

INTRODUCTION TO QUALITATIVE METHODS IN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH¹

Winter Term 2009

ED 792-001 (Seminar Monday 1-4pm) and ED 792-002 (Lab Wed 10-12pm)
4212 SEB

Lesley A. Rex, Ph.D.
2014 School of Education
734-647-1988
rex@umich.edu
www.umich.edu/~rex/

Victoria Haviland, Ph. D
2034 School of Education
734-662-6824
vhavilan@umich.edu

Meetings with the teachers are best scheduled individually via email.

Contents of this Syllabus

Description, p. 1

Course Learning Objectives, p. 2

Organization of the Course, p. 2

Expectations and Grading Policy, p. 4

Readings, p. 5

Complementary Reading, p. 8

Projects, p. 13

Project 1: Documents and Field Notes, p. 13

Project 2: Formal Interview and Discourse Analysis, p. 14

Final Project: Research Proposal, p. 16

Tentative Schedule, Winter 2008, p. 19

Description

Each week, this introduction to qualitative methods in educational research engages students and teachers in three purposefully interrelated strands of activity that merge and build upon each other through out the term. One involves reading and writing about research to promote understanding of the philosophical, theoretical and empirical traditions by which current qualitative research is

¹ The conceptual focus, language, reading list, activities, and design of this course build upon Lesley Rex's original collaboration with prior Education 792 professors Pamela Moss and Sally Lubeck.

assessed as valid, ethical, and valuable; the second sequence provides hands-on workshop experience so as to encounter, define, and solve issues in constructing and writing up four qualitative methods of data collection and analysis; and, the third strand is concerned with understanding methodological issues in planning and conducting emergent iterative qualitative research.

Readings and discussions will lead us to consider a broad range of influential research traditions and epistemological approaches in education such as phenomenological, post positivist, constructivist, narrative, ethnomethodological, hermeneutic, post-structural, and feminist. Additionally, we will discuss how these traditions and approaches combine, merge, and evolve in relation to ongoing conversations in the field of educational research, and how meta-perspectives, such as critical, postmodern, and social justice perspectives, influence qualitative research designs.

With this multi-epistemological and multi-theoretical framework in mind, the remainder of the course foregrounds an ethnographic approach to research, in that our class will be concerned with methods of document, field notes, interview, and discourse data collection and analysis that value what has been referred to as an “insiders” perspective. Consequently, we will distinguish between what has been categorized as “emic” (meaningful to insiders) and “etic” (what makes sense to outsiders) approaches to data collection and analysis. Our aim in the course will be to establish a foundational understanding for evaluating, designing, and conducting trustworthy, valuable, and ethical qualitative research. To this end we will discuss issues of research validity, generalizability, and ethics, as we read, read about, and conduct qualitative research.

Course Learning Objectives

Our specific objectives for the course are to provide activities in which you can learn how to:

- analyze qualitative studies
- find and evaluate qualitative studies related to your areas of interest
- apply a grounded theory approach for coding and analyzing written documents
- take and analyze field notes by applying a thematic analysis
- conduct interviews by creating protocols
- transcribe and analyze interviews through discourse analysis
- evolve researchable questions in relation to data
- write warranted arguments for interpretive assertions
- draft a study design for your own research proposal

Organization of the Course

You will have the benefit of two teachers practiced in the approaches and methods of the course. Lesley Rex is an experienced ethnographer and discourse analyst (Vita available at <http://www.umich.edu/~rex/vita>). Vicki Haviland has designed and conducted several long and short term qualitative research studies; having earned her doctorate at UM several years ago, she also brings a recent perspective on the process of taking what you learn in methods through to designing and conducting a successful dissertation study that leads to publication.

Our key teaching goal is to assist you in experiencing qualitative research in a way you can find valuable and applicable to your evolving future research. Since this is a course, and not an apprenticeship in the field, we have organized a series of interwoven activities to provide you with occasions that will, as much as possible, replicate some of the opportunities and challenges faced by qualitative researchers. We have matched book and course readings to each of the activities so as to provide you with guidance in how to conduct the activities and to raise issues central in doing so. We have tried to be true to the richness and complexity of qualitative research, while making the course meaningful and doable for you in thirteen weeks. As we go along, we will need you to work with us in reshaping what we do to keep the work as meaningful and manageable as possible for everyone.

Two *mini projects* (Project 1 and Project 2), and related readings and discussions, will occupy the first two thirds of the course, while the last four weeks of the course will be devoted to the design and writing of your *research proposal*. Seminar activities are planned to support your understanding of issues and methods through discussion of the readings and practice of techniques. The labs are the occasions for you to collect and analyze data, though don't be surprised when, in actual practice, seminar and lab activities merge.

You will be generating *written artifacts* throughout the course. These written artifacts will support your writing of the two research projects and your research proposal. The two projects will be based on data you have collected in class with and from your classmates, as documents, field notes, and interviews, in response to the following orienting question:

What key knowledge do novice educational researchers take up in an introductory qualitative methods class?

As is often the case with qualitative work, you will be a member of a research team as you conduct your two projects, though you will write up your own individual report from each project. Through the collection and analysis of new data, you and your group will undoubtedly refine this question to create ones that are better suited to your data and interpretations. The course schedule specifies the dates and times all artifacts need to be available in the designated CTools folder. Specific dates may change as we proceed and reshape what we are doing, but the general organizational plan will remain constant.

The following is a list of the written artifacts you will need for your two research projects

- Reflective notes on Hanushek (1999) and Rex (2003) (see reference list)
- A coding matrix for the evaluations
- Jottings and elaborated field notes
- Write up for Project 1, drawing on your analyses of the evaluations and field notes
- Interview transcription
- Re-transcription of a selected portion of the interview
- Write up for Project 2, drawing on the coding and discourse analysis of your interviews.

The final third of the course will be devoted to assisting you in designing and writing a study for your research proposal. More details are provided later in this syllabus. For completing this process, it is expected that you will

- Find three qualitative studies from the library electronic data base that are related to your topic of interest;
- Prepare an evaluative matrix for the three studies; and
- Drawing from qualitative methods, write multiple evolving drafts of a proposal for your own research study.

To provide you with our logic for the interwoven activities, we have provided a detailed course schedule (see pages 22-22), which we hope will serve as a calendar to assist you in planning your time. On it you will find the activities we will engage in during each seminar and lab session, the assigned readings we will refer to and discuss, the activities performed by your research group as you work on projects 1 and 2, the dates of the artifacts you will produce, and the activities you will participate in for your individual research proposal. *Readings are assigned prior to the class session in which they will be applied.*

Expectations and Grading Policy.

One essential aim of our class meetings is supportive and productive learning for all members. Working collaboratively is key. Most of our course activities will occur in teams, which calls for social awareness and skill, common features of qualitative research. In order for collaborative learning to occur so that everyone has the opportunity to learn productively, we expect the following basics: Everyone attends all class sessions, completes readings prior to class, and participates actively in discussions and activities. When unexpected events occur, we want you to inform us of absences, in advance when possible. Because everyone's production depends on others' performances, we expect deadlines to be met and work to be accomplished even when you may not be in class.

The course is organized so that learning is constructed rather than transmitted. That means discussion and writing replace lecture. You will be asked to read each text in a particular way suited to the purposes for the readings in the course. In addition to discussion as a class and in groups, you will be writing for every class. Some writing will be to promote discussion; some will be to promote thinking; some will be to develop rhetorical arguments for reporting research findings. Unless otherwise indicated, all written submissions should be single-spaced, use a 12-point size font (Times family recommended), have one-inch margins, and be submitted as PDF or DOC files. All documents should have title, header (author and page number), and footer (name of the file, date, 792-Winter-09). Unless otherwise indicated, upload all assignments onto CTools in the corresponding folder under the Resources section. All class members are expected to read the written assignments of all their group members. Please follow the following convention for labeling your file: LastName_mm.dd.

Readings

The reading in this course is fundamental for understanding the main concepts underlying qualitative research work. We will read selected portions of three books and twenty-eight articles and chapters. You can purchase the books on line or at the three campus bookstores. They are also on reserve at the UM Hatcher library.

The following textbooks are *required*:

Green, J., Camilli, G., & Elmore, P. (Eds.). (2006). *Handbook of complementary methods in education research*. Washington, D.C. and Mahwah, NJ: AERA & Erlbaum. Chapters from this text are marked with an (*) in the list below.

Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2007). *Basics of qualitative research: Procedures and techniques for developing grounded theory, 3rd edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2006). *Designing qualitative research*. (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

The following texts are *recommended*:

American Psychological Association (5th ed.) (2001). *Publications Manual of the American Psychological Association*. Washington, DC: Author. <http://www.apastyle.org/pubmanual.html>

Emerson, R., Fretz, R., & Shaw, L. (1995). *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

The following chapters and articles constitute the required reading; the plan for reading these papers is given in the course schedule. Readings marked by * are located in the Green, et al Handbook. Most of the remaining course readings are accessible from the 792 CTools link to "Library Reserves." Some are available through the electronic library system. Those not available in electronic form (via the Course Reserves or the electronic library) will be provided by the instructors as pdf files, also on CTools.

1. Ambert, A., Adler, P. A., Adler, P., Detzner, D. F. (1995). Understanding and evaluating qualitative research, *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 57, 879-893.
2. American Educational Research Association. (2006). Standards for reporting on empirical social science research in AERA publications. *Educational Researcher*, 35 (6), 33-40.
3. *American Educational Research Association* (2000). Ethical standards of the American Educational Research Association. <http://www.aera.net/about/policy/ethics.htm>
4. (*) Anderson-Levitt, K. M. (2006). Ethnography. In J. L. Green, G. Camilli, & P. Elmore (Eds.) *Handbook of complementary methods in education research* (3rd ed., pp. 279-298). Washington, D.C. and Mahwah, NJ: AERA & Erlbaum.
5. Arendell, T. (1997). Reflections on the researcher-researched relationship: A woman interviewing men. *Qualitative Sociology*, 20, 341-368.

6. (*) Banks, J.A. (2006). Researching race, culture, and difference: epistemological challenges and possibilities. In J. L. Green, G. Camilli, & P. Elmore (Eds.) *Handbook of complementary methods in education research* (3rd ed., pp. 773-794). Washington, D.C. and Mahwah, NJ: AERA & Erlbaum.
7. (*) Bazerman, C. (2006). Analyzing the multidimensionality in texts in education. In J. L. Green, G. Camilli, & P. Elmore (Eds.) *Handbook of complementary methods in education research* (3rd ed., pp. 77-94). Washington, D.C. and Mahwah, NJ: AERA & Erlbaum.
8. (*) Bloome, D., & Clark, C. (2006). Discourse-in-use. In J. L. Green, G. Camilli, & P. Elmore (Eds.) *Handbook of complementary methods in education research* (3rd ed., pp. 227-244). Washington, D.C. and Mahwah, NJ: AERA & Erlbaum.
9. (*) Bredo, E. (2006). Philosophies of educational research. In J. L. Green, G. Camilli, & P. Elmore (Eds.) *Handbook of complementary methods in education research* (3rd ed., pp. 3-31). Washington, D.C. and Mahwah, NJ: AERA & Erlbaum.
10. (*) Brenner, M. E. (2006). Interviewing in educational research. In J. L. Green, G. Camilli, & P. Elmore (Eds.) *Handbook of complementary methods in education research* (3rd ed., pp. 357-370). Washington, D.C. and Mahwah, NJ: AERA & Erlbaum.
11. Britzman, D. (1995). "The question of belief": Writing poststructural ethnography. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 8; 229-238.
12. Carspecken, P. F., & Apple, M. (1992). Critical qualitative research: Theory, methodology, practice. In M. LeCompte, W. Millroy, & J. Preissle (Eds.) *The handbook of qualitative research in education* (pp. 507-553). New York: Academic Press.
13. Christians, C. G. (2nd ed.) (2000). Ethics and politics in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 133-55). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
14. (*) Cochran-Smith, M. & Donnell, K. (2006). Practitioner inquiry: Blurring the boundaries of research and practice. In J. L. Green, G. Camilli, & P. Elmore (Eds.) *Handbook of complementary methods in education research* (3rd ed., pp. 503-518). Washington, D.C. and Mahwah, NJ: AERA & Erlbaum.
15. Deyhle, D., Hess Jr., A., & LeCompte, M. (1992). Approaching ethical issues for qualitative researchers in education. In M. LeCompte, W. Millroy, & J. Preissle (Eds.), *The Handbook of Qualitative Research in Education*. (pp. 597-641). New York: Academic Press.
16. Diamond, J. B. & Spillane, J. P. (2004). High stakes accountability in urban elementary schools: Challenging or reproducing inequality? *Teachers College Record*, 106, 1145-1176.
17. (*) Eisenhart, M. (2006). Representing qualitative data. In J. L. Green, G. Camilli, & P. Elmore (Eds.) *Handbook of complementary methods in education research* (3rd ed., pp. 567-582). Washington, D.C. and Mahwah, NJ: AERA & Erlbaum.
18. Eisenhart, M., & Howe, K. (1992). Validity in educational research. In M. LeCompte, W. Millroy, & J. Preissle (Eds.) *The handbook of qualitative research in education*. (pp. 643-680) . New York: Academic Press.
19. Emerson, R., Fretz, R., & Shaw, L. (1995). *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. [Chapters 4, 5, & 6.]

20. Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed., pp. 119-161). New York: Macmillan.
21. Fine, M., Weis, L., Weseen, S., & Wong, L. (2000). For whom? Qualitative research representations and social responsibilities. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd, ed., pp. 107-131). Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage.
22. Gergen, M., & Gergen, K. (2000). Qualitative inquiry: Tensions and transformations. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd, ed., pp. 1025-1046). Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage.
23. (*) Greeno, J. G. (2006). Theoretical and practical advances through research on learning. In J. L. Green, G. Camilli, & P. Elmore (Eds.) *Handbook of complementary methods in education research* (3rd ed., pp. 795-822). Washington, D.C. and Mahwah, NJ: AERA & Erlbaum.
24. Hubbard, L. (1999). College aspirations among low-income African American high school students: gendered strategies for success. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 30, 363-383.
25. Johnson, R. B. (1997). Examining the validity structure of qualitative research, *Education*, 118, 282-292.
26. (*) Kelly, G. J. (2006). Epistemology and educational research. In J. L. Green, G. Camilli, & P. Elmore (Eds.) *Handbook of complementary methods in education research* (3rd ed., pp. 33-56). Washington, D.C. and Mahwah, NJ: AERA & Erlbaum.
27. Krefting, L. (1991). Rigor in qualitative research: The assessment of trustworthiness. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 45, 214-222.
28. Lankford, H., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2002). Teacher Sorting and the Plight of Urban Schools: A Descriptive Analysis. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 24(1), 37-62.
29. Lei, J. L. (2003). (Un)Necessary Toughness?: Those "Loud Black Girls" and Those "Quiet Asian Boys." *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 34(2):158-181.
30. Lökman, P. Narrative of the self? Researching embodiment through autoethnographical methodology
31. (*) Nesper, I. (2006). Finding patterns with field notes. In J. L. Green, G. Camilli, & P. Elmore (Eds.) *Handbook of complementary methods in education research* (3rd ed., pp. 297-308). Washington, D.C. and Mahwah, NJ: AERA & Erlbaum.
32. Patton, M. Q. (2002) (3rd ed) *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. [Chapters 1, 2, & 9]
33. (*) Rex, L. A., Steadman, S. A., & Graciano, M. K. (2006). Researching the complexity of classroom interaction. In J. L. Green, G. Camilli, & P. Elmore (Eds.) *Handbook of complementary methods in education research* (3rd ed., pp. 727-772). Washington, D.C. and Mahwah, NJ: AERA & Erlbaum.
34. Rex, L. A. (2003). Loss of the creature: The obscuring of classroom inclusivity in classroom discourse. *Communication Education*, 52(1), 30-46.
35. Rex, L. A., & Nelson, M. (2004). *Teachers College Record*, 106(6), 1288-1331.

36. Scheurich, J. (1997). A postmodernist critique of research interviewing . *Research method in the postmodern*. Washington, DC: Falmer.
37. Silverman, D. (1993). Interview data. *Interpreting qualitative data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
38. Stage, F. K. & Maple, S. A. (1996). Incompatible goals: Narratives of graduate women in the mathematics pipeline. *American Educational Research Journal*, 33, 23-51.
39. Stanley, S. & Billig, M. (2004). Dilemmas of storytelling and identity. In C. Daiute, C. & C. Lightfoot, C. (Eds). *Narrative analysis* (pp. 159-176). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
40. Corbin, J. & Strauss, A. (2007). *Basics of qualitative research: Procedures and techniques for developing grounded theory* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. [Chapters 1-10].
41. (*) Strike, K. A. (2006). The ethics of educational research. In J. L. Green, G. Camilli, & P. Elmore (Eds.) *Handbook of complementary methods in education research* (3rd ed., pp. 57-56). Washington, D.C. and Mahwah, NJ: AERA & Erlbaum.
42. Tapia, J. (1998). The schooling of Puerto Ricans: Philadelphia's most impoverished community. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 29, 297-323.
43. Taylor, S. (2001). Locating and conducting discourse analytic research. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, & S. Yates (Eds), *Discourse as data: A guide for analysis* (pp. 5-48). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
44. Watson, C. (2005). Living the Life of the Social Inquirer: Beginning Educational Research, *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 6(2), Art. 28. <http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs/>
45. Wetherell, M. (2001). Themes in discourse research: The case of Diana. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, & S. Yates (eds.), *Discourse theory and practice* (pp. 14-28). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Complementary Readings

These selections are provided to complement and deepen understandings of course topics, skills, and dispositions. They also will be of use if you pursue further knowledge of qualitative methods beyond the course.

Books and Articles on Qualitative Research

- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2nd ed.) (2000). *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Firestone, W., & Herriott, R. (1986). Multisite qualitative policy research: Some design and implementation issues. In D. Fetterman (Ed.), *Ethnographic evaluation: Ethnography in theory, practice and politics* (pp. 63-88). Beverly Hills, CA, Sage.
- Howe, K. (2001). Qualitative educational research: The philosophical issues. In V. Richardson (Ed.) *Handbook of research on teaching*. (pp. 201-208). Washington D.C.: AERA.
- LeCompte, M., Millroy, W., & Preissle, J. (1992). *The handbook of qualitative research in education*. New York: Academic Press.
- Maxwell, J. (1996). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Patton, Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Popkewitz, T. (1984). *Paradigm and ideology in educational research*. Basingstoke, UK: Falmer.
- Silverman, D. (2001). *Interpreting qualitative data: Methods for analyzing talk, text and interaction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Metatheory Influences on Research

- Anyon, J. (1994). The retreat of Marxism and socialist feminism: Postmodern and poststructural theories in education. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 24, 115-133.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). The peculiar history of scientific reason. *Sociological Forum*, 6, 3-26.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures*. New York: Basic Books. [Chapter 1: Thick description.]
- Geertz, C. (1983). *Local knowledge*. New York: Basic Books. [Chapter 3: From the native's point of view.]
- Greene, M. (1994). Epistemology and educational research: The influence of recent approaches to knowledge. *Review of Research in Education*. (pp. 423-464). Washington, DC: AERA.
- Kincheloe, J., & McLaren, P. (2000). Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 279-314). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2000). Racialized discourses and ethnic epistemology. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 257-278). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lather, P. & Smithies, C. (1997). *Troubling the angels. Women living with HIV/aids*. Boulder, CO: Westview.[pp. xiii-xvii, 3-12, 215-237]
- Lubeck, S. (1988). Nested contexts. In L. Weis (Ed.), *Class, race and gender in American education* (pp. 43-62). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- MacLeod, J. (1987). *Ain't no makin' it: Leveled aspirations in a low-income neighborhood*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press. [Chapter 2, Reproduction in theoretical perspective]
- Oleson, V. (2000). Feminism and qualitative research at and into the millennium. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 215-255). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Thompson, J. B. (1990). *Ideology and modern culture*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. [Chapter 6: The methodology of interpretation]

Deconstructing the Qualitative-Quantitative Divide

- Bredo, E. and Feinberg, W. (1982). Introduction: Competing modes of social and educational research. In E. Bredo & W. Feinberg (Eds.), *Knowledge and values in social and educational research* (pp. 3-11). Philadelphia, PA, Temple University Press.

- Howe, K. R. (1988). Against the quantitative-qualitative incompatibility thesis or dogmas die-hard. *Educational Researcher*, 17(8), 10-16.
- Ilmer, S., Snyder, J., Erbaugh, S., & Kurz, K. (1997). Urban educators' perceptions of successful teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 48, 379-384. [A mixed qualitative-quantitative methods study]
- Smith, J. K. (1983). Quantitative versus qualitative research: An attempt to clarify the issue. *Educational Researcher*, 12, (ISSUE), 6-13.
- Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (1998). *Mixed methodology: Combining qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ethnographic Framework

- Agar, M. H. (1980). *The professional stranger: An informal introduction to ethnography*. New York: Academic Press.
- Denzin, N., (1997). *Interpretive ethnography, ethnographic practices for the 21st century*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Eisenhart, M. (2001). Changing conceptions of culture and ethnographic methodology: Recent thematic shifts and their implications for research on teaching. In V. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching*. (pp. 209-225). Washington DC.: AERA.
- Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 119-158). New York: Macmillan.
- Geertz, C. (1973) *The interpretation of cultures*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gordon, T., Holland, J. & Lahelma, E. (2001). Ethnographic research in educational settings. In P. Atkinson, A. Coffey, S. Delamont, J. Lofland, & L. Lofland (Eds.), *Handbook of ethnography* (pp. 188-203). London: Sage.
- Peshkin, A. (1988). In search of subjectivity—One's own. *Educational Researcher*, 17(7). 17-22.
- Ponterotto, J. (2006). Brief Note on the Origins, Evolution, and Meaning of the Qualitative Research Concept "Thick Description" *The Qualitative Report*, 11(3), 538-549.
<http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR11-3/ponterotto.pdf>
- Wolcott, H. (1995). Making a study "more ethnographic." In J. Van Maanen (Ed). *Representation in ethnography* (pp. 79-111). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Issues of Validity and Generalizability

- Donmoyer, R. (1990). Generalizability and the single-case study. In Elliot W. Eisner & A. Peshkin (Eds.), *Qualitative inquiry in education: The continuing debate* (pp. 175-200). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Firestone, W. (1993). Alternative arguments for generalizing from data as applied to qualitative research. *Educational Researcher*, 22(4), 16-23.

Winter, G. (2000). A comparative discussion of the notion of “validity” in qualitative and quantitative research. *The Qualitative Report*, 4(3&4); <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR4-3/winter.html>

Issues of Ethics and Legality

Howe, K., & Dougherty, K. (1993). Ethics, institutional review boards, and the changing face of educational research. *Educational Researcher*, 22(9), 16-21.

Institutional Review Board (IRB) for Human Subjects in the Behavioral Sciences. You may rehearse writing a proposal for review by clicking on this URL <http://eresearch.umich.edu/> and then click on Sandbox.

Strike, K., Anderson, M. S., Curren, R., van Geel, T., Pritchard, I., & Robertson, E. (2002). *Ethical standards of the American Educational Research Association: Cases and commentary*. Washington, DC: AERA.

Field Notes

Kemmis, S., & McTaggart, R. (2000). Participatory action research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 567-605). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Peshkin, A. (2000). The nature of interpretation in qualitative research. *Educational Researcher*, 29 (9), 5-9.

Spradley, J.P. (1980) *Participant observation*. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston.

Interview

Briggs, C. L. (1986). *Learning how to ask: A sociolinguistic appraisal of the role of the interview in social science research*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Errante, A. (2000). But sometimes you're not part of the story: Oral histories and ways of remembering and telling. *Educational Researcher*, 29(2), 16-27.

Fontana, A., & Frey, J. H. (2000). The interview: From structured questions to negotiated text. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 645-672). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gubrium, J., & Holstein, J. (Eds.). (2002). *Handbook of interview research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Heyl, B. S. (2001). Ethnographic interviewing. In P. Atkinson, A. Coffey, S. Delamont, J. Lofland, & L. Lofland (Eds.), *Handbook of ethnography* (pp. 369-383). London: Sage.

Holstein, J. A. & Gubrium, J. F. (1997). Active interviewing. In David Silverman (Ed.). *Qualitative research: Method, theory, and practice* (pp.113-129). New York: Sage.

Spradley, J. (1979). *The ethnographic interview*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston. [pp. 92-119].

Spoken discourse and textual analysis

Agar, M. (1994). *Language shock; understanding the culture of conversation*. New York: William Morrow.

- Gee, J. P. (1999). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. London: Routledge.
- Hansen, H. The ethnonarrative approach. *Human Relations*. DOI: 10.1177/0018726706068770
Volume 59(8): 1049–1075 www.sagepublications.com.
- Luke, A. (1995). Text and discourse in education: An introduction to critical discourse analysis. In M. Apple (ed.), *Review of research in education* (Vol 21, pp. 3-48). Washington DC: AERA.
- Wetherell, M., Taylor, S., & Yates, S. (Eds), (2001). *Discourse as data: A guide for analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Wetherell, M., Taylor, S., & Yates, S. (Eds), (2001). *Discourse theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Qualitative software

Lewins, A., & Silver, C. (2006). Choosing a CAQDAS Package, A working paper drawn from forthcoming Sage Publication *Using Software for Qualitative Data Analysis : A step-by- step Guide* by Ann Lewins & Christina Silver.

Exemplars

The following list of studies from Lesley Rex’s program of research illustrate how different studies can be generated from the same data corpus in reference to different metatheories and by applying different epistemological approaches, research methods and methodologies, and in response to unique “conversations” in education. They can be downloaded from her web page link at <http://www-personal.umich.edu/~rex/publications.htm>

- Rex, L. & McEachen, D. (1999).”*If anything is odd, inappropriate, confusing, or boring, it’s probably important*”: The emergence of inclusive academic literacy through English classroom discussion practices. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 34, 65-129.
- Rex, L. A. (2001). *The remaking of a high school reader*. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 36, 288-314.
- Rex, L. A. (2002). *Exploring orientation in remaking high school readers’ literacies and identities*. *Linguistics and Education*, 13, 271-302.
- Rex, L., Murnen, T., Hobbs, J., & McEachen, D. (2002). *Teachers’ pedagogical stories and the shaping of classroom participation*: “The dancer” and “graveyard shift at the 7-11”. *American Educational Research Journal*, 39, 765-796.

For an illustration of how different approaches to the study of a single phenomenon—in this case, classroom interaction—produce different views of what counts as the phenomenon and how to understand it, see the following, which can be downloaded at <http://www-personal.umich.edu/~rex/publications.htm>

Rex, L. A., Steadman, S. A., & Graciano, M. K. (2006). Researching the complexity of classroom interaction. In J. L. Green, G. Camilli, & P. Elmore (Eds.) *Handbook of complementary methods in education research* (3rd ed., pp. 727-772). Washington, D.C. and Mahwah, NJ: AERA & Erlbaum.

Projects

In this section we present the prompts to guide your thinking and writing for your three projects. Before beginning each project, we will discuss each set of prompts. During the weeks before you complete each final project, you will be writing preliminary texts that will prepare you for the final write-ups. **Post all preliminary writings on CTools at a to-be-agreed-upon time before the class in which they will be used.**

You will notice that the components for each write-up can be classified into two larger sections: (a) a section where you describe your questions, logic of inquiry (methodology) or application of the methods, interpretations/analyses, and conclusions, and (b) a section where you reflect critically on the method you have practiced and consider its relevance to your own work. In the text, these sections are separated with a centered series of pound signs (# # #).

Project #1: Document and Fieldnote Analysis

For this first study, you will use notes and letters from the first day of class and field notes you will have already collected and analyzed with your research group members in class. From these combined analyses and data you will write a preliminary interpretive summary, or an argument for your summative interpretation(s), that addresses your groups' emergent research question(s), which you derived from the initial orienting question:

What key knowledge do novice educational researchers take up in an introductory qualitative methods class?

As you engaged with the data, you followed the following process:

First, as a research group, the four/five of you applied a grounded theory approach to analyze class members' letters on qualitative and quantitative articles.

Next, you observed another study group for 30 minutes while jotting down notes, then elaborated your notes on the computer, and triangulated and analyzed them with your study group members.

Write up your findings from your first study as follows:

- (1) Briefly describe the question(s) you chose to guide your analyses by explaining how they came to be, as well as their relationship to the purpose of your study, and the subjects of your study (1-2 pages).

- (2) *Letters:* Briefly describe how you analyzed the letters, including the processes of generating patterns and categories, of generating and testing assertions, and of building hypotheses in response to your questions (1 page). Attach your analytical matrix as an appendix.

Fieldnotes: Briefly describe your process of observing, including decisions about what to include or exclude, points of focus, transcription style, etc. Describe what you added when you expanded the notes, keeping in mind the theoretical issues associated with note taking (1 page). Attach your elaborated field notes as an appendix.

- (3) Provide an interpretive summary of what your group has learned about class members' ideas, values, beliefs, and/or dispositions from your groups' analyses of the letters and its observations of the other groups' discussion of the qualitative studies (2-4 pages). Include specific excerpts from the notes and letters and illustrative quotations from the field notes to warrant your claims (2-3 pages).
- (4) Describe what you did (or would like to have done) to enhance the validity of your conclusions and the ethics of your practice (1 page).

#

- (5) Explain what you learned by being the observer and the observed (in terms of the validity and ethics of this practice). Consider the insights, questions, and concerns this ethnographic perspective raised (1 page).
- (6) Reflect on the potential relevance of an ethnographic approach and of grounded theory for your particular research interests, and of the usefulness of document analysis and observational field notes for the study you are envisioning (1 page).

Please upload your report on CTools by midnight, Sunday 2/15.

Project #2: Formal Interview and Discourse Analysis

This second project builds upon the first. Your research questions for the next two rounds of data collection and analysis will have been shaped by your interpretations from the first project. For this second study, you will use interviews as the data for which you will perform a thematic/content analysis and a discourse analysis.

As you engaged with the data, you followed the following process:

First, your research group determined which member would interview which informant in the group you are studying. Then, each of you conducted up to two interviews: a 20-minute formal interview and an optional informal follow-up interview. Using a cassette tape recorder (I provide the recorder; you provide the tape), you have conducted the interviews based on a preplanned set of questions, transcribed the first interview as a text document, and analyzed these one-two interviews. As a group, you then worked collaboratively to

develop one or two conclusions in response to your research question that integrated (some of) your learnings from the individual interviews.

Second, you conducted a discourse analysis [DA] of your individual interview transcript, following the approaches to DA presented by Wetherell, Taylor, and Bloome & Clark. You selected one, or a combination of, DA method(s) which address(es) the research question(s) that emerges from your initial thematic/content analysis of the interview transcript. (You shared your DA analysis with your interviewee before the due date.)

Third, you shared your interview and DA analyses with your research group members and combined data and analyses to strengthen the final conclusions you can make for your study.

Write up your findings from your first study as follows:

- (1) Briefly describe your research question(s), how and why they evolved (in relation to your purpose for your study), and the subjects of your study (1 page).
- (2) *Interviews:* Briefly describe the logic of inquiry you took for your two interviews, including the preplanned questions guiding the interview(s). Explain why and how they changed, if they did, from one interview to the next, and explain the decisions you made about how you would conduct the follow-up interview (1 page).

Discourse analysis: Briefly describe the process you engaged in to perform your discourse analysis. Include an explanation of the method(s) you selected and of why you thought they would be useful for addressing your research question(s) (1 page).

Combined: Briefly describe the process of decision-making you followed in selecting the eventual corpus of data and analyses from which you conducted your final analysis and drew your conclusions. Allude to your emergent research question(s) (1 page).

- (3) Describe your processes of shaping assertions and bringing confirming and disconfirming evidence to bear as you performed the two analyses of the interview (thematic and discourse analysis), illustrated with excerpts from the transcript (1-2 pages).
- (4) Summarize your conclusions about what we can understand about the key knowledge taken up by novice educational researchers. Be sure to build a warranted argument for your conclusions by providing ample illustrative evidence from the interviews. Consider including evidence from the evaluations and field notes to strengthen the validity of your case. (2-3 pages) Mention what you did (or would like to have done) to enhance the validity of your conclusions and the ethics of your practice (1 page).

In an appendix, please include a list of your framing interview questions and your two versions of your interview transcript.

#

- (5) Explain what you learned through the interview process about interviewing as a method, about the process of interviewing, about being an interviewer, about what it means to be an informant. Explain, too, what you learned by being a discourse analyst and by being analyzed (1-2 pages).
- (6) Briefly reflect on the usefulness of the interview, of discourse analysis, and of the integration of methods, analyses, and interpretations across interviews and discourse analyses to your own research study design (1 page).

Please upload onto CTools by 5pm, midnight, Sunday 3/29

Final Project: Research Proposal

We will dedicate the final five sessions of the course to your writing of your individual research proposal. You will prepare an evolving draft for each seminar and lab session, upload it on Ctools so your research group members can read it ahead of time, and read the drafts of your group members. Each seminar and lab session will be devoted to discussing the proposal drafts to promote revision. To assist you with drafting and revising, I will meet individually with each of you, during the class sessions and when you choose to schedule with me outside of class. Also, the Marshall and Rossman and the Eisenhart (2006) texts provide detailed advice on how to write a research proposal.

In addition to meeting with you at your request during your drafting of your proposal, I will also schedule a meeting with each of you to discuss your final text for a half hour. Our meetings will occur between 4/24 and 4/30, at least two days after you have uploaded your final draft.

This means that your final proposal should be uploaded no later than **April 28** and could be sent as early as **April 22**, depending on the time of your appointment.

The following guidelines will assist you in writing a version that is suitable, given the time constraints of the course.

Guidelines for your Personal Research Proposal

These are the questions that we expect you to address in your personal research proposal. The general headings are listed in the order in which they are addressed in a conventional research proposal. However, the order of the categories within those headings may not fit your purposes. Organize them as you think best serves the logic of your particular proposal.

INTRODUCTION (4-5 pages)

- What is (are) the issues or question(s) you will address?
- Why is it important to study these issue(s) or question(s)?
- What have you learned from (at least 3) other studies that would support your rationale for your particular question and design?

- What is your interest in, experience with, hoped-for learning about these issue(s) or question(s)?

METHODS: DESIGN & ANALYSIS (10-15 pages)

- What is your overall design and analysis strategy? Provide a brief overview.
- Who or what will you focus on in this study? How will you identify or conduct the sampling?
- What can you describe about the context in which you will work?
- What role will those researched play in your project?
- What empirical materials will you collect? How will you collect them?
- Tell your reader the “story,” in as much detail as possible, of how you will gather your data. For example, if interviews play a role: whom will you interview, how often, for how long; what kind of interview will it be; what will you ask them about (provide guide)? If field notes: what will you observe; for how long; what kinds of notes will you take; what will you focus on in your notes? If using a survey: how and to whom will you distribute it; what questions will you ask (provide draft); how will you deal with non-respondents? If collecting artifacts: what documents will you collect; how will you get access to them? If you plan to use audio- or visual-recordings: what will you record; how often; how will you deal with the recordings (transcribe, listen/watch and take notes)?
- What potential risks and benefits are there to those with whom you will conduct your research? How will you address those concerns?
- How do you imagine analyzing these materials?
- What will you do to enhance the validity of your conclusions?
- What will you do to examine the effect of your own role in the research--your decisions, developing perspectives, enabling and/or disabling biases, or other influences--on how you are shaping your findings?

CONCLUDING COMMENTS (1-2 pages)

What do you hope others will learn/experience as a result of your work? What contribution will it make to education or to educational scholarship?

REFERENCES

A full list of the references cited with correct APA style.

APPENDICES

Interview guides, survey drafts, prompts, or other artifacts used that would be of use for future reference and that would provide valuable information about your proposal.

There are a few ways in which this outline differs from what would be expected in a small grant proposal. Such proposals typically contain sections detailing the qualifications of the researcher(s) and a full budget. We are not asking you to include those sections. Also, risks and benefits of the research to human subjects are usually addressed in an application to the Institutional Review Board for the protection of human subjects and not in the proposal itself.

V6 Schedule, Winter 2009

3-2-09

Before the first session, please read Rex (2003) and Hanushek (1999). These papers are available in CTools (under First Class Readings). Laptops will be available every session.

Session	Session Activity	Readings Assigned	Group Research Project Assignment	Individual Proposal Assignment
Wednesday 1/7 class 1.1	Introductions Discuss researcher-researched	Study Rex (2003) and Hanushek (1999)	Write notes as assigned on readings	
Monday 1/12 class 2.1	Writing Shoe simulation First group meeting	Strauss & Corbin 1-6 [scan] Bredo [study] Watson [scan] Rex, Steadman, & Graciano [skim]	Organize into study groups Begin forming RQ and reviewing data	Begin defining research project and orienting question
Weds 1/14 class 2.2	Review Strauss and Corbin 1-6 and begin to search for patterns in, and devise a RQ for, the reflections.	Patton 1, 2 [scan] Kelly [study] Diamond & Spillane [skim] Hubbard [skim]	Read all the reflections and begin to look for patterns in relation to the orienting question	Begin collecting three studies that are informative for your study.
Monday 1/19	MLK Day			
Wed 1/21 class 3.1/2	Discuss elements of qualitative research in Patton (1,2) and Kelly	Strauss and Corbin 7-10 [study, and review 1-6] Greeno	Groups continue to work with reflections	Continue with collection of studies and preparing matrix of one study (matrix provided). Due for Seminar 2/2
Mon 1/26 Class 4.1	Complete coding of reflections Consider Straus & Corbin 7-10	Bazerman Anderson-Levitt	Complete a coding matrix for the evaluations	Continue with collection of studies and preparing matrix of one study (matrix provided). Due for Seminar 2/2
Weds 1/28 class 4.2	Discuss ethnographic approach: Bazerman and Anderson-Levitt	Nespor Emerson, et al, 4, 5, 6		Continue with collection of studies and preparing matrix of one study (matrix provided). Due for Seminar 2/2

Session	Session Activity	Readings Assigned	Group Research Project Assignment	Individual Proposal Assignment
Mon 2/2 Class 5.1	Practice taking field notes Jot field notes on study group discussions of student presented articles.	Krefting Eisenhart & Howe Johnson Ambert, et al	Elaborate field notes	Complete matrix for three articles.
Weds 2/4 Class 5.2	Discuss issues of validity and generalizability in Eisenhart & Howe, Krefting, Ambert, et al, & Godley	Erickson Strike Christians Deyhle, et al		Narrow down your research question(s), purpose, site, and participants.
Mon 2/9 Class 6.1	Discuss Erickson pages 146 - 149 Discuss research ethics (Strike, Christians, and Deyhle). Make use of letter coding and field note thematic analysis to generate assertions			
Weds 2/11 Class 6.2	Build argument for assertions for first project write up	Brenner Silverman		
Mon 2/16 Class 7.1	Discuss Interviewing: Brenner & Silverman Practice interviewing		1st project write up due. Upload onto Ctools by midnight, Sunday 2/15.	
Weds 2/18 Class 7.2	Interview a member of another group Midcourse evaluation	Arendell Scheurich Stage & Maple [skim] or Marshall & Patterson [skim]	Transcribe interview	
2/22-3/1	SPRING BREAK			Find/select a site and participants for your study
Mon 3/2 Class 8.1	Discuss issues of interviewing, sampling, and transcription, Arendell and Scheurich. Discuss 1st project			
Weds 3/4 Class 8.2	Dickinson examples Thematic analysis of interview transcripts	Bloome & Clark Wetherell Stanley & Billig	Transcribe select portion(s) of the interview	
Mon	Discuss Discourse analysis in Wetherall, and Bloome	Lei		

3/9	& Clark. Evaluate Stanley & Billig	Taylor (optional)		
Class 9.1				

Session	Session Activity	Readings Assigned	Group Research Project Assignment	Individual Proposal Assignment
Weds 3/11 Class 9.2	Dickinson examples Present Notation key Apply discourse analysis to interview or evaluation data sections.	Carspecken Britzman Fine, et al. Lökman	Retranscribe a selected portion of the interview for DA	
Mon 3/16 Class 10.1	Discuss critical, postmodern, and social justice issues (Carspecken, Britzman, & Fine)	Banks Cochran-Smith & Donnell Gergen & Gergen		
Weds 3/18 Class 10.2	Apply interview and discourse analysis sections to 2nd project write up			
Mon 3-23 Class 11.1	Discuss qualitative research as an evolving approach Banks, Cochran-Smith & Donnell, and Gergen & Gergen	Marshall & Rossman, preface, chapters 1-4 & 7 Eisenhart		Read M & R and Eisenhart and commit to your research question(s) and design for your study.
Weds 3/25 Class 11.2	Continue work on 2nd project write up		2nd project write up due. Upload to CTools by midnight, Sunday, 3/29	
Mon 3/30 Class 12.1	Discuss Marshall & Rossman. Begin planning individual proposals. Discuss 2nd project	Marshall & Rossman Chapters 5 & 6 (optional)		Make appointment for meeting with Lesley about your proposal and research agenda.(optional)
Weds 4/1 Class 12.2	Meet with instructors & Group with RQ and design*			Write zero draft of proposal
Mon 4/6 Class 13.1	Zero draft of proposals discussed			Write... and respond to colleagues' drafts
Weds 4/8	Meet with instructors & Group to discuss			Write... and respond to colleagues' drafts

Class 13.2	revisions*			
Mon 4/13- Weds 4/15	AERA- No Class meetings			
Monday 4/20 LAST CLASS Class 14.1	Revised drafts exchanged for final feedback Evaluation of study. Discussion of important concepts about QR.			Polish final proposal draft
				*Proposals due 4/24 – 4/30 on CTools .

* Schedule meeting to talk with Lesley and Vicki about their responses to your project.

**Unless otherwise indicated, upload all assignments onto CTools file in the corresponding folder under the Resources section. All Class members are expected to read the written assignments of all their group members. Please follow the following standard for labeling your submission:
LastName_mm.dd.

