ME105
Qualitative Research
Methods

Dr. Flora Cornish
Department of Methodology
London School of Economics and Political Science
August 2013

Course teachers

Dr Flora Cornish (f.cornish@lse.ac.uk)
Dr Jen Tarr (j.s.tarr@lse.ac.uk)
Dr Aude Bicquelet (a.j.bicquelet@lse.ac.uk)
Dr Elena Gonzalez-Polledo (e.gonzalez-polledo@lse.ac.uk)

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:

Seale, C., Gobo, G., Gubrium, J.F. & Silverman, D. (2004). Qualitative research practice. London: Sage.

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.

Seale, Clive (2004) *Social Research Methods: A Reader*, London: Routledge

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

Week 1	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
Morning (Lecture)	Qualitative research & design	Documents & archives	Participant observation	Interviewing	Focus groups
Afternoon (Class)	Quality indicators	Ethical Quandaries	Fieldnotes	Interview topic guides	Focus groups

Week 2	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
Morning (Lecture)	Visual & online data	Thematic analysis	Content analysis	Discourse analysis	Writing up qualitative research
Afternoon (Class)	Introduction to NVIVO	Coding with NVIVO	Counting codes & content analysis	Discourse analysis / revision	Exam

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

Seale, C., Gobo, G., Gubrium, J.F. & Silverman, D. (2004). Qualitative research practice. London: Sage, Chapter 24 (Quality in Qualitative Research).

Bauer MW & G Gaskell (2000) *Qualitative Researching with Text, Image and Sound*, London: Sage, Chapter 1.

Flick, U. (2009) *An Introduction to Qualitative Research*, London: Sage. Chapter 11 'Sampling.'

Key texts

Altheide D L and J M Johnson (1994) 'Criteria for assessing interpretive validity in qualitative research', in N K Denzin and Y S Lincoln (eds) *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, London: Sage, 485-499

Brinkman, S. (2012). *Qualitative Inquiry in Everyday Life: Working with everyday life materials.* London: Sage. (especially Chapter 2: The epistemology of working with everyday life materials, and Chaper 9: Conclusions: On quality)

Kirk, J. and Miller, M. (1986) *Reliability and Validity in Qualitative Research*, London: Sage.

Seale, C. (1999) *The Quality of Qualitative Research*, London: Sage.

Contemporary debates

Barbour R (2001) 'Checklist for improving the rigour in qualitative research: a case of the tail wagging the dog?' *British Medical Journal*, 5 May 2001, 1115-1117.

Blaikie, N.W.H. (1991) 'A critique of the use of triangulation in social research', *Quantity and Quality* 25, 115-36.

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

edition, London: Sage, p1047. Koro-Ljungberg, M. (2010) 'Validity, responsibility and aporia', *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16(8): 603-10.

Tracy, S. (2010) 'Qualitative Quality: Eight 'Big Tent' criteria for excellent qualitative research' *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16(10): 837-51.

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).

Goia, D., Price, K.N, Hamilton, A.L., and Thomas, J. B. (2010) 'Forging an Identity: An Insider-Outsider Study of Processes Involved in the Formation of Organizational Identity', Administrative Science Quarterly, 55: pp 1-46.

Cappa, M. and Igbinigie, I. (2003) 'Everyday Lifeworlds of Young Refugees in London', Feminist Review 73: pp. 54-65.

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

Leiby, M. (2009) Digging in the Archives: The promise and perils of primary documents', Politics & Society 37(1): 75-99.

O'Connor, H. and Goodwin, J. (2010) 'Utilizing Data from a Lost Sociological Project: Experiences, Insights, Promises' Qualitative Research 10(3): 283-98.

Introductory readings

Flick, U. (2009) An Introduction to Qualitative Research, London, Sage, Chapter 19.

Prior, L. (2004) 'Documents' in Seale, C Gobo G, Gubrium JF and Silverman D (eds) Qualitative Research Practice, London: Sage pp 345-360.

Key texts

Atkinson, P. and Coffey, A. (2004) 'Analysing documentary realities', in D. Silverman (ed.), Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice, 2nd edition, London: Sage, pp 56-75.

Hill, M. R. (1993) Archival Strategies and Techniques, Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Hodder, I. (2000) 'The Interpretation of Documents and Material Culture' in N. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln, (eds) Handbook of Qualitative Research, 2nd ed, London: Sage, pp. 703-716.

Iacovetta, F., and Mitchinson, W. (1998) On the Case: Explorations in Social History, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

McLeod, J. and Thomson, R. (2009) Researching Social Change: Qualitative Approaches, London: Sage.

Neale, B. & Flowerdew, J. (2003) Time, Texture & Childhood: The Contours of

Longitudinal Qualitative Research, International Journal of Social Research Methods, (3):189-99.

Prior, L. (2003) Using Documents in Social Research, London: Sage.

Saldana, J. (2003) Longitudinal Qualitative Research: Analysing Change through Time, Alta Mira Press, New York.

Scott, J. (1990) A Matter of Record: Documentary Sources in Social Research, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Scott, J. (2006) Documentary Research. London: Sage. (Four volumes; comprehensive

Contemporary debates

Spivak, G. C. (1985) 'The Rani of Sirmur: An Essay in Reading the Archives', History and Theory, 24 (3): 247-272.

Thomson, R. and Holland, J. (2003) 'Hindsight, Foresight and Insight: The challenges of Longitudinal Qualitative Research', International Journal of Social Research Methodology, 6(3): 233-244.

Trouillot, M.R. (1995) Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History, Boston: Beacon Press.

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

Wacquant, L. (1998). A Fleshpeddler at Work: Power, Pain, and Profit in 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 International Journal of Human Resource Management, 17:3): 399-413.

Introductory readings

Hammersley, M. and Atkinson, P. (1994) *Ethnography: Principles in Practice*, 2nd ed. London: Routledge.

Jorgensen, D. L. (1989). *Participant observation: a methodology for 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*

Emerson, R.M, Fretz, R.I. and Shaw, L.I. (1995) *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Geertz, C. (2003) *The Interpretation of Cultures*, New York: Basic Books. (Chapter 1 on thick description)

Hammersley, M. (1992) *What's Wrong With Ethnography: Methodological Explorations*, London: Routledge.

Hine, C. (2000) *Virtual Ethnography*, London: Sage.

Marcus, G. (1998) *Ethnography Through Thick and Thin*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Pink, S. (2007) *Doing Visual Ethnography*, 2nd edition, London: Sage.

Rosaldo, R. (1993) *Culture and Truth: The Remaking of Social Analysis*, London: Routledge.

Schatz, (2009). *Political Ethnography: What Immersion Contributes to the Study of Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Stacey, J. (1988) 'Can There Be a Feminist Ethnography?' *Women's Studies International Forum*, 11(1): 21-27.

Willis, P. (2000) *The Ethnographic Imagination*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Ybema, S., Yanow, D., Wels, H., & Kamsteeg, F.H. (2009). *Organizational Ethnography: Studying the Complexity of Everyday Life*. London: Sage.

Contemporary Debates

Hastrup, K. (1995) *A Passage to Anthropology: Between Experience and Theory*, London and New York: Routledge.

James, A. and Hockey, J.H. (1997) *After Writing Culture: Epistemology and Praxis in Contemporary Anthropology*, New York: Routledge.

Newton, E. (1993) 'My best informant's dress: The erotic equation in fieldwork', *Cultural Anthropology* 8(1): 3-23.

Vrasti, W. (2008) 'The strange case of ethnography and International Relations', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 37 (2): 279-301.

Williams, M. (2007). 'Avatar watching: participant observation in graphical online environments', *Qualitative Research*, *7*(1), 5-24.

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

De Kok, B., & Widdicombe, S. (2010). Interpersonal Issues in Expressing Lay Knowledge. Journal of Health Psychology, 15(8), 1190–1200.

Kennelly, J. and Watt, P. (2011) 'Sanitising public spaces: The spatial experiences of marginalized youth in 2010 Vancouver and 2012 London', Sociology 45(5): 765-781.

Introductory readings

Gaskell, G. (2000) 'Individual and Group Interviewing' in M. Bauer and G. Gaskell (eds), Qualitative Researching: Text, Image and Sound, London: Sage, pp 38-56.

Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2008). *InterViews: Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing*. SAGE Publications.

Hopf, C. (2004). 'Qualitative Interviews: An Overview'. In U. Flick, E. von Kardoff, & I. Steinke (Eds.), *A Companion to Qualitative Research* (pp. 203-208). London: Sage.

Wengraf, T. (2001) *Qualitative Research Interviewing: Semi-Structured, Biographical and Narrative Methods*, London: Sage, pp 72-110.

Key texts

Becker, H. and Geer, B. (2004) 'Participant Observation and Interviewing: A Comparison' (and a subsequent exchange with Martin Trow) in Seale, C. (ed) *Social Research Methods: A Reader*, London: Routledge.

Dexter, L.A. (1970) *Elite and Specialised Interviewing*, Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Finch, J. (1992) 'It's Great to Have Someone to Talk To: Ethics and Politics of Interviewing Women' in Hammersley, M. (ed) *Social Research: Philosophy, Politics and Practice*, London: Sage.

Foddy, W. (1993) *Constructing Questions for Interviews and Questionnaires: Theory and Practice in Social Research*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gubrium, J.F. and Holstein, J.A. (2002) *Handbook of Interviewing Research: Context and Method,* Thousand Oaks and London: Sage.

Hermanns, H. (2004). 'Interviewing as an Activity'. In U. Flick, E. von Kardoff, & I. Steinke (Eds.), *A Companion to Qualitative Research*, London: Sage (pp. 209-213).

Holstein, J.A. and Gubrium, J.F. 'The Active Interview' in D. Silverman (ed), *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice*, 2nd edition, London: Sage, pp 140-161.

James, N. and Busher, H. (2009) *Online Interviewing*, London: Sage.

Kvale, S. (2007) *Doing Interviews*, London: Sage.

Oakley, A. (2005) 'Interviewing women: A contradiction in terms?' in Oakley, A. (ed) *The Ann Oakley Reader: Gender, Women and Social Science*, Bristol: Policy Press.

Wengraf, T. (2001) *Qualitative Research Interviewing: Semi-Structured, Biographical and Narrative Methods*, London: Sage.

Contemporary debates

Anderson, J. Adey, P., Bevan, P. (2010) 'Positioning Place: Polylogic Approaches to Research Methodology', *Qualitative Research,* 10(5): 589-604.

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

Harper, D. (2002) 'Talking about pictures: A case for photo elicitation', *Visual Studies*, 17(1): 13-26.
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

Michael, M. (2004). On Making Data Social: Heterogeneity in Sociological Practice. *Qualitative Research*, *4*(1), 5–23. doi:10.1177/1468794104041105

Potter, J. and Mulkay, M. (1985) 'Scientists' interview talk: interviews as a technique for revealing participants' interpretative practices' in Brenner, M., Brown, J., Canter, D. (eds) *The Research Interview: Uses and Approaches*, London: Academic Press.

Schostak, J.F. (2006) *Interviewing and Representation in Qualitative Research*, Maidenhead: Open University Press.

For those doing elite interviews, any of the Symposium, 'Interview Methods in the Social Sciences', (2002) *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 35(4): 663-88) but particularly:

Goldstein, K. 'Getting in the Door: Sampling and Completing Elite Interviews', pp 669-72

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.

Marková, I., Linell, P., & Grossen, M. (2007). *Dialogue in focus groups: Exploring socially shared knowledge*. London: Equinox Publishing Ltd. (Chapter 3)

Introductory readings

Krueger, R. A., & Casey, M.A. (2000). *Focus Groups. A Practical Guide for Applied Research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

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

edition). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Key readings

Belzile, J.A. & Oburg, G. (2012). Where to begin? Grappling with how to use participant interaction in focus group design. Qualitative Research, 12(4), 459-472.

Fern, E. F. (1982). The use of focus groups for idea generation: the effects of group size, acquaintanceship, and moderator on response quantity and quality. *Journal of Marketing Research, 19,* 1–13.

Fern, E. F. (2001) *Advanced Focus Group Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

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

Lunt, P., & Livingstone, S. (1996). Rethinking the focus group in media and communications research. *Journal of Communication*, *46*(2), 79–98.

Marková, I., Linell, P., & Grossen, M. (2007). *Dialogue in focus groups: Exploring socially shared knowledge*. London: Equinox Publishing Ltd.

Morgan, D.L. & Krueger, R.A. (1998). *The Focus Group Kit.* Thousand Oaks: Sage. (6 volumes)

Morgan, D.L. (1993) *Successful Focus Groups: Advancing the State of the Art*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Wilkinson, S. (2006). Analysing interaction in focus groups. In Drew, P., Raymond, G., & Weinberg, D. (Eds.), *Talk and interaction in social research methods* (pp. 72–93). London: Sage Publications.

Contemporary debates

Agar, M., & MacDonald, J. (1995). Focus groups and ethnography. *Human Organization*, 54(1), 78–86.

Bezile, J.A. and Oberg, G. (2012) Where to begin?: Grappling with how to use participant interaction in focus group design, *Qualitative Research* 12(4): 459-472.

Dolan, P., Cookson, R., & Ferguson, B. (1999). Effect of discussion and deliberation on the public's views of priority setting in health care: focus group study. *BMJ, 318*(7188), 916-919.

Johnson, A. (1996). "It's good to talk": The focus group and the sociological imagination. *The Sociological Review*, *44*(3), 517-538.

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

Lindgren, S. (2012) 'It took me about half an hour, but I did it!: Media circuits and affinity spaces around how-to videos on YouTube', European Journal of Communication 27(2): 152-170.

Knowles, C. (2006) 'Seeing race through the lens', Ethnic and Racial Studies, 29(3): 512-29.

Introductory readings

Flick, U. (2009) An Introduction to Qualitative Research, London, Sage, Chapters 18 and 20.

Hine, C. (ed) (2005) *Virtual Methods: Issues in Social Research on the Internet*, London: Berg.

Mitchell, C. (2011) *Doing Visual Research*, London: Sage.

Online Methods

Key texts

Fielding, N., Lee, R.M, and Blank, G. (2008) *The Sage Handbook of Online Research Methods*, London: Sage.

Golub, A. (2010) 'Being in the World (of Warcraft): Raiding, Realism and Knowledge Production in a Massively Multiplayer Online Game', *Anthropological Quarterly* 83(1): 17-45. Hine, C. (2000) *Virtual Ethnography*, London: Sage.

James, N and Busher, H. (2009) *Online Interviewing*, Los Angeles and London: Sage.

Kozinets, R. V. (2010) *Netnography: Doing Ethnographic Research Online*, London and Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Malaby, T. (2009) *Making Virtual Worlds: Linden Labs and Second Life*, New York: Cornell University Press.

Miller, D. (2011) *Tales from Facebook*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Papacharisssi, Z. (2009) 'The virtual geographies of social networks: a comparative analysis of Facebook, LinkedIn and ASmallWorld', *New Media & Society*,
11(1&2): 199-220.

Pink. S. (2007) *Doing Visual Ethnography*, London: Sage.

Turkle, S. (1996) *Life on the Screen: Identity in the Age of the Internet*, London: Weidensfield and Nicolson.

Turkle, S. (2011) *Alone Together: Why We Expect More from Technology and Less from Each Other*, New York: Basic Books

Contemporary debates

Hookaway, N. (2008) 'Entering the blogosphere: some strategies for using blogs in social research', *Qualitative Research* 8(1): 91-113.

Markham, A. and Baym, N.K. (2009) *Internet Inquiry: Conversations about Method*, London: Sage.

Murthy, D. (2011) 'Twitter: Microphone for the Masses?' *Media, Culture & Society*, 3(5) 779-789.

Visual Methods

Key texts

Banks, M. (2001) *Visual Methods in Social Research*, London: Sage.

Barthes, R. (2000) *Camera Lucida: Reflections on Photography*, London: Vintage.

Berger, J. (1972) *Ways of Seeing*, London: Penguin.

Collier, J. and Collier, M. (1986) *Visual Anthropology: Photography as a Research Method*, Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Frosh, P.(2001) 'Inside the Image Factory: Stock Photography and Cultural Production', *Media Culture & Society*, 23(5): 625-646.
Heath, C., Hindmarsh, J., and Luff, P. (2010) *Video in Qualitative Research*: *Analysing Social Interaction in Everyday Life*, London: Sage.
Mitchell, C. (2011) *Doing Visual Research*, London: Sage.

Papademas, D. (2009) 'IVSA Code of Research Ethics and Guidelines', *Visual Studies* 24(3): 250-257.

Pink, S. (2007) *Doing Visual Ethnography*, 2nd edition, London: Sage.

Prosser, J. (1998) *Image-Based Research: A Sourcebook for Qualitative Researchers*, London: Falmer Press.

Rose, G. (2006) *Visual Methodologies*, 2nd ed, London: Sage.Sontag, S. (1979) *On Photography*, London: Penguin.

Van Leeuwen, T. and Jewitt, C. (eds) (2001) *Handbook of Visual Analysis*, London: Sage.

Wang, C. and Burris, M.A. (1994) 'Empowerment through Photo Novella: Portraits of
Participation, *Health Education & Behavior*, 21(2): 171-186.

Contemporary debates

Bagnoli, A. (2009) 'Beyond the Standard Interview: The Use of Graphic Elicitation and Arts-Based Methods', *Qualitative Research*, 9(5): 547-70.

Harper, D. (2002) Talking About Pictures: A Case for Photo Elicitation, *Visual Studies*, 17(1): 13-26.
http://www.nyu.edu/classes/bkg/methods/harper.pdf

Jones, K., Gergen, M., Yallop, J.J. G., de Vallejo, I.L., Roberts, B. and Wright, P. (eds) (2008) Special Issue on Performative Social Science, *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 9(2):

http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/issue/view/10

Laurier, E., Strebel, I., and Brown, B. (2008) 'Video Analysis: Lessons from Professional Video Editing Practice', *Forum: Qualitative Social Research,* 9(3).

Moreno-Figueroa, M.G. (2008) 'Looking Emotionally: Racism, Photography and Intimacy in Research', *History of the Human Sciences* 21(4): 66-83.

Pink, S (2009) *Sensory Ethnography*, London: Sage.

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

Hsieh, H.-F., & Shannon, S.E. (2005) Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. Qualitative Health Research, 15(9), 1277-1288.

Attride-Stirling, J. (2001) 'Thematic Networks: an Analytic Tool for Qualitative Research', *Qualitative Research* 1(3): 385-405.

Introductory readings

Flick, U. (2009) An Introduction to Qualitative Research, London: Sage, Chapter 23.

Joffe, H. and Yardley, L (2004) 'Content and Thematic Analysis', in D. Marks and L. Yardley, eds: Research Methods for Clinical and Health Psychology. Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, Chapter 4.

Key texts

Boyatzis, RE (1998) *Transforming Qualitative Information*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bradley, E.H, Curry, L and Devers, J (2007) Qualitative data analysis for health services research: Developing taxonomy, themes, and theory. Health service Research 42: 1758-1772.

Braun, V, and Clarke, V (2006) 'Using thematic analysis in psychology', *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 3: 77- 101.

Feredey, J. and Cochrane, E.M. (2006) 'Demonstrating Rigor Using Thematic Analysis: A hybrid approach of inductive and deductive coding and theme development,' *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 5*(1): 80-92.

Miles, M.B., Huberman, A.M. (1994) *Qualitative Data Analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd edn.)London & Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ryan, G.W. and Bernard, H.R. (2000) 'Data management and analysis methods' in Denzin & Lincoln, eds, *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 2nd ed, London: Sage.

Saldaña, J. (2009). The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers. Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA. Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA

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 Co-ordinating (EPPI-)Centre*, Social Science Research Unit, 18 Woburn Square, London WC1H 0NS
http://eppi.ioe.ac.uk/cms/Default.aspx?tabid=188

Seale C (1999) 'Quality in qualitative research' *Qualitative Inquiry* 5:465-478.

Oakley, A. (2002) 'Social science and evidence-based everything: the case of education', *Educational Review* 54: 277-286.

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

Hirschman, E.C. (1987). People as products: Analysis of a complex marketing exchange. *Journal of Marketing,* 51. (98-108).

Cunningham, G. B., Sagas, M., Satore, M. L., Amsden, M. L., & Schellhase, A. (2004). Gender representation in the NCAA News: Is the glass half full or half empty? *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, 50(11/12), 861-870

Introductory readings

Franzosi R P (2004) 'Content analysis,' in: Hardy, M. and Bryman, A. (eds) Handbook of Data Analysis, Thousand Oaks: Sage, pp 547-565.

Key texts

Franzosi R P (2004) *From Words to Numbers: Narrative, Data and Social Science*, New York: CUP.

Hsieh, H.-F., & Shannon, S.E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, 15(9), 1277-1288.

Krippendorff, K (2004) *Content Analysis: An Introduction to its Methodology*, 2nd edition, London: Sage

Mayring, P. (2000). *Qualitative content analysis*. Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 1(2).

Neuendorf K A (2002) *The Content Analysis Guidebook*, London: Sage.

Weber, R P (1985) *Basic Content Analysis*, Beverly Hills: Sage.

Contemporary debates

Althaus S L, J A Edy, P F Phalen (2001) 'Using substitutes for full-text news stories in content analysis: which text is best?' *American Journal of Political Science*, 45(3): 707-724.

Janowitz M (1976) 'Content analysis and the study of socio-political change,' *Journal of Communication,* 26(4): 10-21.

Kracauer S (1952) 'The challenge of qualitative content analysis', *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 16: 631-42.

Krippendorff, K (2004) 'Reliability in content analysis: some common misconceptions and recommendations', *Human Communication Research*, 30(3): 411-33.

Markoff J, G Shapiro, S R Weitman (1974) 'Toward the integration of content analysis and general methodology', in: Heise, D R (ed) *Sociological Methodology* San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.

Neumann W R (1989) 'Parallel content analysis: old paradigms and new proposals', *Public Communication and Behavior*, 2: 205-289

Woolley J T (2000) 'Using media-based data in studies of politics',

American Journal of Political Science, 44: 156-173.

<u>Lecture 9: Discourse Analysis</u>

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

Bonilla Silva, E. and Forman, T.A. (2000) '"I am not a racist but…" mapping White college students' racial ideology in the USA', Discourse & Society 11(1): 50-85.

Stokoe, E. (2010) 'I'm not gonna hit a lady: Conversation analysis, membership categorization and men's denials of violence towards women', Discourse & Society, 21(1): 59-82.

Introductory readings

Flick, U. (2009) *An Introduction to Qualitative Research*, 4th edition, London: Sage, Chapter 24.

Potter, J. (2004) 'Discourse analysis as a way of analyzing naturally occurring talk', in Silverman, D. (ed) *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice*, 2nd edition, London: Sage.

Key texts

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change.* Oxford: Polity Press.

Hall, S. (Ed). (1997). Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices. London: Sage/Open University Press. Particularly Chapter 1: 'The Work of Representations', pp. 13-75.

Kendall, G. And Wickham, G. (1999) *Using Foucault's Methods*, London: Sage.

Leach J (2000) Rhetorical analysis, in: Bauer MW & G Gaskell (eds) *Qualitative researching with text, image and sound. A practical handbook for social researchers*, London, Sage, 207-226.

Parker, I. (1992). *Discourse Dynamics.* Routledge: London.

Potter, J & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Discourse and Social Psychology:*

Beyond Attitudes and Behaviour. London: Sage.

Titscher, S., Meyer, M., Wodak, R. and Vetter, E. (2000) *Methods of Text and Discourse Analysis*, London: Sage.

Wetherall, M., Taylor, S. & Yates, S.J. (Eds) (2001). *Discourse Theory and Practice: A Reader.* London: Sage.

Contemporary debates

Billig, M.(2008) 'The language of Critical Discourse Analysis: the case of nominalization,' *Discourse & Society,* 19(6): 763-800.

Chouliaraki, L. and Fairclough, N. (1999) *Discourse in Late Modernity: Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Fairclough, N. (2008) 'The language of Critical Discourse Analysis: A reply to Michael Billig', *Discourse & Society* 19(6): 811-819.

<u>Lecture 10: Writing and Disseminating Qualitative Research</u>

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

Back, L. (2002) 'Dancing and wrestling with scholarship: Things to do and things to avoid in a PhD Career', Sociological Research Online, 7(4): http://www.socresonline.org.uk/7/4/back.html

Sparkes, A.C. (2007) 'Embodiment, Academics, and the Audit Culture: a Story Seeking Consideration', Qualitative Research 7(4): 521-550.

Introductory readings

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

Mauthner, M., Birch, M., Jessop, J., Miller, T. (2002) *Ethics in Qualitative Research*, London: Sage.

Key texts

Back, L. (2007) *The Art of Listening*, Oxford: Berg.

Becker, H. S. (2007) *Writing for Social Scientists: How to Start and Finish your Thesis, Book or Article*, 2nd ed., Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Clifford, J. (1983). On ethnographic authority. *Representations*, (2), 118–146.

De Laine, M. (2000). *Fieldwork, participation and practice: Ethics and dilemmas in qualitative research*. Sage Publications Ltd. (especially chapter 6)

Hammersley, M. (1993) *Social Research: Philosophy, Politics, and Practice.* London: Sage.

Ely, M., Anzul, M., Downing, M. and Vinz, R. (1997) *On Writing Qualitative Research: Living By Words*, London: The Falmer Press.

Lee-Treweek, G. & Lingokle, S. (2000) *Danger in the Field: Risk and Ethics in Social Research*. London: Routledge

Liamputtong, P. (2006) *Researching the Vulnerable: A Guide to Sensitive Research Methods*, London: Sage.

Silverman, D. (1997) 'Towards an Aesthetics of Social Research', in Silverman, D. (ed) *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice*, London: Sage.

Stanley, L. and Wise, S. (1993) *Breaking Out Again: Feminist Ontology and Epistemology*, 2nd ed. London, Routledge.

Van Maanen, J. (1988). *Tales of the field. On writing ethnography.* University of Chicago Press

Wolf, M. (1993) *A Thrice-Told Tale: Feminism, Postmodernism, and Ethnographic Responsibility*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Contemporary debates

Aldred, R. (2008) *Ethical and Political Issues in Contemporary Research Relationships*, Sociology 42(5): 887-903.

Law, J. (2004) *After Method: Mess in Social Science Research*, London: Routledge.

Richardson, L. (1993). Poetics, dramatics, and transgressive validity: The case of the skipped line. *Sociological Quarterly*, *34*(4), 695–710.

Fine, G.A. (1993). Ten lies of ethnography. Moral dilemmas of field research. Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 22(3), 267-294

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 reprentations 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 underpining 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?

SEMINAR 1

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.

Table 1

Data Inventory

Data type	Quantity	Original data source	Original (intended) data audience
Interviews	33	Informants	Analysis for this study
Strategic report	42 pages	Strategic Planning Committee	CITS Planning Committee, State U President, and Provost
Chronological journals	6, with 1,660 pages total	CITS dean	Personal use and record keeping
Bi-weekly e-mail reports	7, covering the 13 months prior to CITS's launch date	Assistant to the provost	Provost
Archival records	Approximately 10,000 documents	Meeting minutes, letters, notes, copies of speeches, and memos spanning 4 years	Committee members, letters to state leaders, other campuses, colleges, universities, state governor
CITS Strategic Plan Report (years 8–11)	A six-year review and plan for the future; 50 pages	CITS Dean's Office	CITS stakeholders, including donors, faculty, potential new hires, recruiters, and industry leaders
Observational data	Approximately 100 hours	Principal investigator's notes from two 3-day industry conferences at State U	Analysis for this study
Conference video	1 hour, 29 minutes	Taped by professional videographer	Conference attendees; members of information schools
Conference minutes	63 pages	Compilation of notes written by 10 different conference participants	Conference attendees
Materials from peer schools (e.g., promotional materials, letters from the dean)	272 pages, from approximately 15 information school programs	Corporate communication offices, public relations offices of individual information schools	Potential students and their families, donors, and recruiters
CITS in-house document	4 pages	CITS dean	CITS career center, recruiters, new employees
CITS Web site		In-house corporate communications office materials	Prospective and current students, faculty, donors, and recruiters, and the general public

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

28

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

potential for bias in retrospective interview data. The dean's metacommentaries also offer a form of member check on the analysis, i.e., verification with an informant that an analysis is credible, as well as further theoretical and practical insight into the phenomena we observed. We present selected quotations from the dean's metacommentaries following the discussion of each of the second-order themes in the findings below.

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.

SEMINAR 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 homelesseness 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?*

SEMINAR 4

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/you 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;
- How did you come to live in England? (Reasons? How? Social network)
- 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)
- perception, knowledge and usage of medical services: Chinese health centre/Chinese medicine/GP/alternative medicine? When to use what? How often? Any difficulties: language, accessibility, affordability, and cultural differences with medical officers? Suggestions for improvement?
-

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

SEMINAR 8

Study Title: (From Digital Spy – Internet General discussion forum- May 2005)
Topic: Should the Queen retire?

Forum members Gender and Age (*names and loggings have been deleted for confidentiality purposes)	Question: Should the Queen retire? Comments:
Member 1 gender: Female Age: 52	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?
Member 2 gender: Male Age: 42	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!
Member 3 gender: Male Age: 70	It's a job for life, monarchs don't retire, they die of old age or at the point of sword.
Member 4 gender: Female Age: 45	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.
Member 5 gender: Male Age: 51	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.

	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 **gender: Female** **Age: 30**	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.
Member 7 **gender: Male** **Age: 56**	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.
Member 8 **gender: Female** **Age: 31**	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.
Member 9 **gender: Male** **Age: 60**	Her Majesty seems to be still battling on and there is no reason for her to retire.
Member 10 **gender: Female** **Age: 37**	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.

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.