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Description

The purpose of this course is to equip students to sensitively and critically design, carry out, report, read, and evaluate qualitative research projects. It is taught by a team of qualitative research experts, who regularly use the methods which they teach, making the course particularly practical and realistic. It covers the full cycle of a qualitative research project, from design, to data collection, analysis, reporting and disseminating.

The course is intended for postgraduates, academics or professionals with an interest in using qualitative methods to undertake social research. It assumes little or no knowledge of qualitative methods. There are no formal prerequisites.

The course covers the classic sources of qualitative data: interviews, focus groups, participant observation and documents. It also introduces recent developments in the use of visual and online data. Three widely-used data analysis methods are covered: thematic analysis, content analysis and discourse analysis. In addition, design issues including issues of establishing the quality of qualitative research, ethics, and disseminating are also addressed.

Course benefits

- A solid understanding of the core methods of qualitative data collection and analysis
- Critical skills in interpreting and evaluating reports of qualitative studies
- Experience in putting qualitative skills into practice

Teaching methods

The format of the course is a combination of lectures and seminars. Lectures are interactive and introduce the key conceptual issues of each method, as well as giving practical guidance. Lectures also incorporate critical discussion of sample papers from the peer-reviewed literature, developing students’ skills in critically evaluating reports of qualitative research. Seminars provide hands-on experience of the core methods, including training in the software package NVivo.
**Textbooks**

There is no one set text for this course. If you wish to purchase one text which has a good overview of the topics we will cover, we recommend:


It is available through the LSE library as an e-book.

For some more specific and in-depth discussions, the following reader contains extracts from many original key texts on various methods (quantitative and qualitative) and can help you to find key authors and debates.


**Assessment**

The course will be assessed by one 2h examination on the afternoon of Friday, 30 August 2013. Material up to and including Lecture 9 (Thursday, 29 August) may be included. The exam will comprise two essay style questions which apply your knowledge to specific examples. A mock exam paper will be provided in advance and a revision session will take place on Thursday 29 August.

**Readings**

Two essential readings are listed for each lecture from Day 2 onwards. These readings are available in the coursepacks. Please prepare for each lecture by reading the essential readings and being ready to discuss them during the lecture.

The other readings listed under each lecture are provided to give you a sense of key texts, contemporary debates and examples of the method under discussion. You are not expected to read these on a daily basis. Rather, the list is included for your reference once the course is complete.

**Moodle**

The course uses a Virtual Learning Environment called Moodle. This site will provide the lecture slides, quizzes and other supplementary materials. You will have access to this page for the period of the summer school and for some time after. If you want to keep the materials, you should download and save them before your access expires.
The Moodle page can be found at: https://shortcourses.lse.ac.uk/course/view.php?id=98

## Teaching Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Morning (Lecture)</strong></td>
<td>Qualitative research &amp; design</td>
<td>Documents &amp; archives</td>
<td>Participant observation</td>
<td>Interviewing</td>
<td>Focus groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Afternoon (Class)</strong></td>
<td>Quality indicators</td>
<td>Ethical Quandaries</td>
<td>Fieldnotes</td>
<td>Interview topic guides</td>
<td>Focus groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Morning (Lecture)</strong></td>
<td>Visual &amp; online data</td>
<td>Thematic analysis</td>
<td>Content analysis</td>
<td>Discourse analysis</td>
<td>Writing up qualitative research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Afternoon (Class)</strong></td>
<td>Introduction to NVIVO</td>
<td>Coding with NVIVO</td>
<td>Counting codes &amp; content analysis</td>
<td>Discourse analysis / revision</td>
<td>Exam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lecture Outlines

Lecture 1: Quality Indicators in Qualitative Research
Monday, 19 August 2013 (Dr Flora Cornish)

This lecture will introduce the course and its structure and will then explore one of the key issues in qualitative research, namely how to make judgements about its quality. While quantitative research has traditionally prioritized issues of validity and reliability, there has been significant debate within qualitative research as to whether these concepts are relevant or appropriate. The emphasis of the lecture will be on giving students the practical skills to evaluate what constitutes good quality qualitative research.

Introductory readings

Key texts

Contemporary debates
Lincoln, Y. and Denzin, N. ‘The seventh moment: Out of the past’ in in N K Denzin and Y S Lincoln (eds) Handbook of Qualitative Research, 2nd
Examples to be discussed in the seminar

(for today only, you are not expected to read the full text. Excerpts to be discussed in class are reproduced in this guide, in the seminars section).


Lecture 2: Research Ethics/Using Documents and Archives

Tuesday, 20 August 2013 (Dr Jen Tarr)

The first part of this session will introduce ethical issues in qualitative research. We will then move on to discussing documents as a primary source of qualitative data. Documents provide contemporary and historical perspectives on what is or has been written about a topic. They are critical to any historical work but are also central to research in fields such as law and politics. We will look at how to select and collect documents for qualitative research, and what kinds of research questions they can be used to answer. We will also introduce some key resources and examine the limitations of documentary and archival work.

Essential readings


Introductory readings


Key texts


Contemporary debates


Lecture 3: Participant Observation

Wednesday, 21 August 2013 (Dr Flora Cornish)

Participant observation is a method for the researcher to understand how a particular community or social setting ‘works’ – by both participating in the setting, and by observing how others participate in the setting. It is especially suited to uncovering the informal, often unarticulated social rules and patterns of our collective lives. Data are typically captured in
fieldnotes. This lecture will introduce key debates regarding the role of
the participant observer and introduce strategies for making observations
and writing fieldnotes.

**Essential readings**

the Prizefighting Economy, Theory and Society, 27(1), 1-42.

Moore, F. (2006). Strategy, power and negotiation: social control and
expatriate managers in a German multinational corporation. The

**Introductory readings**


human studies*. Sage.

**Key texts**

Clifford, J. and Marcus, G.E. (1986) *Writing Culture: The Poetics and
Politics of Ethnography*, Berkeley: University of California Press,
particularly the Introduction


(Chapter 1 on thick description)


Princeton University Press.


London: Routledge.


*Organizational Ethnography: Studying the Complexity of Everyday Life*.
Contemporary Debates


Lecture 4: Qualitative Interviews
Thursday, 22 August 2013 (Dr Flora Cornish)

Interviewing skills are a foundation for much qualitative research. Although interviews build on the researcher’s everyday social skills, they constitute a peculiar kind of interaction requiring careful preparation and conceptualization. This lecture will introduce different types of qualitative interview, discuss the construction of a topic guide, and cover key conceptual and practical concerns in interview studies. We will consider the interpersonal dimensions of the interviewer-interviewee relationship and their significance for the design and interpretation of interview studies, and will critically debate the kinds of claims that can legitimately be made from interview data.

Essential Readings


Introductory readings


**Key texts**


**Contemporary debates**


Hammersley, M. (2010) 'Reproducing or constructing?: Some questions about transcription in social research,' *Qualitative Research* 10(5): 553-569.

http://www.nyu.edu/classes/bkg/methods/harper.pdf

Hoong Sin, C. (2007) Ethnic-matching in qualitative research: reversing the gaze on ´white others' and ´white as ´other´ *Qualitative Research* 7(4): 477-499


Aberbach, J. and Rochman, B. ‘Conducting and Coding Elite Interviews’, pp673-6

**Lecture 5: Focus groups**

Friday, 23 August 2013 (Dr Flora Cornish)

Focus groups are a form of group interview particularly suited to exploring socially shared knowledge and group processes of discussion and debate. They are a popular means of getting a quick snapshot of “the public’s point of view”, but this lecture will suggest that their special methodological strength is in providing an opportunity for observing collective argumentation and debate. The lecture will consider the situations in which one might choose to use focus groups, issues to consider in designing a focus group study, and how to manage group dynamics so as to produce useful data.

**Essential readings**

Crossley, M. L. (2002). Could you please pass one of those health leaflets along?: exploring health, morality and resistance through focus groups. *Social Science & Medicine, 55*(8), 1471–1483.


**Introductory readings**


Morgan, D.L. (1997). *Focus Groups As Qualitative Research* (2nd
Key readings


Kitzinger, J. (1994) The methodology of focus groups: The importance of interaction between research participants, Sociology of Health and Illness, 16(1): 104-121.


Contemporary debates


Lecture 6: Visual and online data

Monday, 26 August 2013 (Dr Jen Tarr)

Two key developments have recently been changing the conduct of
qualitative research: first, greater access to and distribution of images through digital cameras mobile phones, and second, the rise of the Internet, particularly through blogs, social media such as Twitter and Facebook, and online forums. We will discuss how to apply more traditional qualitative methods to these settings and what challenges and opportunities are offered by new media.

**Essential readings**


**Introductory readings**


**Online Methods**

**Key texts**


**Contemporary debates**


**Visual Methods**

**Key texts**


**Contemporary debates**


**Lecture 7: Analysing Qualitative Data: Thematic Analysis**

Tuesday, 27 August 2013 (Dr Aude Bicquelet)

Thematic analysis is a basic analytical strategy used by researchers to identify key themes or repetitive patterns in text corpora. This session will focus on corpus construction, coding strategies and robustness checks for qualitative data analysis. The emphasis will be on practical techniques for applying thematic analysis and understanding how it differs from other approaches such as grounded theory, discourse and classical Content Analysis.

**Essential readings**


**Introductory readings**


Key texts


Contemporary debates
Thomas, J. and Harden, A. (nd) 'Methods for the thematic synthesis of qualitative research in systematic reviews' *Methods for Research Synthesis Node, Evidence for Policy and Practice Information and Coordinating (EPPI-)Centre, Social Science Research Unit, 18 Woburn Square, London WC1H 0NS* http://eppi.ioe.ac.uk/cms/Default.aspx?tabid=188


Lecture 8: Content Analysis
Wednesday, 28 August 2013 (Dr Aude Bicquelet)

Content Analysis is a set of methods for systematically coding, analysing and drawing valid inferences from texts. These methods are used across the social sciences to explore explicit and covert meanings (also called manifest and latent content) and to test hypotheses about texts. This lecture will introduce the main analytical steps involved in Classical Content Analysis. The second part of the lecture will focus on Validity and Reliability issues and will consider various strategies to strengthen the robustness of the results obtained through classical content analysis.
Essential readings


Introductory readings


Key texts


Contemporary debates


**Lecture 9: Discourse Analysis**

Thursday 29 August 2013 (Dr Jen Tarr)

Discourse analysis is a general term for ways of looking at text as a form of social interaction, that is, of discourse. Analysts in this tradition often have a clear theoretical perspective or slant on the research which is embedded in their approach. In this session we will explore various methods of discourse analysis and the strategies used— in particular by critical discourse analysts— for reading and interpreting texts of various kinds. Specific applications will look at newspaper articles and interview transcripts.

**Essential readings**


**Introductory readings**


**Key texts**


Contemporary debates


Lecture 10: Writing and Disseminating Qualitative Research
Friday 30 August 2013 (Dr Jen Tarr).

In this final session we will discuss a central element of the research process: that of writing up research. We will look specifically at issues of style, audience, and presentation as well as who engages with the product of the research. As well as pragmatic ‘tips and tricks’, we will look more broadly at how writing is implicated in the ethics and politics of the research process.

Essential readings


Introductory readings
Flick, U. An Introduction to Qualitative Research, London: Sage, Chapters 4 and 30.


Key texts


**Contemporary debates**


Seminar programme

Seminar 1: Quality indicators
Look at the selected methods discussions from the published qualitative articles (excerpts below). What are the indications of quality? How well are the methods described? What kind of research would this strategy be likely to produce? What kinds of knowledge claims can be made from this research? What makes you feel confident or not confident that the findings these researchers produce are likely to be valid and significant?

Seminar 2: Ethics
Read through the scenarios provided at the end of this document. You will divide into groups and each group will take two scenarios. Discuss the scenarios, the ethical issues they raise and how you could address them. Be prepared to report back and defend your choices to the seminar group as a whole.

Seminar 3: Fieldnotes
Visit one of the galleries within the British Museum, National Gallery, or National Portrait Gallery (all of which are free to view the permanent collection and are within 10-15 minutes walk of LSE). What are the social norms of museums? Can you make the familiar strange, and notice how people behave in this particular environment? Which objects or people command respect, and which do not? How can you observe people following the ‘rules’ of the museum? Does anyone break the rules (children, perhaps?) and how are the rules enforced? Reflect on how the museum makes you feel and behave.

Stay in the gallery for half an hour to an hour. You can take brief, jotted notes while you are there.

Immediately following this experience, write up your fieldnotes. On one side of the page, note down where you were, the setting and time, and the ‘data’: what kinds of behaviours or interactions occurred while you were there. On the other side of the page, note your own thoughts, reflections, and initial analytic insights.

In your seminar group, discuss your fieldnotes. What did you observe and what sort of ‘findings’ might a bigger study of this kind produce? How did you observe norms or rules? How did the varieties of site visited within the seminar group affect the observed behaviours? How did your own perspective, location, etc. influence what you wrote and saw?

Seminar 4: Interview topic guides
Compare the example interview topic guides you have been given and discuss them in small groups. All of these topic guides come from real, funded research projects. How are they similar or different? For
instance, do they collect demographic data about the participant, and if so, where and how?

If you were being asked these questions yourself, would they work? Pick out examples of questions likely to elicit rich responses, and questions that seem less likely to do so? How would you rework the less good questions?

Seminar 5: Focus Group topic guides
In this session we will run a brief focus group on the topic of ‘cities of the future’. The group will be moderated by the seminar leader and several seminar members may be selected to observe the group from outside and provide feedback on the group dynamics. There will be a debriefing at the end of the group to discuss the structure.

Seminar 6: Introduction to NVivo (computer lab)
This session will introduce you to the basics of how NVivo works, and how you can incorporate it in to your qualitative research practices. We’ll run through the programme’s capabilities and understand why they’re important to modern research practices. This will be an opportunity for us to also discuss how we can put in to practice many of the issues around validity discussed in previous seminars.

In this seminar we’ll discuss ideas behind how you code your research, and how that is practiced when using NVivo. We’ll explore the software’s functions for coding, and see how to set up an efficient and effective coding framework.

Seminar 7: NVivo 2 (computer lab)
Now that we have coded data, we can begin to explore it using the various analysis functions of NVivo. We’ll start with basic word queries to explore the idea of content analysis, and progress towards more sophisticated measurements and compound queries as time permits.

This is the ‘fun’ side of NVivo! We’ll look at how we can build models of our analysis, graph our findings, and create meaningful representations of our analysis. This is where you’ll learn to create impactful presentations of your work, so that you can show people a “killer chart”.

Seminar 8: Content analysis
In this session you will be asked to replicate the main analytical steps for undertaking a classical content analysis as presented and discussed during the lecture (E. Hirschman’s article on dating advertisements and Cunningham et. al’s article on gender reprenatations in newspaper articles – please refer to the Essential readings listed under week 8).

You will be provided with a small sample of data extracted from an Internet chat room where participants debate about whether the Queen
should retire or not. The aim here will be to identify and operationalize meaningful variables, code and look for interesting associations between independent variables (age and sex) and the content of the posts. A second objective of this seminar will be to compare the different logic underpinning the use of thematic and classical content analysis in social science research.

Seminar 9: Discourse Analysis

Look through the data for seminar 8.

A) Break apart some of the arguments as you would in argumentation analysis: are there warrants (claims), backing evidence, qualifiers, claims, rebuttals? What are they? How is the argument structured?

B) Following rhetorical analysis, which of these arguments are based on ethos, which on pathos and which on logos?

C) What might critical discourse analysis say about these arguments? For instance, you could consider: who is the audience, and who are the authors? How are particular words or turns of phrase used to back up the points the authors are making? Do they employ any abstract notions such as fairness, justice, or accountability? If so, how? How does this type of discourse reproduce particular social relationships and/or power relationships?
The Research

The research study, entitled Extraordinary Childhoods, was carried out at the Thomas Coram Research Unit, at the Institute of Education, University of London, in collaboration with the British Refugee Council. The study formed part of the Economic and Social Research Council’s (ESRC) Children 5-16 Programme. In keeping with the Programme’s focus on children as social actors, the project sought to involve children in the research process. We felt it particularly important that participating children were active subjects, rather than passive objects of the research, and set out to engender a two-way relationship between ourselves and the children being researched. Children, accessed through two schools, participated in the research process in a number of ways. Some assisted in the development of the questionnaire and interview schedule through commenting on draft instruments. Others assisted in editing their stories for publication in a school’s Reader on refugee issues (Rutter and Candappa, 1998). Where possible, children were consulted in the selection of their own pseudonyms. Later, at the dissemination stage, results of the school’s survey were fed back to the young people who participated, in a specially prepared young-person friendly document.

In addition to involving children, we also felt it important that the refugee community, more generally, be involved in the research process. Therefore, while working in collaboration with the Refugee Council, we also worked closely with representatives of refugee community organizations and professionals working with refugee children through an Advisory Committee.

The research aimed to contribute to the knowledge of the lives of refugee children, and to provide information that will be useful to policy makers and others concerned with the welfare of refugee families. The term ‘refugee’ was used in the study to include asylum seekers and those granted exceptional leave to remain in the country (ELR status), as well as those granted refugee status, that is, it was self-defined rather than a legal definition. Research questions focused in particular on refugee children’s experiences in their families, their friendships and social relationships, the children’s experiences of services, such as schools and health care and the children’s expectations of the future. The study centred on children aged 11-14, the first years of secondary schooling in the UK, and a time of significant transition in the children’s lives. Work was conducted in two complementary stages.
Stage I consisted of a series of case studies. Its main focus was a group of 35 refugee children who arrived in Britain around 1994, drawn from the main groups of asylum seekers to arrive in the country at that time: namely, Bosnians, Somalis, Sri Lankan Tamils and Turkish Kurds. The research issues were explored in-depth with these children, in semi-structured interviews, conducted in English. For comparative purposes, the research issues were explored at this stage with a similar number of girls and boys who were born in Britain, an ethnically mixed group, many of whom attended the same schools as the refugee children. Stage 2 consisted of a survey with refugee and non-refugee children aged 11-14, in two London schools. It employed a self-completion questionnaire, which was administered by the researchers in whole classes, in school time. A total of 312 children participated in the survey.

Of the total number of respondents, 73 percent indicated that they were born in the UK. The legally, and therefore also socially and emotionally, insecure status of asylum seekers meant that a direct question on refugee/asylum status could not be included. However, of those children born outside the UK, 22 children (7 percent of the total) indicated that they had come to the UK because of war or fighting in their home countries. These children were defined as refugees for purposes of analysis and comparison.

The number of participating children who could be identified as refugees is small, presenting difficulties in identifying differences of statistical significance in perceptions and behaviour between them, in order to compare experiences of refugee and non-refugee children. For this reason, tests of statistical significance have not been applied, and comparative data presented here should be treated as indicative only. However, we found case study data, in broad terms, to be in line with survey data on the issues reported here. Survey responses of refugee children are, in this article, therefore complemented by data from in-depth interviews with refugee children in the same age groups, to give more of an insight on these issues.

The children's accounts of their experiences have been edited, with their consent, to remove identifying features.
METHODOLOGY

Data Collection

We gathered data from five types of sources during the founding of the College of Interdisciplinary Technology Studies (CITS, a pseudonym) within State University (or State U, also a pseudonym): (a) semi-structured interviews with people involved in the formation of the school (the Appendix shows the generic protocol), (b) archival data from CITS during its embryonic years, including meeting minutes, (c) archived communications (written and electronic) by faculty, staff, and administration to inside and outside stakeholders during the formation process, (d) non-participant observation, and (e) the founding CITS dean’s private journals, chronicling CITS’s history in real time as recorded in his meeting notes, memos, reflections, etc., for his personal use in documenting the early history of CITS. The CITS dean himself served as our primary informant; initial interviews with him identified other founding members who could provide insight, whom we also interviewed—i.e., we used a “snowball technique” (Lincoln and Guba, 1985) to identify members of CITS so we could investigate how CITS formed a new organizational identity.

Overall, we conducted 33 formal interviews in years 4 through 7 of CITS’s history and many informal interviews, including interviews with the five original faculty members, additional present-day faculty, staff, alumni, and State U’s president and provost. Each formal interview was 30–70 minutes in length, digitally recorded, and then transcribed. Table 1 displays a detailed list of all data sources, as well as the audience and source for whom that information was created.
Purposeful Sampling

We employed purposeful sampling (Kumar, Stern, and Anderson, 1993) of all key informants who had insight into the formation of CITS or unique access to knowledge of organizational history, strategies, and actions. Purposeful sampling was an integral part of the constant comparison technique we employed, repeatedly comparing data across informants and over time (Glaser and Strauss, 1967), and was a critical part of the data gathering stage of this study. Overall, our interpretive approach involved an iterative process of simultaneously collecting data, analyzing the data, and seeking new informants based on information deemed important by prior informants. This process resulted in an evolving and increasingly focused sample until no additional embellishment of emerging themes occurred, or what Glaser and Strauss (1967) termed “theoretical saturation,” as we worked to develop a grounded theory of organizational identity formation.

Categorical Analysis

We began our analysis by identifying relevant concepts in the data and grouping them into categories (open coding). For this analytical step, we used in-vivo (Strauss and Corbin, 1998) or first-order (Van Maanen, 1979) codes (i.e., terms and language adequate at the level of meaning...
of the informants) whenever possible, or a simple descriptive phrase when an in-vivo code was not available. Next, we engaged in axial coding (Strauss and Corbin, 1998), wherein we searched for relationships between and among these categories and assembled them into higher-order themes. We coded the data using NVIVO, a qualitative data analysis program, to keep track of emerging categories. Doing so allowed for quick reference to similar concepts and their representative examples that could be collapsed into fewer categories and themes, as well as collections of examples that needed to be parsed into more fine-grained categories. We allowed concepts to continue emerging until we had a clear sense of the developing relationships among categories and their related themes and until additional interviews and analyses failed to reveal new relationships. We made statements of findings only if we corroborated a given finding across multiple informants (to mitigate the possibility of problems associated with retrospective accounts). Representative quotes, therefore, represent only corroborated findings.

Insider-outsider Approach

As an additional feature of this research project, we employed an insider-outsider approach (Evered and Louis, 1981; Bartunek, Foster-Fishman, and Keys, 1996; Bartunek and Louis, 1996) to give voice to a knowledgeable insider who could best articulate the rationales for conceptions and actions that affected the formation and development of this new organization. During the execution of the research, we also decided to engage our primary informant, the founding CITS dean, as an inside researcher who would later offer post-hoc, overarching “metacommentary” on the findings. In this sense, he was simultaneously an “actor” involved in the formation of CITS’s identity and an analytical “observer” of the process. The dean was a true knowledgeable “double agent,” in that he was simultaneously familiar with the practical difficulties of founding a new organization and also well informed about the conceptual issues involved because he had been a management scholar who understood organizational strategy in theoretical terms. The dean provided many insightful commentaries throughout he findings in his role as primary informant. Because of the key role of the dean, however, we needed to take steps to avoid insider bias, so he did not participate in the analyses of the data that the outside researchers conducted. The other authors were researchers who had no direct connection to the school. By presenting ourselves as outsiders, while offering informants assurances that the dean would not have access to the data and that all first-order data would be reported anonymously, the outside researchers were able to maintain a scholarly distance, thus allowing immersion in the study while minimizing bias. We reserve the term “dean’s metacommentary” for his post-analysis remarks because they took an encompassing view not only of the findings concerning a given theme but also of the entire study. The dean made these metacommentaries when we presented our findings to him after we had gathered all data and completed the initial theme analyses. We were able to corroborate the content of his remarks with the chronological journal entries, thus allaying concerns about the
Ensuring Trustworthiness
To ensure that our analyses met Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) criteria for trustworthiness, we employed two additional techniques. The first was “peer debriefing” between the outside researchers. One of the authors had primary responsibility for gathering and initially analyzing the interview data. The other outside researchers adopted a more general orientation—noting areas requiring more data, formulating follow-up interview questions, playing “devil’s advocate” by offering alternative explanations for developing findings, and considering the data at a level beyond the details contained in the large qualitative database. All outside authors were involved in the actual data analysis so that the credibility of the findings would not rely solely on the interpretations of a single analyst. Consistent with this approach, and as a second procedure aimed at ensuring trustworthiness, we performed two separate intercoder agreement assessments. In both, disagreements between coders served as the basis for discussions about how to strengthen the codes and thus improve the trustworthiness of the interpretations. In the first, we calculated intercoder agreement among the outside researchers on the relationship between the first-order categories and the second-order themes. The researcher who conducted the initial data analysis gave each of the other outside researchers a selection of first-order categories and requested that they sort them into the emergent second-order themes. That intercoder agreement was 0.91. The outside researchers discussed all discrepancies in coding until they reached a unanimous decision about how to code each discrepancy. In the second assessment, the researcher responsible for initial data analysis asked three other coders, all familiar with qualitative methods but with no attachment to this study, to sort data samples that were representative examples of first-order categories into the second-order themes that the outside researchers had generated from their analyses. She provided each independent coder with definitions of the second-order themes, when requested by the coders. She then calculated the average agreement level of each coder with the overall coding scheme; the agreement level was 90.6 percent, indicating a high level of agreement. We believe that these two assessments demonstrate the credibility of our analysis; as is always possible with interpretive research, however, other researchers might draw somewhat different conclusions from the same empirical materials that we analyzed.
SEMIDR 2: Ethical Quandaries in Qualitative Research

1. Your research report on women’s feelings about with their home/work life balance has been picked up by one of the national papers. Your research showed that many women were dissatisfied with the way the workplace was unable to cope with their home demands and recommended structural changes within places of employment, but the article makes it sound as if you’re arguing that women should think twice about becoming involved in the workforce. To what extent are you responsible for their interpretation? What could you do about it?

2. You are attracted to a participant with a peripheral role in your ethnographic research. The participant has asked you to dinner, and it is clear that they reciprocate your interest. Assuming neither of you is married or otherwise attached, under what circumstances could you accept the invitation? Would the situation be different if the participant played a key role in your research?

3. You have promised to give your transcripts to your interviewees before including them in your final thesis. Most of the interviewees seem uninterested and do not read them through, however, one of them responds immediately by telling you she did not say something you have transcribed and forbidding you to publish it. It is a useful piece of data and one you were hoping to use. You go back and listen to your recordings and it is definitely on the tape. How would you proceed? What are your ethical responsibilities?

4. You are doing a project on homelessness and are committed to ensuring your work adequately reflects your participants’ experiences. Yet when you show your analysis to your participants in a focus group at the end of the project, they tell you that they ‘can’t understand a bloody word it says.’ Does it matter? Why or why not?

5. Your archival research on a historical figure of minor significance has turned up evidence of links to Nazism during the 1930s which, to the best of your knowledge, have not been acknowledged in any previous work on the topic. Under what circumstances should you mention this in your research? Would it be different if this historical figure had living relatives? Would it matter if you knew them personally?

6. During a research interview on adults’ memories of their educational experiences, a participant reveals to you that he was abused by one of his teachers and that he attempted suicide. How would you deal with this situation? What are your ethical responsibilities as a researcher? Now imagine the participant is 18 years old and just leaving school. Does that change the situation?
7. The organisation you work for has bad data management practices. Despite promising anonymity and confidentiality to research participants, interview and focus group data is stored on the office network where anyone can access it, and individuals’ initials instead of full names are used as a guarantee of ‘anonymity’. A separate file, also accessible on the network, lists personal data including full names, contact details, and annual salaries. Your boss shrugs off your concerns, saying it doesn’t matter. What are your ethical responsibilities? What could you do?
Study Title: Cross-Generational Investigation of the Making of Heterosexual Relationships, 1912-2003

Interview Schedule

INVITE EXAMPLES IN EACH CASE.
ASK HOW GRAND/PARENTS/CHILDREN VIEWED THEIR DECISIONS /ACTIONS IN PARTICULAR INSTANCES.

1. How did you find out about 'sex'/periods etc? Do you think that boys/girls were treated differently?

PROBE AROUND SOURCES OF SEXUAL KNOWLEDGE

2. When did you first notice/become 'interested' in boys/girls?

3. What was/is courtship like for people of your generation? What do/did you get up to?
   (ACTIVITIES: CINEMA, MEALS, OUTINGS, CLUBS, DANCING, HOLIDAYS, SEX?)

4. How did you know when you’d found what you thought was the 'right one'? What was 'right' about them?

5. The first time you slept together/were intimate together, was it a) what you expected? b) what your partner expected?
   (Was this on your wedding night or some other time or place?)
   PROBE AROUND LOCATIONS (IF EXPERIENCED WITH MORE THAN ONE PARTNER)

6. Do/did you find yourself comparing other partners to your 'true love'? How have earlier or subsequent partners compared with this person sexually, emotionally etc?

7. Tell me about your wedding day. How did he/she propose? What was planning for it like - was it a big event or low key? How did you feel? What are your enduring memories of your wedding day(s)?

8. How did your courtship compare with day to day life after you decided to set up home together? Think about having to share each other's physical, psychological and emotional space and also sharing them with other people (in-laws, children etc)?

9. What impact did the arrival of children have on your relationship? Do you feel that you became less of a partner/husband/wife and more of a parent? Was there an 'identity' shift? What was the impact on your sexual relationship?
10. How did you make your choices about how to socialise your children? Did you replicate or reject existing family models? Do you feel that you treat your sons and daughters the same, or do/did you have different rules for the girls/boys? (E.g. re. sex and social lives - going out etc.)

11. How do/did you feel about the possibility of your children being sexually active in your home? OR Do/did your parents let your partners stay over?

12. How do you feel about the possibility that your parents are still sexually active, or that they are while you're in the house?

13. As you've got older, do you think that your relationship has become less physical and more emotional/companionship etc? If so, do you think that the latter has been a compensation for a waning sex life? How has your sex life changed from when you were younger, if at all? OR Do you think imagine that sex will hold the same place for you as you get older? When do you think that it might change?

14. Are there other moments that had a significant impact on your relationships - either by testing it/them or bringing you closer together? For example, starting or leaving work, changing body image/confidence, taking up an 'interest', children leaving home, moving house, becoming a grandparent, separation, divorce, loss, retirement?

INVITE EXAMPLES IN EACH CASE. ASK HOW GRAND/PARENTS/CHILDREN VIEWED THEIR DECISIONS /ACTIONS IN PARTICULAR INSTANCES.

15. What were the best and worst moments in your relationships? How did you and your partner(s) respond when difficulties arise?

16. How important is talking through things with your partner?

17. Who do you talk to when you're having problems or, share the good times with? Partner, parent, sibling, friend, grandparents etc?

18. What is okay to take outside the relationship? 'Bedroom moments', emotional or sexual difficulties etc?

19. How did/do your experiences of relationships compare with the expectations you had when you first started discovering men/women?

20. How have your relationships with your partners differed to those with your friends? What do you get from one and not the other?

21. What do you see as the key ingredients for a successful relationship?
Study Title: Mental Health of Chinese Women in Britain, 1945-2000

Interview Schedule (Revised):

A) Migration History:
- Country of origin: herself, husband, parents;
- Anticipation and/or experiences of any difficulties: physical, cultural, racial and linguistic; problems overcome or still persist?
- family or relatives of your side (composition, family size, residence, feelings of them living here or elsewhere, the best/worst aspects)
- family or relatives of your husband side (composition, size, residence, the best or worst aspects of them living here or elsewhere)
- future plan: leaving or settling in this country

B) Employment History:
- work history (the no. of jobs before and in this country; nature of each jobs; mode of employment; reasons for change; difficulties or social networks in getting jobs in this country)
- work conditions (no. of hours, working environment, wages, relationships with colleagues)
- feelings and experiences of paid

C) Family Relations: (Immediate Family, own family, and husband's family)
- when and where get married? no. and composition of household members?
  Number, age, education/occupation of children? Planned or accident? Family planning: knowledge and usage of services?
- household division of labour: who do what and why? Sources and main providers of family income?
- child-caring experiences: happiness or difficulties? Does/did it affect employment, family finance, social life, or health? Expectation and realisation on children? Similarities and differences between her and her husband in terms of responsibilities, practice, disciplining, expectations
- relationship with, responsibilities to, and support from in-laws and husband’s relatives and friends
- relationship with, responsibilities for, and support from own family and relatives

D) Informal and Formal Help and Support-Seeking:
- the best and worst time so far? Share with whom? Any support and resources when needed? Whom, where, what?
• knowledge and usage of social services/drop-in centre/community or cultural centre? How often? When and what for?
• physical and social activeness (exercise, driving, leisure, study and classes, family and/or social activities? How often? what kind? With whom?)

E) Medical history:
• health conditions? Chronic illness (esp. on headache, insomnia, loss of weight, palpitation, pressures on chest, numbness or shaking of limbs?) other serious or minor illness? When and possible reasons? Treatment? What kind? Diagnosis (self, GP, and Chinese doctor)?
• worries, pressures and anxieties? When? What kind? Why? And how to handle?
• health of other family members (type of illness? Kind(s) of treatment? Diagnosis (self and doctors, Chinese or GP)

Study Title: Presentation of Genetically Modified (GM) Crop Research to Non-specialists, 1997-2002: A Case Study

FIRST PART OF INTERVIEW - Questions for scientists at University of Reading
First a brief introduction on our project, and then:
1. What in your opinion accounts for the public response to GM in Britain? [Probe the link with the idea of breakdown of trust, and the issue of risk.]
2. What do you see as the best strategy to convey information on GM research/products?
3. What are the key themes/components that you wish to communicate about GM research? Do you have different strategies you use with different audiences?
4. How are communications with the public produced? In the form of adverts/ press releases? Who participates in their production?
5. Do you see room for improvements in the link between industry and research?
6. Are sustainable business growth and good/quality science linked? If so, how?
7. If you walk in a US supermarket the shelves are full of GM food. What is going to take for the same to happen in the UK? [Probe the future of the industry.]

8. Drawing on something that they'll have said, paint a scenario for their personal everyday life where they have to explain/justify their work.
SEMINAR 6
Log on to Nvivo

- New Project> Referendum debate UK> Ok
- External data> Documents> 1974 Debate Nvivo Not Coded> Ok
- Double click on the 1974 debate
- Go to Nodes
- Create
- Manually enter Nodes: Create Institutional arguments/Political Arguments/ Manipulation issues. Merge nodes.
- Delete all Nodes
- Go to external data> Classification sheet> Browse import ‘Nodes’
- Classification type> Node classification> Next> Finish.
- Click to edit text (right)
- Code by selecting, dragging and dropping
- Or, Code by using ‘Code at …’

SEMINAR 7
Log on to Nvivo

- New Project> Referendum debate UK 2> Ok
- External data> Documents> 1974 Debate Nvivo Not Coded> Ok
- Double click on the 1974 debate
- Go to external data> Classification sheet> Browse import ‘Nodes’
- Classification type> Node classification> Next> Finish.
- Click to edit text (right)
- Code by selecting, dragging and dropping
- Or, Code by using ‘Code at …’

Once coding is done:

- Go to: Explore> Chart> Chart Document Coding
- Go to: Cluster Analysis> Nodes> Select all nodes> Finish

Compare your coding strategy and your results with other students
**Study Title:** (From Digital Spy – Internet General discussion forum- May 2005)

**Topic:** Should the Queen retire?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forum members Gender and Age (*names and loggings have been deleted for confidentiality purposes)</th>
<th>Question: Should the Queen retire?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member 1 gender: Female Age: 52</td>
<td>In recent photos, the Queen looks to have aged considerably. She is nearly 80 and most people have retired way before then. Should she not enjoy her few or many remaining years in comfort and relative privacy without having to traipse around the country and world and perform official duties?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member 2 gender: Male Age: 42</td>
<td>What ??! The King or Queen are on the throne until they die, then the next in line takes over. It doesn't matter how old she looks. Queen Victoria was on the throne for 63 years until she died!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member 3 gender: Male Age: 70</td>
<td>It’s a job for life, monarchs don't retire, they die of old age or at the point of sword.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member 4 gender: Female Age: 45</td>
<td>I think she probably won't but I think she could probably retire from public duties fairly well as Queen Mum did for the last years to live her last days without too much media interference. I don't think anyone would blame her.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member 5 gender: Male Age: 51</td>
<td>Depends what are the full conditions of her retirement. Not being a royal expert I would need to know these before I gave an opinion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment [A1]:** Same data (table below) ought to be made available to students via Moodle to help the coding process. I’ll provide a word doc with table and instructions for the exercise.
Solely from the fact she is nearly 80 then I think the poor dear deserves a bit of time off. She has served her country long enough and I would be seriously annoyed if anyone expected me to work for this long.

| Member 6 | So that Charles would become King? I don't think he is anywhere near as popular as her and perhaps eventually that will result in increased questioning of the institution itself. |
| Gender: Female | Age: 30 |

| Member 7 | As long as she has the job and is fit to carry on then I don't see why she should retire. I mean what exactly does the job entail? - a few well-rehearsed speeches, trips around the globe visiting foreign dignitaries and getting very expensive gifts for her trouble. |
| Gender: Male | Age: 56 |

| Member 8 | I just thought that if Charles gets on the throne now, there's a chance that his relative unpopularity as compared to the Queen will result in more questioning of the institution. Whilst the Queen is there, the monarchy is pretty safe. But I expect she may well think the same. |
| Gender: Female | Age: 31 |

| Member 9 | Her Majesty seems to be still battling on and there is no reason for her to retire. |
| Gender: Male | Age: 60 |

| Member 10 | I don’t think she ever will because she has a high sense of responsibility, that’s why, unlike Charles, she’s still popular after so many years. |
| Gender: Female | Age: 37 |

**Exercise;**

1) Identify key variables
2) Operationalize variables
3) Code independent and dependent variables
4) Look for associations between variables
5) Discuss differences and similarities between Classical Content Analysis and Thematic Analysis.