AIDS education: a conversation with an african-american adolescent

Typ	Zeitschriftenartikel
Autor	Marjorie Davis
Publikation	Journal for a Just and Caring Education
Band	3
Ausgabe	3
Seiten	289-297
Datum	July 1997
Hinzugefügt am	Di 29 Jan 2013 16:20:13 EST
Geändert am	Di 29 Jan 2013 16:21:04 EST

Tags:

2013-qualitative-lather

Notizen:

P: A researcher's reflections on what she learned from a 13-year-old girl who looked at the survey instrument on AIDS the researcher was planning on giving to local youth. The girl was angry at the survey's phrasing and statements, saying that the survey (which she saw as coming from adults, who are supposed to teach kids things) was inappropriate and needed to tell kids not to have sex and get AIDS. It was this girl's outburst of anger that disrupted the researcher's planned study in a way that actually let her get deeper into, and learn more about, how to reach and research youth with HIV/AIDS.

Becoming qualitative researchers: an introduction

Typ	Buch
Autor	Corrine Glesne
Auflage	4th ed
Ort	Boston
Verlag	Pearson
Datum	2011
Anzahl der Seiten	317
ISBN	9780137047970
Kurztitel	Becoming qualitative researchers
Bibliothekskatalog	Library of Congress ISBN
Signatur	H61 .G555 2011
Hinzugefügt am	Di 15 Jan 2013 14:59:57 EST
Geändert am	Di 15 Jan 2013 14:59:57 EST

Tags:

2013-qualitative-lather, Methodology, Social sciences

Notizen:

Chapter 1 - Meeting Qualitative Inquiry

Q 4: [Quantitative and qualitative researchers both] "state a purpose, pose a problem or raise a question, define a research population, select research methods, develop a time frame, collect and analyze data, and present outcomes. They also rely (explicitly or implicitly) on theory and are concerned with rigor."

P 5: Logical positivism is the paradigm that research built linearly upon itself until we knew how the world worked. Thomas Kuhn was the first to question this.

Q 5: "A paradigm... is a framework or philosophy of science that makes assumptions about the nature of reality and truth, the kinds of questions to explore, and how to go about doing so."

P 5: Ontology is what you believe about reality.

P 5: Epistemology is the study of the nature of knowledge.

P 7: Great table on paradigms, partially reproduced below.

- Positivism (also postpositivism and logical empiricism) - research is to predict, methods are experimental or quasi-experimental, causal comparative
- Interpretivism (also constructivism, naturalism, phenomenological, hermaneutical) - research is to understand, methods are ethnography, phenomenology, symbolic interactionism, narrative analysis, grounded theory
- Critical theory (also feminist theory and critical race theory) - research is to emancipate, methods are critical ethnography, feminist research, participatory action, critical discourse analysis
- Poststructuralism (also postmodernism, postcolonialism, post-Fordist) - research is to deconstruct, methods are deconstruction, geneaology, rhizoanalysis, paralogic legitimation

N: There's a more detailed history/overview of the growth of these paradigms that I skip here because we covered it in Dr. Dolby's class in May 2012.

P 16-23 : Different methods -- ethnography, life history (getting at a picture of an individual life or lives), grounded theory, case studies, action research (focused on getting stuff done)

P 22: Three types of case studies: intrinsic (understand that actual case better), instrumental (use the case to gain insight into or change perceptions of something), and collective (use a few instrumental cases to look at a general condition/population).

Chapter 2 - prestudy tasks: doing what is good for you

P 29-30: Choose a topic that's of interest to you, but not so personal/emotional that it's about your therapy.

P 31-33: Use literature reviews as an ongoing process to inform and inspire your methods, broaden your horizons, and make sure you're going into new territory with the knowledge you're contributing.

N: What is the difference between a literature review and a theory review? Is one type of lit review a theory lit review? Is lit reviewing about "facts" and theory about "framing of the facts"?

P 35-36: There are several layers of theories.

- Low level - empirical generalizations or substantive theories; these are outcomes from related studies.
- Middle-range - formal theory, general theory, middle-range propositions: explain a class of phenomena (examples in book: revolution, delinquency, antagonism)

N ^: Are there higher-level theories? Or... help me understand what theories are, what the mapping is, how to think about them because right now I just have one big brain-lump labeled "THEORY" and that does me little good.

P 39-44 : Design your research statement and question, select a site.

N ^: I'm skipping taking notes on these because I'm mostly using "The Craft of Research" on research questions (and this repeats much of it) and I have my sites (or at least as of this January 2013 writing, think I do).

P 44- : Study participant selection, some options:

- typical case sampling
- extreme/deviant case sampling
- homogenous sampling (describe people "of this type")
- maximum variation sampling (search for common patterns, try to get people of all different types)
- theoretical sampling (select based on your evolving theory, mostly grounded theorists use this)
- snowball/chain/network sampling (one participant leads to another; mostly a getting-started point, not recommended if you have other options)
- convenience sampling (what's easy? not recommended at all)

P 46: How many people do you need to interview? Morse (1994, 225) suggests 30-50 interviews are needed for ethnographic/grounded theory research.

N ^: Do I fit that with my current design? Let's see. 4 faculty per school for 8 faculty total... times 3 interviews per semester, times 2 semesters is 48 interviews... plus pre/post interviews and admin interviews? Yeah, I have plenty.

P 47-50 : select research techniques (longer discussion here than I'm taking notes on) and consider how to make your research trustworthy; who can check you, how can you check yourself, see your biases?

P 50-59 : Consider timeframe for everything; it usually takes longer than you think it will. Factor in IRB.

P 59-60: Define your role as a researcher.

N^: What is mine? I need to consider this.

Chapter 3 - Being there: developing understanding through participant observation

P 65: Where on the continuum from observer to participant should you place yourself? It depends, but remember to do it consciously, and you may adjust as needed.

Q 71: Wolcott (1981) suggests four more strategies to guide observations: (1) observations by a broad sweep, (2) observations of nothing in particular, (3) observations that search for paradoxes, and (4) observations that search for problems facing the group.

P ^: The "nothing in particular" is to see what stands out when you're not looking for specific things.

P 83-85: collaboratively created visual data; researcher gives participants cameras, for instance. Consent, etc. is important to consider; do you want to anonymize, blur faces, etc? Will photos be published, etc? Photos/videos tend to make participants more eager to review/read/get copies of the research.

N^: Is this something I want to do for my dissertation, since classrooms/curricula are so often such embodied spaces, and space designs are a huge factor in learning experience design?

P 90: table on different kinds of observational data: setting appearance, acts, events, processes, talk, documents, and artifacts

Q 94: As participation increases, marginality decreases, and you begin to experience what others see, think and feel. This can be absolutely worthwhile for yourself and research participants; no amount of advantageous marginality can replace the sense of the things that participation offers. How you combine participation and observation will be dictated by what you hope to understand, your theoretical stance, and your research participants.

Chapter 4 - Making words fly: developing understanding through interviewing

P 102: Types of interviews - structured, semi-structured, unstructured/conversational

P 107: Differentiates between "presupposition questions" and "leading questions." The former presupposes the respondent has something to say; for instance instead of asking "Are you satisfied with volunteering? In what ways yes, in what ways no?" you can say "I will ask you about your satisfaction/dissatisfaction with volunteering; let's start with how it's satisfying" and presuppose there's satisfaction/dissatisfaction involved. This is not leading. Leading is when you make it obvious which way you "want" them to answer.

P 110: Pilot your questions with (ideally) the group you want to study, but not your actual study subjects. Get your pilot respondents to also criticize and help you shape your questions.

P 114: How long should an interview last? An hour starts being the point of diminishing returns for most. How often will you meet? Regularity is helpful, and it's good to agree on a couple sessions in advance if you need more data.

Q 114: [sample text you can use with subjects] "I would like to meet with you at least two times, and maybe more, certainly no more than is comfortable for you. And you may - without any explanation - stop any particular session or all further sessions."

N ^: Citation of (Meho, 2006) here on online interviewing, which I need to read. This is Meho, L. 2006. Email interviewing in qualitative research: A methodological disucssion. Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology, 57(10), 1284-1295.

Chapter 5 - Personal Dimensions: Field relations and reflexivity

P 142: Sometimes you'll need to take action to fit in -- standing up for "the side" of the people you're building rapport with, or ignoring "bad things" for the same reason (if someone makes racist remarks, etc), or modifying your public behavior (displays of affection, etc).

P 146: You may need to take breaks and blow off steam during your fieldwork; your journal is a place where you can do this. Gain distance periodically.

P 154: Be attuned to your emotions -- when you feel angry, sad, excited, etc. your personal views are likely

at work. Explore those feelings and what they tell you about who you are in relationship to your participants, what you're learning, what you might be preventing yourself from seeing and learning.

Q 158: Thinking about the interplay of subjectivity, embodiment, and positioning of yourself with that of research participants assists in data interpretation and representation. In fact, how you position yourself within the text is yet another positioning, a "textual positioning" (Madison 2005). Ask yourself how those in the research site would react to your interpretations, to your words. Is your interpretation paternalistic at times? ...How is the representation missing the complexity of the lives studied?

Q 158-159: Rather than the voice of the expert who authoritatively presents "results," the reflexive stance involves honestly and openly locating your positions and positionalities in the research, reflecting upon how they interacted with your observations and interpretations.

P 159-160: A set of reflexive questions based on Patton's work that can be used to prompt reflection.

Chapter 6 - But is it ethical? Considering what's "right"

P 164: Quotes the AAA Code of Ethics -- especially pay attention to the following...

Q 164: Anthropological researchers have primary ethical obligations to the people, species, and materials they study and to the people with whom they work. These obligations can supersede the goal of seeking new knowledge...

Q 164: Anthropological researchers must determine in advance whether their hosts/providers of information wish to remain anonymous or receive recognition, and make every effort to comply with those wishes. Researchers must present to their research participants the possible impacts of the choices, and make clear that despite their best efforts, anonymity may be compromised or recognition fail to materialize.

N^: Use for Leadership case study on RTR IRB

P 181-182: Current IRB standards are being challenged by "feminist communitarianism." (Lincoln and Denzin 2008, pp 542-543) has more on this; it's (according to Lincoln & Denzin) "communitarian, egalitarian, democratic, critical, caring, engaged, performative, social justice oriented" and creates a community characterized by "moral obligation on the part of qualitative researchers, responsibility and obligation to participants, to respondents, to consumers of research, and to themselves as qualitative field-workers... [and mandates] a stance that is democratic, reciprocal, and reciprocating rather than objective and objectifying"

Chapter 7 - Finding your story: data analysis

P 185: Quick definition of conversation analysis taken from (Bloor and Wood, 2006)

Q 186: In other words, the context in which the narrator tells the story influences what is told and how it is told. Who asks the questions that invite a story? How are some stories encouraged or silenced?

P 186: Mentions Gubrium & Holstein's 2009 work on "narrative ethnography" - see (Gubrium and Holstein, 2009) for full quote.

P 190: Create and keep a filing system of some sort. Consider keeping, in particular, a file for quotations to use for epigraphs and so forth.

P 193: How can you tell the difference between theoretical saturation and a too-small sample pool? No absolute answer, but it's something to pay attention to.

P 206-207: (Weitzman, 2000) classifies CAQDAS (computer-assisted qualitative data analysis software) programs as follows:

- Text retrievers - search for words/phrases
- Text-based managers - holds text and metadata on that text, allows you to organize/sort/retrieve it according to different criteria
- Code and retrieve programs - apply codes to text, then retrieve data according to codes
- Code-based theory builders - Code and retrieve programs that also graphically represent relationships between codes; lets you create hierarchies
- Conceptual network builders - network displays that show relationships among concepts

N^: Right now I have zotero, ack, and my brain. I should probably work more with zotero export to plaintext so I can sift it with ack.

P 207: Nice quote by Gibbs from "Analyzing Qualitative Data" (2007, p. 40) on plenty of great qualitative analysis was done without software before it became available, so software tools aren't actually needed.

P 208-209: (Wolcott, 1994) "Transforming Qualitative Data: Description, Analysis, and Interpretation" posits those three means of data transformation as stages you can use to move from organization to meaning of data.

N^: Might make a good blog post in the midst of my dissertation, and help me explain the coding process to participants if I frame it in this way.

P 213: An outline that one can put all of one's research data into.

N^: If I ever teach qualitative methods to newbies, I should give them this page as an outline for their first assignment. Also Appendix A, "guide for developing a qualitative research proposal."

Chapter 8: Crafting your story: writing up qualitative data

P 219: The writer's roles are threefold: artist, translator/interpreter, and transformer.

P 227: Mentions Stephen King's 10% rule -- every draft, cut the previous draft by 10%.

P 229-231: Possibilities for text organization:

- thematic
- natural history approach ("retrace your own steps and perceptions")
- chronological
- zoom lens - move between descriptive detail and theoretical abstraction
- narrative
- separate narrative and interpretation
- amalgamation -- describe the "typical" person or day
- data display (charts, graphs, etc)

P 233-234: Examples of different ways to end a write-up: academic-style "essence" statements, "looking forward" statements that point towards the next project, and journalistic-style writing that leaves the last line as a quote from a research participant. From (Delamont, 1992) 's analysis of endings of qualitative

write-ups.

P 236: There are tradeoffs you can think about when deciding on presentation form. For instance, what are the pluses/minuses of storytelling vs problem statement + lit review + methods + findings + conclusion, or a separate literature section vs integrating it into the text?

P 237: If you're quoting your subjects and your interview notes are accessible (online, etc) you should cite/link-to them.

P 246: Examples of nonconventional formats: Troubling the Angels (Lather and Smithies, 1997), In the Realm of the Diamond Queen (Tsing, 1993).

P 247: Autoethnography is the sort of writing you do when you put yourself into an sociocultural context you're writing about. Readers are often asked to relive the experience with writers.

P 247-249: Many autoethnography resources, including (Reed-Danahay, 1997) on the phenomenon and (Ellis, 1996) and (Boechner, 2000) as examples. (Richardson 2000, p. 931) describes how readers are asked to relive the experience with the author. (Pigeon, 1998) is an example reliving a PhD. And Mystory (Denzin 2008, 123) is like autethnography but collides sources and then uses those stories to critique some aspect of society.

N^: these are notes for me for further reading -- I'd like to write a memo/blog on this.

P 250-255: Poetic transcription as a writing technique, with examples. More at (Glesne, 1997) - That rare feeling: Re-presenting research through poetic transcription. Qualitative Inquiry, 3(2), 202-221.

P 255-259: Ethnodrama as a writing technique, with more resources here if I need to draw upon them later.

N^: "Handle With Care" is an example of an ethnodrama on cancer, with scripts pieced together from "data."

P 259-260: Short stories or ethnographic novels are another format -- nothing new.

N^: Tracy Kidder is a good example.

P 260-262: there are tons of formats you could use for your output -- film, painting... be creative! what message will you send with your medium?

Meeting qualitative inquiry -- Prestudy tasks : doing what is good for you -- Being there : developing understanding through participant observation -- Making words fly : developing understanding through interviewing -- Personal dimensions : field relations and reflexivity -- But is it ethical? Considering what's "right" -- Finding your story : data analysis -- Crafting your story : writing up qualitative data -- Improvising a song of the world : language and representation -- The continuing search

---

Design Across Disciplines

Typ	Dissertation
Autor	Shanna R. Daly
Universität	Purdue University

Ort	West Lafayette
Datum	August 2008
Anzahl der Seiten	189
Sprache	en
Hinzugefügt am	Di 05 Mär 2013 06:42:18 EST
Geändert am	Di 05 Mär 2013 06:43:22 EST

Tags:

2013-qualitative-lather

Notizen:

P 38: Uses 2 frameworks: one describing features of a design task that determined participant recruitment from different disciplines, the other being phenomenography (what is it to be aware of an aspect of the world) and its specific subset of variation theory that shaped the research approach

P 39-41: Phenomenography is a very engineering-ish approach that sounds like a reply to post-positivism's decentering: "there is only one world, but it is a world that we (as individuals) experience." It's been used in education ("how do different students understand and experience the same concept?")

N 41: Defends sample size by saying phenomenographical samples are "traditionally small" (she had 20 participants, which I don't think is small at all!)

P 41: Sampling method is for as wide a variation as possible in discipline

P 42: Used structured questions with unstructured follow-ups

N 42-45: Spends a lot of time explaining the approach and defending its "rigor" -- interviewer should not "lead" participants and make sure all data comes "from them," don't even transcribe things until all interviews are done because otherwise transcription will influence the future interviews, etc. -- all this points to a distanced positionality.

P 46: 3 outcomes of a phenomenographic study: description of outcome space, picture of categories of description and their relationship, description of categories.

N ^: Does picture mean, literally, "graphic"?

Q 47: A criticism of many qualitative studies is researcher bias.

N^: Sounds like she's trying to remove this as much as possible instead of embracing it.

P 47: Member-checking in phenomenography is used only for transcript accuracy, not for analysis verification (participants can't member-check something that's been aggregated from data that includes people that aren't them).

Q 48: In the end, finding professional designers who were willing to be participans played a more significant role than the balance of all criteria [of diversity, namely gender, years of experience, and domain of design].

N^: Participant selection was constrained by reality/sanity bounds.

P 51: In the disciplinary sample, a lot of engineers were included deliberately because engineering is heavily associated with design, and the researcher is an engineer.

N^: Speaking of herself in the third person. Also, why not just say "this was an engineering education dissertation"? Was Shanna trying to reach as broad a design audience as possible?

P 55: Describes the process of piloting interview protocol; tested with art/writing grad student and chemical engineering grad student, so that it was piloted with one discipline Shanna was associated with (engineering) and one she wasn't (art).

N^: This makes the informal "I'll ask my friends!" protocol sound more formal.

P 56-59: The interview protocol is given here; it is a short list of questions that spans 2 pages (1 full page and 2 half-pages).

P 59: Interviews were 30-60 min

P 61-66: Includes a few versions of her categories (one of her final "research outcomes") and how they evolved; displays an early categorization and then a brief critique of what she realized wasn't quite right, and then how this got reworked for the next version

P 66-67 : Describes researcher bias as a chemical engineer and dancer/choreographer, and describes frustration feelings from people reacting to her doing both by thinking they were super-different; Shanna believes there are fundamental similarities

P 67: Shanna says she did not impart this bias to participants and did not let it influence her analysis, because she was aware she held this bias

N^: ...really?

Eliciting narrative through the in-depth interview

Typ	Zeitschriftenartikel
Zusammenfassung	Interviews that elicit narratives can be more meaningful than interviews based on a question-and-answer format. A study investigating the fear of crime elicited rich data when interviewees were allowed to tell stories in response to open-ended questions. An understanding of the gestalt of the narrative and its connection to the psychological implications of free association can help social scientists understand the meaning of the interview.
Publikation	Qualitative Inquiry
Band	3
Ausgabe	1
Seiten	53-70
Datum	1997
Hinzugefügt am	Di 22 Jan 2013 15:56:54 EST
Geändert am	Di 22 Jan 2013 16:07:07 EST

Tags:

2013-qualitative-lather

Notizen:

Interviews that elicit narratives can be more meaningful than interviews based on a question-and-answer format. A study investigating the fear of crime elicited rich data when interviewees were allowed to tell stories in response to open-ended questions. An understanding of the gestalt of the narrative and its connection to the psychological implications of free association can help social scientists understand the meaning of the interview.

P: It can be difficult to talk with people about subjects difficult to them (traumatic experiences, fears they have, etc) because their defenses get in the way, even if they're trying to be open about it. The biographical interpretative method, first developed for interviews of Holocaust survivors, was created for exactly this. It takes the stance that there is a whole ("gestalt") behind the parts that the researcher should strive to elicit and not destroy -- a delicate extraction, a peeking at the anxieties through the thicket of defenses. There are 4 principles: use open-ended and not closed questions, elicit stories, avoid "why" questions, and follow up using respondents' ordering/phrasing.

N ^: Seems fairly straightforward -- if I decide to use this for my narrative elicitation, the citation is in this paper.

E-mail interviewing in qualitative research: A methodological discussion

Typ	Zeitschriftenartikel
Autor	Lokman I. Meho
Publikation	Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology
Band	57
Ausgabe	10
Seiten	1284-1295
Datum	08/2006
DOI	10.1002/asi.20416
ISSN	15322882, 15322890
Kurztitel	E-mail interviewing in qualitative research
URL	http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/asi.20416
Heruntergeladen am	Mi 23 Jan 2013 10:48:26 EST
Bibliothekskatalog	CrossRef
Hinzugefügt am	Mi 23 Jan 2013 10:48:26 EST
Geändert am	Mi 23 Jan 2013 10:48:26 EST

Tags:

2013-qualitative-lather

Notizen:

P 1284: This paper looks at email interviewing - "online, asynchronous, in-depth interviewing within the context of qualitative research" -- as a method. It's previously been lumped into "online qualitative research methods" but is distinct from surveys, etc.

P 1286-1287: tables summarizing the studies they found that used email interviewing -- number of participants, number of dropouts, etc.

P 1285-1288: pluses/minuses of email interviewing

- scheduling is easier
- cost is low (no travel, no transcription)
- enables geographically spread out groups to communicate
- may be more comfortable for shy people
- some people may respond slowly, or drop out

P 1288-1289: recruitment is usually via online means -- message boards, etc. Do follow-up emails because some people delete emails. Also, consent forms can be done via email as well instead of on paper, but make sure you do them, and consider data protection and anonymity measures.

P 1289-1291: Email interviews can have just as good data quality as face-to-face ones (there have been several studies comparing these). Interviewers must be skilled with online interviews -- compensating for the lack of body language and tone of voice, probing with good follow-up questions afterwards (knowing that some participants won't respond to follow-up probes), etc.

N ^: If I consider doing online ethnography/interviews, those will be good sources to look at to think about how I will get good data quality, and show others that my data quality is high.

P: ends with a how-to on doing email interviews

Keywords in Qualitative Methods

Typ	Buch
Autor	M Bloor
Autor	F Wood
Ort	Thousand Oaks, CA
Verlag	Sage
Datum	2006
Hinzugefügt am	Mi 20 Mär 2013 15:32:21 EDT
Geändert am	Mi 20 Mär 2013 15:33:03 EDT

Tags:

2013-qualitative-lather

Notizen:

N: Quote below comes from Glesne's "Becoming Qualitative Researchers," 4th ed.

Q 39: Conversation analysis studies the various practices adopted by conversational participants during ordinary everyday talk. This may include how participants negotiate overlaps and interruptions, how various failures (such as hearing and understanding problems) are dealt with during the interaction and how conversations are opened and terminated.

N^: This is a positive framing of conversation analysis (CA) compared to (Parker 2004) chapter 7, which critiques it as a pale shadow of discourse analysis. It seems to me to be a technique that has its place, just like every other -- and strengths and weaknesses, like every other.

N^: I won't do this in my dissertation, but CART during interviews opens up some interesting possibilities for CA on those interviews either during or after the session.

Passion at work: blogging practices of knowledge workers

Typ	Dissertation
Autor	Lilia Efimova
Universität	Novay
Ort	Enschede
Datum	2009
Sprache	English
Kurztitel	Passion at work
Bibliothekskatalog	Open WorldCat
Hinzugefügt am	Mo 29 Okt 2012 16:01:52 EDT
Geändert am	Mo 29 Okt 2012 16:01:52 EDT

Tags:

2013-qualitative-lather

Notizen:

N: This was a dissertation completed by a student in the Netherlands that studied the blogging practices of knowledge workers. I chose it for a few reasons: first, she was doing her data collection online and navigating public/private spaces and relationships in a similar way as what I see myself doing, and second, her approach and attitude was very transparent -- she blogged memos to herself throughout her work, and her blog posts are as much a "methodology section" as the formal chapter in her printed dissertation, and I found the interplay fascinating. All the notes below are based solely on the printed dissertation paper.

Q 17: Somewhere in 2004 I shared Italian food and some of my methodological frustrations with Torill Mortensen, also a blogger, who had just completed
her PhD studying text-based multi-user computer games.

N^: This is the most conversational and human-embedded opening to a methods section I've ever seen. She names people! She shares food with them! She admits the story as part of the process! This is in contrast to Shanna's "I am objective and speak of myself in the third person" approach and even Alice's brisk "I did this, that, and the other" fact-stating.

P 18-19: Describes her paradigm as interpretive, and explains why choosing and articulating a paradigm is so important. Explicitly acknowledges that her thinking and research evolved a great deal in the process.

P 20-26: Efimova provides a detailed literature review of multiple aspects of researching using blog data; prior work done, analysis tools that can be used, limitations, assumptions, various uses of data and technology. She draws a broad picture of the possible terrain, then locates herself within it.

P 27: Includes a snippet from one of her blog posts in the middle of the chapter to illustrate a point about her research approach.

N^: This is incredibly cool -- it's like a sidebar, a different way of quoting yourself that makes it clear that these are different versions of you speaking at different levels of polish and at different points in time.

P 28-30: Describes Efimova's decision to become a participant researcher -- that is, she began blogging herself when she began studying bloggers. This helped her understand the experiences of bloggers more deeply. Her blogging practice also gave her something to compare to the practices of her subjects, and made her an "insider" that could more freely move about and be introduced within the community as "one of them."

N^: The researcher is transformed by her research.

P 30-31: Efimova also used blogging as a way to make sense of her research while she was doing it and also as a way to involve participants.

Q 31: As I blogged on the progress of my research, other bloggers could easily follow those posts, creating influences and feedback loops that researchers usually learn to avoid in order to escape "contaminating their data". I have learnt to embrace them in my research...

N: But this did not mean she let all hell break loose in terms of "anything goes" building relationships between herself and her subjects.

Q 31: I tried to vary the degree of closeness to the participants between and within specific studies. For example, when selecting bloggers for interviews I made an effort to talk to people more distant from myself (for example, those unlikely to be reading my weblog).

P 31-36: Writing style and role conflict created by being a participant-researcher, a researcher and a blogger -- how to keep this project from being endless and unformed, how to react when the "researcher" reaction to an occurrence and the"friend" or "fellow blogger" reaction might be different? Efimova doesn't offer neat answers, but instead offers excerpts from her blog posts grappling with these issues. She also notes the deadline of finishing a dissertation was great motivation to stay on track.

P 36-38: Efimova describes her decisions with regards to research ethics and confidentiality. She used public data sources from public figures, which were searchable and non-anonymizable -- but also blended them with more "private" data (as in interviews), so making sure the "private" data didn't inadvertently get unmasked by the "public" data was an important consideration.

Q 37: As a starting point to resolve this problem, I use ethical recommendation from the Association of Internet Research (Ess & the AoIR ethics working committee, 2002): I treat bloggers as authors of publicly available texts and explicitly attribute weblog posts to them.

P 38-45: The remainder of the chapter provides suggestions on how to evaluate the quality of the research, including techniques such as triangulation and thick description.

N^: In effect, Efimova is saying "I know this is complex and hard to evaluate; let me show you some ways you could judge the quality of my work."

Qualitative Psychology

Typ	Buch
Autor	Ian Parker
Ort	Maidenhead :; Blacklick :
Verlag	Open University Press Imprint ; McGraw-Hill Education ; McGraw-Hill Companies, The Distributor
Datum	2004
Sprache	English
ISBN	9780335213498 0335213499
Bibliothekskatalog	Open WorldCat
Hinzugefügt am	Di 19 Mär 2013 17:04:06 EDT
Geändert am	Di 19 Mär 2013 17:04:06 EDT

Tags:

2013-qualitative-lather

Notizen:

7 - Discourse (p. 88-104)

N: (From Dr. Lather in class) The word "discourse" here is used in a very specific sense; some people say "discourse" when they really mean just "talk" or "language." In the Foucauldian sense, "discourse" specifically refers to how words shape and are shaped by power/politics.

N: "heteroglossia" (from Mikhail Bakhtin) is a PhD-student word Dr. Lather jokes we can impress people with (it refers to different "varieties" within a single "language" -- English-speaking parents speak a different way to their little kids than to their boss.)

P 89-90: 4 key ideas in discourse analysis useful to radical research

- Multivoicedness of language: how are we made to fit into certain categories, how are we marked as different, how contradictions work in/within the categories... what's the difference between "lesbian" and "dyke" and "homosexual" (which can be seen as synonyms, but mean different things in category names)?
- Semiotics: how do we put language together into things (papers, book covers, etc) and how are we put together by our language and discourse? (Q 90: "At the same time as we actively form sentences and turns in a conversation, we also have to use words and phrases that carry meanings we cannot entirely control.")
- Resistance: what actions is the language carrying out? Does it challenge power relations? Keep them in place?
- Social bond: how does discourse draw boundaries to show what is in what category, what people are in/out of certain social bonds? (Q 90: For example, a discourse of heterosexuality defines what is

deviant, a medical discourse defines what is sick, and a dominant patriotic discourse defines what is alien.)

P 91-92: Beware conversation analysis, a shadow of discourse analysis that sticks to moment-by-moment interaction of "what they said" to keep the research "safer." Pitfalls:

- Textual empiricism: we need to "really see what is there" so we can only talk about what we see in the transcript, so if subjects did not specifically talk about power, we can't either.
- Pointless redescription: taking points already made in the transcript and repeating them more verbosely by inserting jargon to make things sound impressive; you add nothing new
- Nuts and bolts positivism: building up a list of technical terms that you use only for pointless redescription
- Not our department thinking: "we can't talk about ideology/power here because I'm only concerned with this tiny transcript I'm analyzing, it's out-of-scope"

N^: conversation analysis is the positivist version of discourse analysis?

N^: I'm not convinced by these arguments against conversation analysis -- I see how they can be limiting evils when done unconsciously in the name of TRUTH!!!, but conscious boundary-drawing is not evil and is in fact necessary sometimes.

P 92: Questions for discourse-analytic reading:

- Why is the text interesting?
- What do we know of the material out of which it is constructed? (P 93: bring in context -- what do we know about the characters/places/etc already?)
- What might be the effects of different readings of the text?
- How does it confront/challenge patterns of power?

P 94-98: Discourse-analytic interviewing. A discourse-analytic interview is a text-in-process; your "interview subject" becomes a "co-researcher" when enrolled as a discourse analyst (make sure your subject can do this). Start with a puzzling text and a question about it, and tell your co-researcher you want to be wary of taking things for granted so you share a framing of suspecting things may not be as they seem. Then fragment the text into parts: what are the objects described, the agents portrayed? What audience is this text written for, and what might people-who-agree-with-the-text say about people-who-disagree-with-the-text? What sorts of theory (sexuality? race/class? gender?) will you use to organize and map these categories? Finally, reflecting on what you've done together: where have you gone, what did you find, what did you miss because of the path you chose?

P 99-100: content vs thematic vs discourse analysis

- Content analysis counts words (quantitative: "we said X 9 times.")
- Thematic analysis groups words/phrases, which means we're making assumptions that the words in a group mean the same-enough thing to be grouped.
- Discourse analysis goes beyond that and links terms into meanings that are independent of the speakers.

N^: (Dr. Lather, in-class) Discourse is the study of effects that are somewhat independent of speakers. It decenters the subject. It's much more about how we are born into these discursive frameworks.

P 100-101: Pitfalls in discourse research

- Idle curiosity/voyeurism instead of a research question -- know why you're there!
- Sorting into themes instead of linking into discourses
- Discovering what people "really think"
- Discovering the "only" reading of the text

N 101: Talks about (Cameron, 1995) on verbal hygiene -- might want to look up this reference. Turns out to be the book "Verbal Hygiene" by Deborah Cameron, published 1995.

Other sections of the book

P 66-67: Pitfalls in interview research

- Claiming to have "established rapport" -- you're claiming it, not your subject. Instead, pay attention to when rapport breaks down and what you do about it.
- Claiming that someone has "really told you their story" -- it's a version of a story crafted for an audience. Why did they tell you this one?
- Claiming to have discovered "important information" -- you're not there to get information; that's an interrogation. You're there to learn about differences between forms of information and the consequences of those differences.
- Using the interview to "describe someone's experience" -- you don't have the experience, you have their story of it.

P 83: Pitfalls in narrative research

- "They really told me their story" -- it was a performance for you to hear. What was that performance about?
- "It was therapeutic for them" -- you're a researcher, not a counselor; keep boundaries so you don't cause them pain.
- "They were a good example of X" -- even if people present themselves as part of a category, don't just accept that blindly. Why did they do that, what identity scripts are at play?
- "They meant X by Y" -- you can't decode "the truth."

Q 140: Notes on validity/quality

- What counts as good?
- Who should it be for?
- What counts as analysis?
- What is the role of theory?

N ^ Boundaries I should pay attention to in my methods section writeup. Efimova did this admirably in her dissertation.

"They Must Be Working Hard": An (Auto-)Ethnographic Account of Women's Artistic Gymnastics

Typ	Zeitschriftenartikel
Autor	N. Barker-Ruchti
Publikation	Cultural Studies <=> Critical Methodologies
Band	8
Ausgabe	3
Seiten	372-380

Datum	2008-08-01
DOI	10.1177/1532708607310799
ISSN	1532-7086
Kurztitel	"They Must Be Working Hard"
URL	http://csc.sagepub.com/cgi/doi/10.1177/1532708607310799
Heruntergeladen am	Di 19 Mär 2013 18:41:27 EDT
Bibliothekskatalog	CrossRef
Hinzugefügt am	Di 19 Mär 2013 18:41:27 EDT
Geändert am	Di 19 Mär 2013 18:41:27 EDT

Tags:

2013-qualitative-lather

Notizen:

N: Great example of narrative write-ups in research that draw on an author's personal experience with the subject.

N: In-class questions:

1. The style used here is auto-ethnography, a fictional narrative interwoven from a collation of "real" experiences. The fictional narrative automatically invites suspicion (but sometimes that's intentional).
2. It comes from (unsurprisingly) Foucault.
3. The interweaving of theory and data was a lack of interweaving -- the author separated data from her theory so readers could interpret the data on their own.
4. (bibliography tips -- left empty)
5. Interesting things here: the author is writing about one of her own interests, and deliberately introducing fiction into the narrative construction.

Transcription in Research and Practice: From Standardization of Technique to Interpretive Positionings

Typ	Zeitschriftenartikel
Autor	J. C. Lapadat
Autor	A. C. Lindsay
Publikation	Qualitative Inquiry
Band	5
Ausgabe	1
Seiten	64-86
Datum	1999-03-01
DOI	10.1177/107780049900500104
ISSN	1077-8004

Kurztitel	Transcription in Research and Practice
URL	http://qix.sagepub.com/cgi/doi/10.1177/107780049900500104
Heruntergeladen am	Di 22 Jan 2013 15:58:35 EST
Bibliothekskatalog	CrossRef
Hinzugefügt am	Di 22 Jan 2013 15:58:35 EST
Geändert am	Di 22 Jan 2013 15:58:35 EST

Tags:

2013-qualitative-lather

Notizen:

Q 66: ...researchers make choices about transcription that enact the theories that they hold.

P: By treating transcription itself as a research method, we can see that there are many different conventions that can be used, all revealing underlying assumptions about what the data is and how one ought to work with it.

N: The article itself discusses (mostly theoretically) a wide range of techniques for transcription, so its references may be a good place to look at examples of varied techniques.

N: My stance on transcription is an interesting one -- if I'm using CART to transcribe my interviews in realtime, what does that say about my stance? That also removes my opportunity to do my own transcription and make certain choices myself. What does it say that I'm relying on others for this -- and are there any specs I want to give them?

What can be known and how? Narrated subjects and the Listening Guide

Typ	Zeitschriftenartikel
Autor	A. Doucet
Autor	N. S. Mauthner
Publikation	Qualitative Research
Band	8
Ausgabe	3
Seiten	399-409
Datum	2008-07-01
DOI	10.1177/1468794106093636
ISSN	1468-7941
Kurztitel	What can be known and how?
URL	http://qrj.sagepub.com/cgi/doi/10.1177/1468794106093636
Heruntergeladen am	Di 19 Mär 2013 18:43:26 EDT
Bibliothekskatalog	CrossRef
Hinzugefügt am	Di 19 Mär 2013 18:43:26 EDT

Geändert am Di 19 Mär 2013 18:43:26 EDT

Tags:

2013-qualitative-lather

Notizen:

Talks about "narrated subjects" and describes a "listening guide" for how to read, in successive iterations, a narrative.

Q 405: READING 1: RELATIONAL AND REFLEXIVELY CONSTITUTED NARRATIVES. Our own approach has been to combine the basic grounded theory question, which is 'what is happening here?' (Charmaz, 2006), with elements from narrative analysis such as an interest in recurring words, themes, events, chronology of events, protagonists, plot, subplots, and key characters (Mishler, 1986; Elliott, 2005)

Q 405-406: READING 2: TRACING NARRATED SUBJECTS. A second reading of interview transcripts attends to the particular subject or narrator in the interview transcripts, and to how this person speaks about her/himself and the parameters of their social world. In concrete terms, we conduct this reading by utilising a coloured pencil to trace the 'I' in the interview transcripts. This process centres our attention on the active 'I' who is telling the story, amplifying the terms in which the respondent sees and presents her/himself while also highlighting where the respondent might be emotionally or intellectually struggling to say something. It also identifies those places where the respondent shifts between 'I', 'we', 'you' or 'it', which can signal varied meanings in the respondent's perceptions of self (Stanley, 2002).

Q 406: READING 3: READING FOR RELATIONAL NARRATED SUBJECTS. Our third reading of interview transcripts is a reading for social networks, and close and intimate relations.

Q 406: READING 4: READING FOR STRUCTURED SUBJECTS. A fourth reading of interview transcripts focuses on structured power relations and dominant ideologies that frame narratives. This reflects a concern to link micro-level narratives with macro-level processes and structures.

N: In-class discussion questions:

1. Name the narrative strategy. - Iterative reading of narrative subjects
2. From where do they get their theory? - grounded theory (Charmaz) and narrative analysis (Mishler & Elliott)
3. How do they interweave theory and data? - They don't. There is no data.
4. Bib tips - read the Charmaz and the Mishler, they're fantastic.
5. What's useful or not? - useful things: reminders that a story isn't the same as forensic truth, first 3 steps. not useful: no data, ridiculous amounts of theory that don't seem relevant to the analysis (they're the a priori theory they use to analyze their data, but they don't show us the data), and the 4th step seems only useful sometimes because it takes a hardcore critical theory stance -- if it just said, instead, "link your grounded theory with a priori now," it'd be way better.

Where do you draw the line? A study of academic engineers negotiating the boundaries of engineering

Typ	Dissertation
Autor	Alice L. Pawley
Universität	University of Wisconsin-Madison
Ort	Madison
Datum	2007
Anzahl der Seiten	229
Sprache	en
Hinzugefügt am	Di 05 Mär 2013 07:17:22 EST
Geändert am	Di 05 Mär 2013 07:18:26 EST

Tags:

2013-qualitative-lather

Notizen:

N: The dissertation of one of my professors in Engineering Education at Purdue. She does research on feminist engineering education and still uses small, interview-intensive, qualitative datasets for her work.

N: In contrast to Shanna Daly's dissertation, which sprinkled references throughout an extended defense of her methodology, Alice simply lists the references for the methods she chose, as if to say "and that's it, people."

Q 64: This study employed semi-structured interviews: the majority of questions were determined ahead of time, but the order or wording
was modified on site, and additional relevant questions were posed, depending on the interviewer's perception of the flow of the interview.

N ^: I love this wording and may borrow it. Concise and clear.

P 65: Section on how the IRB reacted - this study was exempt and classified "benign."

N ^: I've worried a lot about IRB reactions to my own work, but maybe it's not such a big deal.

N: Alice uses appendices a lot to refer to more detail that people can choose to look at; she doesn't need to defend everything up-front, but if she needs it, the work is there.

P 66: Alice used an "interview summary form" of guiding reflections/questions for herself to fill out after each interview to help guide thinking on the next ones.

• What were main issues in interview?
• Summarize the information you got, or failed to get on each target question.
• Anything else interesting, salient, illuminating, or important in this interview?
• What new (or remaining) target questions do you have in considering the next interview?

N^: I like this -- I'd never thought about making instruments for myself before, but I can see how giving myself a structure will help me sort out the mount of data I tend to get buried in.

P 67-70: Describes sampling methodology, which was based on getting a diversity of tenure-line engineering faculty at a large research university. Participants are not described individually ("subject A

was a woman associate professor...") but breakdowns are given for each of the criteria (X women, Y full professors, and so forth).

Q 70: (Description of member-checking) Once the interviews were transcribed, participants were mailed a CD containing the voice files of their interviews and the transcripts, and were invited to read through and correct any inaccuracies or other problems or to add any clarifications. However, no corrections were submitted, so the transcripts were taken as approved.

N^: Lack of activity is still a good thing to report -- tell everyone your procedure even if "nothing happened."

N: Alice lists in great detail all the tools and technology she used, right down to the model of microphone used to record the interviews and the specific software she applied.

Q 74: (On validity and data display) In many cases, I decided to base the writing on long quotations, which remain in the document rather than being paraphrased. These long quotes are a form of data display, and because of the nature of the data, they can only be "reduced" so much without   losing information. I found it challenging to try to reduce the quotations because how each one hangs together—through the actual language used, through its context, and often messily intertwined with all sorts of other ideas—seemed so crucial for understanding what each person was trying
to say. The presence of the data themselves allows readers to decide whether the analysis is believable or not.

P 76-78: One interesting writing convention was to not refer to participants using gendered pronouns ("except in direct quotes and in
a very few instances where the participant's quote made visible his or her own gender.") Alice does note that excluding identifiers may be as offensive to people in some cases as including them -- some people think it's very important to note they are of a certain race/gender/group/etc.

P 78-80: Alice gives a demonstration of a raw interview snippet and how she analyzed it, to give a picture of how complex the analysis was.

N^: This is a great behind-the-scenes technique.