for theory building in two ways. First, it contributes to the empirical literature on a broader principle. For example, I found inductive rationales "partisan affiliation" that emerged from my empirical analysis. Next, we engage in reconstruction by looking for additional theories to explain inductive rationale codes that do not fit with the principles from our initial theories. It was in this way that I created my rationales for "moral economy", "libertarianism", and "neoliberalism". It is through this process of reconstruction in which we create a dialogue between deductive and inductive analysis that avoids using the "rationale" concept as a tautology.

A key application here is Boltanski and Thévenot's (2006; see also Barnard, 2016) work on justification as employing "moral proofs". The argument is that actors' build their justifications on moral "proofs", that are "based on objects that are external to persons" (Boltanski and Thévenot, 2006: 131; Barnard, 2016: 1025). Rationales, in the sense that I use the term, serve to operationalize "proofs" by providing a coding and analytical strategy for moral proofs. In this sense, the application of a moral principle in a concrete moral dilemma would serve as a rationale and – by extension – evidence of a moral proof.

This approach is particularly suited not only to voter rationalization, but to voter rationalization of policy position. Thus, I used the partisanship reasoning and self-interested reasoning literature, respectively, to generate level two thematic codes – operationalized as "rationales" – through a literature review of voter reasoning in a policy domain that was specific to each ballot measure. Each issue-specific literature review allowed me to identify and select key words, phrases, and examples for each level two thematic code.

This allowed me to construct an initial codebook of level two thematic codes as policy-specific rationales. I then coded my semi-structured interview data for each ballot measure separately using the "list coding" feature in ATLAS.ti (see Figure 2).

#### [Figure 2 here]

In this process I used to "open coding" feature to code inductively when I found data that related to a level two descriptive or thematic code but were not a part of my initial codebook (see Figure 3).

#### [Figure 3 here]

As I progressed with my coding, I was able to apply inductive codes as they emerged to subsequent data through my use of the "list coding" feature. I used this coding strategy as a way to develop initial inductive codes that enabled theory building by serving as reference points for a subsequent literature review that sought to address these anomalous codes with extant literature and theory that were outside of my initial theoretical framework. Given that these codes were preliminary documentation of theoretical and empirical anomalies, there was no need to recode every document every time an inductive code emerged because the first round of coding used inductive codes as tools for reconstruction rather than a definitive set of final codes. I also updated my preliminary codebook each time I introduced an inductive code in order to keep track of these codes as the emerged.

I divided each semi-interview transcription into a separate document for each of the four ballot measures I included in my semi-structured interview guide. For each ballot measure, then, all of the data for a given respondent were in one document. I then coded entire documents, which allowed me to code for the presence or absence of a rationale in the reasoning of a respondent for each ballot measure – rather than coding for utterances of each rationale for each respondent.

Central to my inductive coding was my identification of instances/key words of issue-specific cases that were used by the respondent that fit logically with a level two descriptive or thematic code but were not in my initial thematic coding scheme. Through this dialogue between deductive and inductive coding, I began my process of "Reconstruction". After I coded all of the interviews for a corresponding ballot measure in a first round of deductive coding, I used my inductive codes to conduct an expanded literature review of potentially relevant alternative theories and an expanded review of issue-specific empirical findings. Crucially, I asked, "Is there evidence in further research that matches with the inductive codes?" If there was not, then my inductive codes extended theory. If there was further research that could be used to classify these inductive code, I adopted this literature to help explain an inductive code and thus synthesize theoretical perspectives. My reasoning here was that I did not want to create inductive theory that was redundant. The advantage was that this approach allowed me to investigate whether the inductive code presented data that were anomalous to just my initial theoretical framework, or if they were anomalous to the entire field of voter reasoning. I then used this additional relevant literature to rename my inductive codes and generate a second round of deductive coding. To do this, I used the "rename code" feature to reclassify inductively generated codes using additional theory and empirical findings. The ease of this task was dictated by how prominent data of this sort were in the voter reasoning literature. Often times my anomalous cases forced me to extend beyond the voter reasoning literature and thus required a more extensive literature review. I then double-checked my codes for the whole case set for the entire ballot measure by using the "quotations" function and verifying that each code applied to each interview.

Once I had finished coding, I used theories on which my research question was based (partisan voter reasoning and self-interested voter reasoning) to motivate analysis using the "query tool." I applied the following level one descriptive codes to each ballot measure respondent semi-structured interview segment document: economic position, partisan affiliation, and reported vote choice. I then used the query tool to investigate the combination of rationales that emerged for each form of reasoning (partisan or self-interest) as it corresponded - respectively - to the level two descriptive codes. In this way, I was able to isolate when level two thematic codes were present or absent for a given level two descriptive code, as well as identify corresponding inductively generated rationales. The "query tool" was especially useful in enabling me to find cases in which level two thematic rationale codes fit or contradicted theoretical expectations for level two descriptive codes. For example, I was able to identify rationales for high-income self-interested reasoning that were used by low-income respondents. ATLAS.ti, then, enabled me to "Reconstruct" theory not only via coding, but also via the "query tool". In my subsequent analysis, I systematically reconstructed partisan reasoning and self-interested reasoning voting theories, along with subsequent theories of voter political and/or economic reasoning. I did so by isolating and discussing deductively generated level two thematic rationales that are theorized to be present or absent for a given level two descriptive codes. This then allowed me to isolate anomalous cases.

# Application: Turning Talk into Rationales for Arizona's "Homeowners' Bill of Rights", Proposition 201 (2008)

For this analysis I selected the "Homeowners' Bill of Rights", Proposition 201 (2008), that sought to protect new home purchasers by extending new home warranties and increasing transparency in the relationship between new home vendors and financial institutions. I provide a background of the social and economic context of housing in Arizona. Next, I describe the ballot measure. I then outline which level two thematic codes should be present among respondents for each level two descriptive code, discuss my coding schema, and then provide an overview of my analytic process.

## The Ballot Measure: The Case of Arizona

Arizona was a locus of the American housing boom in the 1990s and 2000s. Contemporary statelevel attempts to protect homebuyers manifested in legislation that sought to protect purchasers of new homes. In 2002, the Arizona state legislature passed the "Purchaser Dwelling Act", which implemented a system of arbitration through which homebuyers and manufacturers could settle disputes concerning defects in new homes and avoid litigation. A major shortfall of this system was that this mediation period only lasted for 90 days after the purchase of a new home. It was in this context that Proposition 201 (2008) "Homeowners' Bill of Rights" emerged. Crucially, the measure only sought to amend the "Purchaser Dwelling Act" (2002) and thus did not attempt to address subprime lending or the needs of low-income tenants.

Spencer Kamps, a vice president of the Homebuilders Association of Central Arizona, claimed that Proposition 201 (2008) was spawned by unions trying to implement collective bargaining in the Arizona homebuilding industry. According to Kamps, unions contacted his association, which refused to collaborate, and thus prompted labor interests to spearhead the proposition (Rice, 2008). In this light we can see Proposition 201 (2008) as primarily the result of a conflict between homebuilders and unions. Opponents publically argued that the measure would increase housing prices and litigation by eliminating the mediation period, while proponents publicly took the stance that the measure would provide much needed protections by guaranteeing a 10-year warranty on all new homes and increasing transparency in the home selling process.

## The Ballot Measure: Proposition 201 (2008)

Proposition 201 (2008) was primarily the result of a conflict between homebuilders and unions. Neither the Democratic nor Republican party on the local, state, or national levels took an official stance on the measure. Furthermore, Republican Arizona state senator Barbara Leff was the only politician to take a public position – officially opposing the proposition. The measure was also opposed by libertarian and conservative online media sources (libertariansolution.com and sonorannews.com). Pro-business groups opposed the measure, while a pro-labor ideological group (Interfaith Worker Justice of Arizona) and a social justice group (Arizona Alliance for Retired Americans) supported the proposition. The proposition was primarily opposed by homebuilders and their associations and supported by unions and pro-labor associations involved in homebuilding. In terms of media coverage, the measure was officially opposed by the Arizona Daily Star, a newspaper that serves southern Arizona and has been owned by a media conglomerate since 2005.

In total, Proposition 201 (2008) opponents raised \$3,498,487<sup>5</sup>. While accounts vary on how much supporters raised, it was no more than \$1.6 million<sup>6</sup>. As expected, this translated into very unequal campaign expenditures. For example, the largest opponent of the measure ("Arizonans Against Lawsuit Abuse") filed over \$2.5 million in campaign expenditures, while the largest supporter of the measure filed \$946,384 in expenditures. Major supporting contributors included trade unions, law firms, and transportation unions. Donations from opponents came mostly from homebuilding companies and associations – as well as real estate companies.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> https://www.followthemoney.org/entity-details?eid=10246669

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> https://apps.azsos.gov/apps/election/cfs/search/BallotMeasureSearch.aspx

Below is the unofficial summary of the measure that proponents are required by law to submit with the petition measure, which I provided to participants before I interviewed them about their vote choice:

HOMEOWNERS' BILL OF RIGHTS. Ten-year warranty on new homes. Right to demand correction of construction defects or compensation. Homeowners participate in selecting contractors to do repair work. They can sue if no agreement with the builder. No liability for builders' attorney and expert fees but homeowner can recover these costs. Homeowners can sometimes recover compensatory and consequential damages. Disclosure of builders' relationships with financial institutions. Model homes must reflect what is actually for sale. Right to cancel within 100 days and get back most of the deposit. Prohibiting sellers' agents from participating in false mortgage applications.

On November 4, 2008 this ballot measure failed with 78% of the voters choosing to reject it. Conversely, a vast majority of my respondents (54/68) that reported a vote on the measure during the interview supported the proposition. The stark difference between my sample's reported vote choice and the electorate's vote choice – which is irrelevant to the qualitative analysis of these data – is most likely due to the fact that I gathered my data from 2013-2015 and that my sample was non-representative – largely because of my use of theoretically-driven recruitment criteria and different types of non-random sampling techniques.

I provided my respondents with a prompt because some time had passed since voting and there are many ballot measures each year, so to improve the quality of data and decrease non-response I provided a legitimation of the measure by proponents. A central element of this analysis is understanding how voters legitimate economic ballot measures, so providing a prompt that directly addressed the measure's legitimacy allowed me to elicit data on (de)legitimation of the measure in which voters either remembered or responded to legitimacy narratives concerning the measure. The point here is not to understand the true motives of respondents, but rather to understand processes of legitimation and the narratives from which they draw in their legitimation reasoning.

#### Overview of Analytic Approach

For this analysis there are four types of rationales. The first two were generated in the first round of deductive coding in order to correspond to the two descriptive categories I sampled on: economic position and partisan affiliation. I generated "iterations of self-interest" rationales to correspond with economic position and "iterations of partisan most sacred values" rationales to correspond with partisan affiliation (see Table 1). My initial round of coding generated inductive codes. Based on these inductive codes, I broadened my theoretical review and found two subsequent classes of theories that I thought would explain most of the inductive codes: "iterations of economic ideology" rationales and "iterations of market fairness" rationales. I then applied these codes in a second round of coding, which then revealed further empirical anomalies in this extended theoretical toolkit.

Within "iterations of economic ideologies", I incorporated literature and theory on libertarianism and neoliberalism, which then allowed me to generate deductive rationales for exclusively neoliberal and libertarian legitimations – respectively. Second, I drew upon the "moral economy" literature to generate "iterations of market fairness" rationales. Based on a synthesis of partisan voter reasoning theories and the literature on moral economy, I expected to see three fairness rationales: neoliberal market fairness beliefs, market fairness judgments paired with iterations of the

conservative most sacred value (Smart Code), and market fairness judgments paired with iterations of the liberal most sacred value (Smart Code) (see Figure 4).

## [Table 1 here]

## [Figure 4 here]

"Smart Codes" are formulas in ATLAS.ti that are generated with the "Query Tool" that allow an analyst to isolate all quotes that contain a given combination or absence of a set of codes.

## Generating First Round Level Two Thematic Codes ("Rationales")<sup>7</sup>

To begin, according to self-interest voting theories, economic position should correspond with economic policy incentives, which would then motivate actors to use different types of rationalizations. Sears and Funk (1991) demonstrate that actors vote for short-term self-interest when they perceive the stakes to be high and the issues to be clear. In 2008, when this measure was on the ballot, low-income homebuyers were facing rising levels of foreclosure and were particularly vulnerable to being targeted by subprime mortgage lenders (for a summary see Pattillo, 2013; Zavisca and Gerber, 2016). Furthermore, there is a well-documented diminishing supply of affordable housing for low-income buyers and increasing supply for the affluent (for summaries see Pattillo, 2013; Desmond and Bell, 2015). This dynamic was then amplified by the measure's opposition, which very publicly claimed that the proposition would raise housing prices. There were then relatively high stakes and clearly defined the issues that tied position on Proposition 203 (2008) to level of affluence. Given this background, we would expect low-income voters to legitimate their opposition to the measure by appealing to the potential for increased in housing prices and high-income respondents to legitimate their support for the measure by appealing to the potential for it to boost the value of their home .

I used the "self-interest" voting literature to code any rationale in which a respondent claimed to be voting to benefit himself materially as "self-interested". Drawing upon findings on economic incentives for homebuyers and well as American housing market conditions, I coded for two short-term self-interested rationales: "Lower/Preserve Housing Prices" and "Increase Home Price". I expect low-income voters to use the "Lower/Preserve Housing Prices" rationale to justify "No" votes and high-income voters to use the "Increase Home Prices" rationale to justify "Yes" votes. I coded for the "Lower/Preserve Housing Prices" rationale to justify "ges" votes. I coded for the "Lower/Preserve Housing Prices" rationale to justify reported voting to lower or maintain housing prices for their own material gain. I coded for "Increase Home Price" when respondents claimed that they voted in order to benefit materially by supporting a measure that they perceived would increase the value or price of the home that they currently owned.

According to partisan voting theories, voters should provide partisan rationalizations for their policy positions. In terms of partisan reasoning, Haidt (2012) finds that liberals' "most sacred value [is] care for victims of oppression" (Haidt, 2012: 345), and more broadly protecting "the rights of certain vulnerable groups" (Haidt, 2012: 212), while conservatives' "most sacred value" is preserving "the institutions and traditions that sustain a moral community" (Haidt, 2012: 357). For government regulation, Haidt (2012) explains that "liberals are most concerned about the rights of certain

For a summary, see Table 2.

7

vulnerable groups...[while] conservatives, in contrast, hold more traditional idea of liberty as the right to be left alone, as they often resent liberal programs that use government to infringe on their liberties in order to protect the groups that liberals care about most" (Haidt, 2012: 212). In the domain of economic regulation, the conservative most sacred value overlaps with the libertarian exaltation of liberty (Iyer *et al.*, 2012: 15). Using the government to protect certain vulnerable groups by limiting some individual liberties would thereby undermine a "tradition" (liberty) that supports a "moral community". Thus, liberals should be concerned with using government regulation of homebuying to protect vulnerable groups, such as homebuyers, who are often unable to check the quality of all aspects of their prospective home thoroughly. Conversely, conservatives should be concerned with protecting the liberty of those involved in the homebuying transaction.

Based on the partisan literature and its intersection with government regulation and consumer protection, I selected two partisan most sacred value rationales for liberals and two partisan most sacred value rationales for conservatives. I begin with these most sacred value rationales based on my initial literature review. Republicans should use at least one conservative rationale to justify "No" votes and Democrats should use at least one liberal rationale to justify "Yes" votes. The primary liberal most sacred value is "protecting the vulnerable", which should manifest itself as a concern for protecting consumers in general, as well as homebuyers/owners, from being taken advantage of or from material loss. I coded for "Consumers in General" when respondents reported voting to protect all consumers from being taken advantage of or from material loss. I coded for "Homebuyers/Owners" when respondents reported voting in order to protect homebuyers or homeowners from being taken advantage of or from material loss. The primary conservative most sacred value is to preserve the "traditions and institutions" that maintain a "moral community". In the case of consumer protection regulation, this should manifest itself as a concern for protecting the tradition of individual economic liberty, especially for home sellers and homebuyers. I coded for "Homeowners/Buyers' Liberty" when respondents reported voting to protect the "liberty" or "freedom" of those buying a home, or those who own a home, from government interference. I coded for "Home Sellers' Liberty" when respondents reported voting to protect the "liberty" or "freedom" of those selling homes from government interference. This use of liberty overlaps with the libertarian most sacred value, and in this context reasoning using a belief in economic liberty is indistinguishable from libertarianism.

#### [Table 2 here]

Finally, the libertarian narrative sees government economic regulation as wasteful due to government inefficiency, which stems from the libertarian most sacred value of individual liberty.

I used the "self-interest" voting literature to code any rationale in which a respondent claimed to be voting to benefit himself materially as "self-interested". Drawing upon findings on economic incentives for homebuyers and well as American housing market conditions, I coded for two short-term self-interested rationales: "Lower/Preserve Housing Prices" and "Increase Home Price". I expect low-income voters to use the "Lower/Preserve Housing Prices" rationale to justify "No" votes and high-income voters to use the "Increase Home Price" rationale to justify "Yes" votes. I coded for the "Lower/Preserve Housing Prices" rationale to justify reported voting to lower or maintain housing prices for their own material gain. I coded for "Increase Home Price" when respondents claimed that they voted in order to benefit materially by supporting a measure that they perceived would increase the value or price of the home that they currently owned.

Additionally, two inductive self-interested rationales emerged: "Help Respondent's Business" and "Protect Investment". Given that high-income respondents are more likely to own homes and businesses, I expect high-income respondents to use both of these rationales. I coded for "Help

Respondent's Business" respondents claimed to be voting to benefit themselves materially by protecting their business or increasing their customer base. I coded for the "Protect Investment" rationale when respondents reported voting for their material gain by attempting to protect their investment in or value of their current home, or the home that they hoped they would be able to purchase in the future.

### **First Round Coding: Empirical Analysis**

To understand this coding process further, I discuss how I coded the liberal first round level two thematic codes. Zachary, a low-income Democrat, was attempting to protect homebuyers/owners and the elderly in conjunction trying to promote market fairness. Zachary began by evaluating the measure using the lens of promoting fair market practices. "Well, I think it would stop shoddy practices... and make sure people do their job correctly". He continued: "I don't like when people get away with doing shitty work. People should take pride in their work and if I'm going to hire somebody to build my house they better well build it right". In these quotes, Zachary judged the measure as regulating unfair market practices because it would "stop shoddy practices" and ensure that homebuilder "do their job correctly". He displayed his distaste for unfair building practices, or "shitty work", by insisting that construction companies build houses "right" and "take pride in their work". In this way, he judged subpar workmanship as an unfair market practice and concluded that the measure would be fair because its implementation would decrease these unfair practices. This emphasis on market fairness was not theorized by the American partisan rationalization literature. Thus, this indicated the need for an inductive code for a "market fairness judgment". My observation of the use of these market fairness judgments across economic position led me to recode these fairness judgments using deductive codes that I derived from the "moral economy" literature.

Zachary continued his legitimation by explaining that he was attempting to help homebuyers so that they would not have "to pay out of their own pocket if something bad happened to their house after that three year you know period". Here, the "three-year period" refers to a standard housing industry warranty length. In this line of reasoning, the respondent would seemed to see homebuyers as economically vulnerable and thus deserving of extended protection for their new homes. This quote corresponded to the first round deductive code for liberals. However, the respondent this application of the liberal "most sacred value" into a fairness judgment by stating that "people shouldn't be screwed for things they have no control over". Thus, homebuyers were economically vulnerable because they, in the eyes of respondents, did not have control over the quality of their home.

Zachary then concluded by insisting that "I just don't like to see people get screwed over. There's a lot of predatory people out there and they will take advantage when they can... especially here in Tucson, there's a lot of older folks... [who] people take advantage of... [because] maybe their minds aren't completely right". Here, we see the respondent designate the elderly as a vulnerable group specifically mentioning the tenuous mental state of many elderly homebuyers. The respondent's reported goal was then to ensure market fairness by stopping the "shitty work" of "predatory people" who "take advantage" of consumers who were vulnerable because they "have no control" over the quality of their home or are experiencing a marked decline in their mental faculties. This appeal to the protection of the elderly, which was shared by multiple respondents, constituted an application of the liberal most sacred value that is not discussed in the partisan rationalization literature and is largely overlooked in the housing market literature. Thus, the respondent's discussion of protecting the elderly prompted me to create an inductive code for liberal rationalization that contributed to the partisan legitimation literature. In my subsequent literature review, I used this finding on the fusion of partisan values with fairness judgments to build on the "moral economy"

literature – which does not theorize about partisan norms of market fairness. Thus, this finding constituted an empirical anomaly – and thus extension – of both theories of partisan reasoning and the "moral economy" literature. We can see another example in Shannon, a high-income Democrat. This respondent explicitly claiming to be motivated by a desire to protect homebuyers from material loss caused by homebuilders:

"This was protection from shoddy building, you know? There were communities being put up overnight. 200 unit communities, developments being put up overnight with shoddy building. And so this protects people. When they buy a home they're investing their life saving in something, so I wanted them to be protected...[this was] pushing for was the rights of people buying a home in one of these new developments".

In this line of reasoning, homebuyers were clearly seen as a vulnerable group that needed protection provided by government regulation. Shannon then explained that he was particularly concerned for "middleclass families buying their first home. People starting out. You know, when you're buying your first home, you're starting out in your career, you may be starting your family... People who have a lot to lose if that big investment goes sour". For Shannon, middleclass families - especially those buying their first home – were particularly at risk because of their fragile financial situation, in which respondent often assumed that these buyers were "starting out in your career, you may be starting your family". Shannon used the belief that consumers who faced certain life-course changes were economically vulnerable to justify voting for government regulation to protect them from material loss. He then transitioned back to a judgment of market fairness, explaining that his vote was motivated by a desire to see "fairness and transparency" in the housing market - which would then protect the vulnerable groups for which he was voting. Shannon then elaborated: "That's the reason we have regulations, you have to do it in a fair way. You can't be selling people a \$200,000 thing that's a lemon. That's \$200,000, they've taken out a mortgage, they're signing away their future financial life. And if you're selling them a lemon, that's not good". Thus, for Shannon, market fairness stemmed from regulations that protected vulnerable groups of consumers that were being taken advantage of in the housing market.

Many Republican respondents used the conservative rationales of "Homeowners/Buyers' Liberty" and "Home Sellers' Liberty". Bert, a high-income Republican, estimated that he would have voted "No" because he saw this measure as "overregulation by the state. Let homeowners and homebuilders decide what they work out and we have sufficient remedies in law right now if there are latent defects on things and stuff like that". Notice that this was not an instance of neoliberal individualization of responsibility and/or risk because the respondent claimed that there was already "sufficient remedies in law" to protect homeowners if there were any "latent" or unforeseen "defects". Instead, many such respondents insisted that the state "let homeowners and homebuilders work decide what they work out". Preventing this freedom of economic choice for both the buyer and the seller represented an overreach by the government that violated both of the parties' liberty (Haidt 2012: 212-213). For Bert, the responsibility was not fully on the homebuyer because there were already sufficient legal protections for defects that could not be observed by the buyer in the purchasing process. However, according Bert, it was crucial for the buyer and seller to have to freedom to negotiate a deal without the interference of the government beyond the established formal framework of protections.

Owen, another high-income Republican, used a neoliberal iteration of this line of reasoning, which took the form of the respondent's claim that "I don't want the government involved in business... If a builder wants to provide a warranty or not, that's up to the buyer and the seller to make those decisions. You know, you can buy a home warranty, and if I was buying a brand new house and the guy didn't offer a warranty, I wouldn't buy the house. It's real simple". In this line of reasoning,

Owen seemed to be attempting to protect the liberty of buyers and sellers. Central to this thought process was the belief that responsibility and risk of homeownership laid solely with the individual homebuyer. Notice that the respondent did not mention any potential "latent" defects or acknowledge "predatory" building practices by homebuilders that take advantage of information asymmetry. Instead, any protection or guarantees that the buyer may procure from the seller must be negotiated in the purchasing process without the interference of the government. For Owen, the central value was liberty for both the buyer and seller, or keeping "the government [from being] involved in business". This passage then reaffirmed both of my expected first round deductive rationales for the conservative most sacred value.

Owen concluded by reaffirming his commitment to protecting liberty. "My values are, you know, I think the government needs to stay out of people's personal business... 'Laissez-faire' ". He then reiterated the role of individual responsibility of the buyer and the subsequent risk that this entailed. "If there's a problem with a house, then you know, you need to pick a builder that builds good houses, and that's built by reputation. People vote with their dollars instead of having the government tell you or protect you from yourself". Responsibility and risk for homeownership, then, laid solely with the homebuyer and were the cornerstones of protecting liberty for buyers and sellers. Here, the respondent's emphasis on individualized risk and responsibility for homeownership prompted me to create an inductive code – as this theme extended beyond the conservative most sacred value. In my round two literature review, I discovered that this theme is distinctive of neoliberal ideology. I then created deductive codes for neoliberalism and then used one such code to reclassify this round one inductive code. I then used this finding to supplement the partisan legitimation literature by demonstrating how respondents can simultaneously use neoliberal and conservative rationales.

### Inductive Codes That Expand Theories Used in the First Round of Coding<sup>8</sup>

First, two inductive self-interested rationales emerged from the initial round of coding: "Help Respondent's Business" and "Protect Investment". I coded for "Help Respondent's Business" respondents claimed to be voting to benefit themselves materially by protecting their business or increasing their customer base. I coded for the "Protect Investment" rationale when respondents reported voting for their material gain by attempting to protect their investment in or value of their current home, or the home that they hoped they would be able to purchase in the future. These codes expand the literature on self-interested rationalization on housing policy, which to my knowledge does not discuss voters as using either of these themes in self-interested housing policy position rationalization. However, they are not anomalous to the broader theme of self-interested policy rationalization, as both codes appeal to respondents' material interests.

Furthermore, four inductive rationales emerged for liberals. As with the inductive self-interest codes, these liberal rationales apply a core theoretical theme – in this instance a given ideological "most sacred value" – in ways that were not predicted by the partisan rationalization literature. I coded for "First Time Homebuyers" when respondents specified that first time homebuyers were particularly vulnerable in the homebuying process, so the respondent was voting to protect these buyers from being taken advantage of or from material loss. I coded for "Middleclass" when respondents reported voting in order to protect middleclass homebuyers from being taken advantage of or from material loss. I coded for "Working Class" when respondents reported voting in order to protect working class or low-income homebuyers from being taken advantage of or from material loss. Finally, I coded for "Elderly" when respondents reported voting to protect elderly homebuyers

For a summary, see Table 3.

8

from being taken advantage of or from material loss. These themes are not theorized by the partisan rationalization literature – and thus expand this literature empirically – but fall within the purview of this literature as they are applications of the liberal "most sacred value".

## Second Round: Literature Review and Deductive Code Generation<sup>9</sup>

To explain a variety of inductive codes from the first round of coding that referred to economic ideologies, I turned to the literature on libertarianism and neoliberalism - respectively. First, an important perspective worth considering is discussed by Dwyer and Lassus (2015), who find that in the American housing market there has been an increasing shift of risk - and by extension, responsibility – for home ownership onto individual consumers. We can make sense of this by referring to common ideological themes in neoliberalism. Created by French intellectual Louis Rougier (1938), a major theme in "neoliberalism" that is shared by many – but not all – neoliberals is the extension of social Darwinism in order to prioritize "fair" individual competition (par exemple Foucault, 2004; Amable, 2011). It is important to note that some have argued that such a portrayal is a gross oversimplification of key neoliberal thinkers – such as Friedrich von Hayek (Leroux, 1997). The point of my summary of neoliberal ideological themes is not to enter into these important and nuanced debates, but rather to summarize ideological commonalities between most neoliberal intellectuals that eventually came to characterize a good deal of neoliberal policy. It is important to note, then, that neoliberal rationales provide evidence of neoliberal ideology rather than neoliberal theories<sup>10</sup>. With that said, most neoliberals see state intervention that "reregulates" markets in order to foster fair individual competition as necessary, the aim of such intervention is to shift risk, achievement, and responsibility away from groups, institutions, and collective processes onto individuals (par exemple Shamir, 2008; Wacquant, 2009; Amable, 2011; Reich, 2014). In this light, we can see the "Great Risk Shift" (Hacker, 2006), or the general transfer of risk and responsibility for market action onto individuals, as an application of neoliberalism. In the housing market this manifests itself as a shift of risk and responsibility for homeownership onto individual consumers (Dwyer and Lassus, 2015). As applied to consumer protection regulation, we can expect a neoliberal opposition in the form of an emphasis on maintaining the fairness of market competition and placing responsibility for homebuying onto individual buyers. Scholars argue that neoliberalism permeates American culture and spans affluence and partisan affiliation (Amable, 2011; Centeno and Cohen, 2012), so we would expect to see a neoliberal consensus about market fairness, or moral economy, across economic position and partisan affiliation.

There are two typical neoliberal ideological beliefs that apply to this measure: fair competition and individual responsibility. I created a code for each of these beliefs as they manifested in corresponding rationales. First, given the focus on the individualization of risk and responsibility in the literature on housing, I coded for "Individualized Responsibility/Risk" (Dwyer and Lassus, 2015). This housing literature does not link individualized risk to judgments of market fairness, so I coded for individualized risk without coding for fairness. I coded for "Individualized Responsibility/Risk" whenever the respondent reported that his vote was motivated by his perception that responsibility for buying a quality home, and/or the economic risk that comes with homeownership, lies solely with the individual consumer. There is undoubtedly much overlap with the conservative/libertarian rationale of "Homeowner/Buyer's Liberty", as liberty often implies individual responsibility and risk

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> For a summary, see Table 4.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> This approach is similar to the perspective developed by Michael Freeden (1996).

for the consumer in the homebuying process. However, I did not code for "Individualized Responsibility/Risk" unless the respondent clearly reported a motive of individualizing responsibility and/or risk. Furthermore, I coded for "Individualized Responsibility/Risk", and not "Homeowner/Buyer's Liberty", when the respondent focused on the consumer's responsibility and assumption of risk for the quality of the home after it was purchased, rather than on the consumer's responsibility during the act of homebuying. Second, I coded "Neoliberal Fair Market Competition" when a respondent reported that he was voting "No" because he judged that government regulation would impede fair market competition.

Furthermore, a key libertarian ideological perspective is that government economic regulation as wasteful due to government inefficiency, which stems from the libertarian most sacred value of individual liberty (Iyer *et al.*, 2012). This characteristic of libertarianism is distinct from the conservative most sacred value because of its relationship to morality. For conservatives, economic liberty is moral because it is a tradition that sustains a moral community. For libertarians, liberty is a moral goal in and of itself, and thus government regulation is fundamentally inferior because of its interference in individual freedom. In the context of economic liberty, government inferiority takes the form of "inefficiency" for libertarians. Given this belief about government regulation I expect libertarian reasoning to correspond with "No" votes.

Because government inefficiency is a distinctly – but not uniquely – libertarian belief, I coded for the libertarian rationale "Government Inefficiency" when respondents reported that their vote was motivated by a belief that government spending or operation could not improve its efficiency or was fundamentally inefficient. While libertarians do not have a monopoly on this argument, it nonetheless constitutes an iteration of their "most sacred value". Although this critique can be used in politically motivated ways by partisans to criticize governments controlled by opposing parties, libertarians use it to characterize government regardless of partisan control.

Furthermore, self-interest and partisan voting theories do not theorize how the intersection of economic position and partisan affiliation structure voter legitimation. In order to fill this gap, I turn to the moral economy literature. A moral economy is a popular consensus about the rules of market fairness (par exemple Thompson, 1971; Western and Rosenfeld, 2011; Kissane, 2012; Sachweh, 2012). Moral economy stands in opposition to exclusively rational choice models of action and instead argues that agents across levels of affluence use shared beliefs about fairness to evaluate market action (Svallfors, 2006; Sachweh, 2012). Applied to consumer protection, moral economy would suggest that voters should draw upon their party's moral narrative to make judgments about the fairness of market regulation, which I call "partisan market fairness".

Haidt (2012) finds that the conception of "fairness" as "proportionality", or people getting "what they deserve", spans partisanship (Haidt, 2012: 212-213). However, partisan values shape how and when proportionality is applied. For example, liberals use proportionality in the defense of vulnerable groups while conservatives tend to use proportionality regardless of group vulnerability (Haidt, 2012). Applied to moral economy, we would expect that across economic position Democrats would vote "Yes" by making fairness judgments in conjunction with a concern for protecting vulnerable groups, in this case homebuyers. Conversely, Republicans should vote "No" across economic position by making fairness judgments in conjunction with a concern for protecting everyone's liberty in the homebuying transaction. The prevalence of partisan fairness across economic position would then constitute a consensus.

I operationalized "moral economy" as the use of a criterion for evaluating market fairness across a major social division in my data (Svallfors, 2006; Western and Rosenfeld, 2011; Sachweh, 2012; Kissane, 2012). Furthermore, I extend the moral economy literature by using first round inductive codes to theorize the existence of political ideological moral economies. I operationalized two different partisan iterations as combinations of different rationales. The first, "liberal market fairness", occurred when respondents used at least one liberal rationale, made an explicit judgment of market fairness, and did not reference the "Neoliberal Fair Market Competition" and/or conservative rationales. The second, "conservative market fairness", occurred when respondents used at least one conservative rationale, made an explicit judgment of market fairness, and did not reference the "Neoliberal Fair Market Competition" and/or liberal rationales. I coded for "Neoliberal Fair Market Competition" even when used in conjunction with liberal and/or conservative rationales because according to the literature, neoliberalism is bipartisan (par exemple Amable, 2011; Centeno and Cohen, 2012). I coded for a "market fairness judgment" when respondents provided an explicit evaluation of the fairness of the regulations proposed by Proposition 201 (2008), either by directly judging the regulations as fair/unfair or by justifying their vote by appealing to the fairness of market fairness judgment" when respondents used words that explicitly expressed judgment about the fairness of market action that would be regulated, such as "fair", "unfair", "right", "wrong", "ripped off", "scammed", "cheated", "accountable", "honest", "dishonest", "transparent", or "level playing field".

Base on my own theorization of the synthesis of partisan reasoning theories and moral economy, I expected to find three different moral economies: liberal, conservative, and neoliberal. There is evidence of a "liberal moral economy" when Democratic respondents across economic position use "liberal market fairness" in defense of a "Yes" vote and do not also use a conservative and/or neoliberal rationale. There is evidence of a "conservative moral economy" when Republican respondents across economic position use "conservative market fairness" in defense of a "No" vote and do not also use a liberal and/or neoliberal rationale. Finally, there is evidence of a "neoliberal moral economy" when respondents across economic position and partisan affiliation use the "Neoliberal Fair Market Competition" to justify a "No" vote. Any evidence of a political ideological moral economy would be not only an extension of partisan rationalization theories, but also theories of moral economy.

#### Theory Building After the Second Round of Coding

I primarily engaged in theory building by using the "moral economy" framework. In my data, I found an emphasis on "fairness" that my original theoretical framework did not theorize. Thus, I began to code respondent legitimations using the concept of "fairness". By discovering the "moral economy" framework, I was able to classify some of my fairness codes as "fair market competition" and then look for a consensus in the use of a "fair market competition" rationale across my respondents. However, the moral economy literature does not theorize political ideological moral economies. As I had theorized based on my second round of literature reviews, there was evidence of a consensus of market fairness among "Yes" voters concerning market fairness judgments - and thus evidence of "liberal" moral economy. We see this in respondents' readiness to pair liberal rationales with market fairness judgments while excluding conservative, libertarian, or neoliberal rationales (Smart Code). This process of legitimation was prevalent in my data across partisan affiliation and economic position. While there has been work on moral economy and the welfare state, there has not yet been work on political ideology serving as the foundation for a moral economy. However, respondents consistently paired fairness evaluations with most sacred value rationales. After using the moral economy framework for some time in my analysis, I realized that I needed to create a set of "Smart Codes" that combined most sacred value rationales with market fairness rationales. It was through my creation of political ideological moral economies - like the one discussed above - that my second literature review did not explain anomalous cases in my data. Thus, by creating "Smart Codes" for

political ideological moral economies I was able to use my analytic process to theory build – both in the domains of moral economy and in partisan reasoning. These findings suggests a model of voter reasoning in which actors cross partisan divisions in their legitimation by combining issue-specific applications of partisan values with market fairness judgments. However, I only found evidence of such a process for liberal most sacred values and not for conservative most sacred values. Similarly, there was no evidence of a neoliberal moral economy.

Concerning the neoliberal rationale of individual responsibility, I found cases in which respondents paired it with conservative and liberal most sacred value rationales – respectively. My findings then provide evidence of a relative consensus across partisan affiliation for the use of the individualized responsibility/risk rationale for "No" voters. This reaffirms literature that suggests that neoliberalism is used across partisan affiliation (Amable, 2011; Centeno and Cohen, 2012) and is empirically anomalous for perspectives that theorize that neoliberalism is used almost exclusively by Republicans in American politics (par exemple Garland, 2001; Gauchat, 2015).

#### Conclusion

This article provides a framework for applying the principle of "Reconstruction" from Michael Burawoy's "Extended Case Method" (ECM) in the form of "rationales" to semi-structured interview data using ATLAS.ti. To do so I provided a theoretical framework for understanding the principle of "Reconstruction" – as well as why it was appropriate to use in the coding and analysis of semi-structured interview data on reasoning. This approach has two significant advantages. First, it provides an additional strategy for using semi-structured interview data to engage in theory building. This helps to address potential critiques about the "generalizability" or relevance of semi-structured interviews by linking its application analytically to a well-established technique for empirical contribution used for ethnographic data. I argue that like ethnographic data, semi-structured interview are reflexive in nature, and can analogously be used to "reconstruct" theory. Second, this approach has helped me to develop a systematic and concrete set of procedures for operationalizing broader themes as "rationales" that can be empirically identified in respondent reasoning. This process balances deductive and inductive coding approaches in its application of tools from ATLAS.ti for qualitative analysis and theory building.

Here we can see different philosophical approaches to the generation on theory. While grounded theory is fundamentally inductive, ECM – and my specific application of this method – advances a deductive project of theory building through the process of "reconstruction". As applied in my approach, reconstruction starts with a preliminary phase of inductive coding that then leads to an abductive literature review that draws upon anomalous or unexpected findings that have been inductively coded to then search for additional theoretical or empirical explanations. Regardless of whether or not additional theoretical explanations are found in the subsequent literature review, the goal is to build upon an initial set of theories used to generate the research question in response to a theoretical or empirical puzzle. Thus, this approach seeks to engage in a dialogue between deductive, inductive, and abductive reasoning in the process of theory building as a strategy for using semi-structured interview data to contribute to science.

There are some important limitations to this technique. First, it was specifically designed for use with semi-structured interview data on voter reasoning about ballot measure vote choice. Second, it has only been applied with the ATLAS.ti CAQDAS. However, there is no reason to believe that analogous technical procedures cannot be found to make this approach useful with other types of CAQDAS. Furthermore, the approach of generating "rationales" in order to theory build appears to be applicable to a broader range on analysis that seek to identify issue-specific empirical

manifestations of broader themes in qualitative data. This analytic approach and its use of CAQDAS mixes epistemologies. For those who are wedded exclusively to one epistemological perspective, this mixing of epistemologies may be seen as a fundamental limitation or flaw. My hope is that this article will be useful for future researchers across a broad range of qualitative analyses and continue to help scholars mobilize a variety of epistemological perspectives to make scientific contributions.

## Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Jeff Sallaz, Jane Zavisca, Corey Abramson, Lane Kenworthy, Albert Bergesen, Terrence Hill, and Taylor Danielson. A special thanks to Thibaut Rioufreyt, anonymous reviewers, and the editorial board of the *Bulletin of Sociological Methodology* for their incredibly insightful reviews of previous versions of this article. I would also like to thank Gina Walsh, Eleanor Stilson, Colleen Pignato, Rochelle Cox, Sherry Bao, Christine Scolinos, and Adrian Barbachan for their contributions. I would like to acknowledge B. Torres-Traylor for her contributions. Finally, I thank the QUALIDEM research team for helping me to refine my qualitative research skillset through our collaboration on qualitative secondary analysis.

## **Declaration of Conflicting Interests**

The Author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

## Funding

This research was supported by the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No 716208).

This research was made possible in part by a grant from the University of Arizona Graduate and Professional Student Council. Award Reference Number RSRCH-505FY'15.

## References

- Amable B (2011) Morals and Politics in the Ideology of Neo-Liberalism. *Socio-Economic Review* 9(1): 3-30.
- Bandeira-De-Mello R and Garreau L (2011) L'utilisation d'ATLAS.ti pour améliorer les recherches dans le cadre de la Méthode de la Théorisation Enracinée (MTE) : panacée ou mirage? *Recherches Qualitatives* 30(2): 175-202.
- Barnard AV (2016) Making the City "Second Nature": Freegan "Dumpster Divers" and the Materiality of Morality. *American Journal of Sociology* 121(4): 1017–1050.
- Bernard HR and Ryan GW (2010) Analyzing Qualitative Data: Systematic Approaches. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Boltanski L and Thévenot L (2006) On Justification: Economies of Worth. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Burawoy M (1998) The Extended Case Method. Sociological Theory 16 (1): 4-33.
- Burawoy M (2009) The Extended Case Method: Four Countries, Four Decades, Four Great Transformations, and One Theoretical Tradition. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Centeno MA and Cohen JN (2012) The Arc of Neoliberalism. *Annual Review of Sociology* 38: 317–340.

- Desmond M and Bell M (2015) Housing, Poverty, and the Law. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 11: 15-36.
- Dwyer RE and Lassus LAP (2015) The Great Risk Shift and Precarity in the U.S. Housing Market. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 660: 199-216.
- Foucault M (2004) *Naissance de la biopolitique : Cours au Collège de France, 1978–1979.* Paris : Seuil/Gallimard.
- Freeden M (1996) Ideologies and Political Theory. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Garland D (2001) *The Culture of Control: Crime and Social Order in Contemporary Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gauchat G (2015) The Political Context of Science in the United States: Public Acceptance of Evidence-Based Policy and Science Funding. *Social Forces* 94(2): 723–46.
- Hacker JS (2006) The Great Risk Shift: The Assault on American Jobs, Families, Healthcare, and Retirement and How You Can Fight Back. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Haidt J (2012) *The Righteous Mind : Why Good People Are Divided by Politics and Religion*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Iyer R, Koleva S, Graham J, Ditto P and Haidt J (2012) Understanding Libertarian Morality: The Psychological Dispositions of Self-Identified Libertarians. *PloS One* 7(8): e42366.
- Kissane RJ (2012) Poor Women's Moral Economies of Nonprofit Social Service Use: Conspicuous Constraint and Empowerment in the Hollow State. *Sociological Perspectives* 55(1): 189–211.
- Leroux A (1997) L'évolutionnisme de Friedrich Hayek. (1997) Une Double Controverse Révélatrice d'une Double Illusion. *Revue économique* 48(3): 751-760.
- Pattillo M (2013) Housing: Commodity versus Right. Annual Review of Sociology 39: 509-531.
- Reich JA (2014) Neoliberal Mothering and Vaccine Refusal: Imagined Gated Communities and the Privilege of Choice. *Gender & Society* 28(5): 679-704.
- Rice A (2008) Voters Face Controversial Ballot Proposals Affecting Builders in Arizona, Georgia. Retrieved August 7, 2017 (http://www.builderonline.com/building/regulation-policy/voters-face-controversial-ballot-proposals-affecting-builders-in-arizona-georgia\_o).
- Rougier L (1938) Les Mystiques Economiques; Comment L'on Passe Des Democraties Liberales Aux Etats Totalitaires. Paris: Librairie de Medicis.
- Sachweh P (2012) The Moral Economy of Inequality: Popular Views on Income Differentiation, Poverty and Wealth. *Socio-Economic Review* 10(3): 419–445.
- Sallaz JJ (2009) *The Labor of Luck: Casino Capitalism in the United States and South Africa*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Sears D and Funk CL (1991) The Role of Self-Interest in Social and Political Attitudes. Advances in Experimental Social Psychology 24: 1-91.
- Shamir R (2008) The Age of Responsibilization: On Market-Embedded Morality. *Economy and Society* 37(1): 1-19.
- Svallfors S (2006) *The Moral Economy of Class : Class and Attitudes in Comparative Perspective*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Tavory I and Timmermans S (2014) *Abductive Analysis: Theorizing Qualitative Research*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Thompson EP (1971) The Moral Economy of the English Crowd in the Eighteenth Century. *Past & Present* 50: 76–136.
- Timmermans S and Tavory I (September 01, 2012) Theory Construction in Qualitative Research: From Grounded Theory to Abductive Analysis. *Sociological Theory 30*(3): 167-186.
- Wacquant LJD (2009) *Punishing the Poor: The Neoliberal Government of Social Insecurity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

- Western B and Jake Rosenfeld. (2011) Unions, Norms, and the Rise in U.S. Wage Inequality. *American Sociological Review* 76(4): 513–37.
- Zavisca JR and Gerber TP (2016) The Socioeconomic, Demographic, and Political Effects of Housing in Comparative Perspective. *Annual Review of Sociology* 42: 347-367.



## **Descriptive codes**

## Figure 2. Level Two Thematic Codes Using ATLAS.ti "List Coding"



12 5 -	a 🗖 .	Ŧ							0	ocument		Prop 201 Dissertatio	
File	Home	Sea	arch Proje	ect	Analyze	Import	& Export	Tools & Support	Document	Tools	View		
(14 99)	$\sim$		<u>\$</u> =			$\diamond$		-2 25		I	ļ ,C	)	
reate Free	Open	Code In	List	Quick	Auto	Focus Group	Rename Delet	e Unlink Flip	Relation Comment	Word Wor	d Searc	:h	
Quotation	Coding	Vivo	Coding	Coding	Coding	Coding		Link		Cloud List	Docum	ient	
			Coding			_	Quotation	Mar	gin Entities	Explore	& Analyze		
Explore	- 201 Dia			Query T	ool	Documer	it Manager	D 1: UTD 1	#1 Prop 201 Jack.do	cx + ×			
	Documen	ts (68)	U	TD 1 #1	Prop 201	Jack							
> <>	Codes (36	)	s							$\times$ right to	demand	correction of con	
	Memos (0)		it	_				- II		fees, bu	fees, but homeowner can recover		
	Networks	(0)		Open Coding				ly for sa	and mortgage applications. (47)				
× [[]	Code Gro	ups (0)	oups (6)			•	Enter your code names. Press down arrow (1) for next entry				und mortgage appreciations. (17.		
(C)	Memo Gr	oups (0)					next entry.						
$\langle \! \bigcirc \! $	Network (	Groups (0							×	yey or	ney on it	, I would say, ye	
			L						×				
			S							you kno	w, one o	f the shows we re	
			a							is. She t	old me a	nd I don't know	
			т										
										the rue	r it shoul	d ha Whan you?	
			u							the way	y it shoul	id be. when you	
			т										
			\$										
			т				Create			02)			
			L							03)			
			D D	eople ar	re shellir	ig out that ki	nd of money	for a home, the	ev deserve to get s	some sort of	guarante	e that they're not	
			T	· Veah	um so i	vhat do vou	feel is a risk f	rom something	tike this passing	.2	0	,	
				. The e	ulli, 50 -	land in that a		n la that mant t	a da husinaan mu			an an attack liter she	
			S	ee a risk	tiny fisk i t. a nega	tive risk. I g	iess.	pie mai wani i	o do busiliess, wa		y busine:	ss of stuff like the	
		I : Um so for which groups do you think society do y						ciety do you t	hink benefit from	this passing	2		
		2. Chi so for which groups do you think solvery, do you think benefit ho							w not just the pa	and that have the homes new but when			
			history of that has been. Any defects they'll know, and if it was corrected be							ecause we h	cause we have that warranty you can		
	L: Ok. So, who loses? Who is negatively affected?												
			s	(Laug	h) Like I	ssaid neon	e who do sha	ty business, ar	nd um.				
			т	Right	., 2			.,					
			<b></b>	. Augut.									

## Figure 3. Inductive Coding Using ATLAS.ti "Open Coding"

## Figure 4. Constructing Smart Codes Using ATLAS.ti's "Query Tool"

🔕 🖆 뉴 • 려 🗖 • 후 Prop 2	Prop 201 Dissertation Coding Third Empirical Chapter - ATLAS.ti					Query Tool			- [	X
File Home Search Project	Analyze	Import & Ex	port To	ols & Support		Query Tool Sc	ope Tool			\$
Save Smart Code	oerator • OR AND	D ONE NOT OF	Up Down Siblings	Co-Occurs	With Enclo Over	in Coverlapped oses Follows laps Precedes	By Rotate Refresh Layout	Fit Content	Report	
Save As Smart Code		perators	Semantic O	Pro	oximi	ty Operators	View		Output	
Create a new smart code from the query. T	his code can be	📄 D 1: l	JTD 1 #1 Prop	201 Jack.docx		🛆 Code Manager	🔎 Query Tool	* ×		
used like any other code (in networks, que	ries, etc.), only it				P	Scope: Entire Project	t			
cannot be manually linked to quotations.						Term: Liberal most sacred value: consumers in general & Market fairnes				
Memos (0)						Liberal most s	acred value: consume	r	♦ Market	fairness: iudo
Networks (0)										
Document Groups (6)						$\downarrow$ $\downarrow$				
Code Groups (0)					(O)					
Network Groups (0)							$\bigcirc$			
Sean	ch Codes				Q					
Code	es									
	Liberal mo:									
					Search Quotations					
					ID 🔺 Name					
00					🗐 1:1 UTD 1 #	1 Prop 201 Jack S: So	, the Home	eowners Bill	of Rights, th	
00					9:1 UTD 26	#55 Prop 201 Samuel	L: Great.	So now to t	the ballot me	
Term Quotations 11 Scope Quotations 0							14 D 204 D 14	- 41 F		

Table 1. First Round Coding (Thematic Coding)

Level One Thematic Code	Self-Interest	Partisan Most Sacred		
		Values		
Level Two Thematic Codes or	Self-Interest Rationales	Partisan Most Sacred Value		
Smart Code Formula		Rationales		

# Table 2. Proposition 201 (2008): First Round Level Two Thematic Codes ("Rationales") for Deductive Coding

	Expected Corresponding First Round Level Two				
Descriptive Code	Thematic Deductive Code/Rationale				
Low-Income	"Lower/Preserve Housing Prices"				
High Income	"Increase Home Price"				
Liberal	"First Time Homebuyers"				
Liberal	"Consumers in General"				
Conservative	Homeowners/Buyers' Liberty				
Conservative	Home Sellers' Liberty				

## Table 3. Inductive Codes That Expand Theories Used in the First Round of Coding

Descriptive Code	
	Inductive Code
High-Income	
and	
Low Income	"Protect Investment"
High Income	"Help Respondent's Business"
Liberal	"Working Class"
Liberal	"Middle Class"
Liberal	"Elderly"
Liberal	"First Time Homebuyers"

# Table 4. Expected Second Round Level Two Thematic Codes and Smart Codes for Deductive Analysis

Rationale		Observed
Туре	Code or Smart Code	
Economic		Yes
Ideologies	"Neoliberalism: Individualized Responsibility/Risk"	
Economic		Yes
Ideologies	"Exclusively Libertarian: Government Inefficiency"	
Market		Yes
Fairness	"Market Fairness Judgment"	

	Liberal market fairness smart code: Liberal Rationale(s) AND Market	Yes
Market	Fairness Judgment AND NOT Neoliberal and Conservative	
Fairness	Rationales	
	Conservative market fairness smart code: Conservative Rationale(s)	No
	AND Market Fairness Judgment AND NOT Neoliberal and Liberal	
	Rationales	
Economic		No
Ideologies		
AND		
Market		
Fairness	"Neoliberalism: Fair market competition"	